

## 2019 SECOND CONSULTATION

1 July – 30 September 2019

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

#### Summary of comments

Name	Summary
APPPC Σ	Agreed comments entered based on 20th APPPC regional workshop conclusions.
Australia	A proposed new table for the Appendix 1 has been developed. I was unable to attach the proposed table through the OCS and so have emailed this to the IPPC Secretariat separately.
Barbados	Barbados is in general agreement with this ISPM and has only a few minor changes
COSAVE	Ver también archivo del grupo del Taller Regional de la CIPF para complementar y asegurar que todos los comentarios hayan sido introducidos en el grupo de la CIPF.
Cuba	No tenemos comentarios sobre la norma, estamos de acuerdo con la propuesta.
European Union	Comments submitted by the European Commission on behalf of the European Union and its 28 Member States.
Libya	I accept the review
Malawi	Malawi supports the revision of ISPM 8 Malawi supports that Appendix 1 should remain in the ISPM
NEPPO Σ	The source of the report is crucial in determining the pest status.
Nigeria	NPPO Nigeria agrees with the Draft ISPM on Determination of Pest Status in an Area.
OIRSA	Revisión finalizada, incorporando los comentarios consensuados por los países del OIRSA
Singapore	Singapore agreed with APPPC submitted comments.
South Africa	The National Plant Protection Organisation of South Africa (NPPOZA) has no further comments and therefore accepts this standard.
Trinidad and Tobago	T&T is in agreement with the comments made and collated by CAHFSA at the IPPC Regional Workshop for the Caribbean 2019

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

FAO sequential number	Para	Text	T	Comment
1	G	(General Comment)	C	<b>Jamaica</b> This is a well-written standard, very comprehensive . Jamaica has no additional comment or information to add.

				<i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
2	G	(General Comment)	C	<p><b>Mexico</b> According to the request on whether or not to maintain Appendix 1, this NPPO considers eliminating it because it does not provide much guidance for a country to take into account such data to define the status of a pest; The proposal creates more uncertainty. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i></p>
3	G	(General Comment)	C	<p><b>Saint Kitts And Nevis</b> We generally agree with revisions made to this ISPM. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i></p>
4	G	(General Comment)	C	<p><b>Guyana</b> We support the comments submitted by CAHFSA which were formulated by discussions from the Caribbean Regional IPPC Workshop. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i></p>
5	G	(General Comment)	C	<p><b>Peru</b> Per#250; ratifica los comentarios y sugerencias concordados a nivel del COSAVE y en el Taller Regional realizado en Medell#237;n, Colombia. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i></p>
6	G	(General Comment)	C	<p><b>Poland</b> Poland would like to formally endorse the EPPO comments submitted via the IPPC online Comment System. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i></p>
7	G	(General Comment)	C	<p><b>Canada</b> Technical and substantive comments provided for consideration and incorporation. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i></p>
8	G	(General Comment)	C	<p><b>New Zealand</b> New Zealand has serious concern about and strongly oppose removing pest status of "transient" as a category. 1. Retain the status "transient" as a separate section not in the "Presence" section. This would take into account temporary populations not expected to establish (as per Article VII, par 3 of the IPPC). The category "Present: transient" may be read with an emphasis on presence and result in unjustified phytosanitary import requirements. 2. Including "transient" under "present" will have potential implication of trade restriction and create problem for market access negotiation where disagreement may arise. For example unjustifiable phytosanitary measure may be required if a pest is categorised as "present: transient" when the pest is not expected to establish and phytosanitary actions are being taken. 3. The proposed category "Present: transient" substitutes all previous categories under "transience", and it seems that details on the measures in place, or its</p>

				<p>establishment potential are lost, i.e. actionable, under surveillance, or actionable, under eradication.</p> <p>3. New Zealand strongly proposes to keep the "transient" category separately from "present" and "absent";, and propose to define transient as follows: "Pest status is considered transient when a pest is detected but establishment is not expected to occur based on technical evaluation. [i.e. to replace "present" in the current standard wording with "detected"]</p> <p>4. New Zealand further proposes to combine the three types of "transient" in the current ISPM 8 into two types:</p> <p>1). 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.</p> <p>2). 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.</p> <p>5. If "transient" status is reinstated, New Zealand proposes to delete the type "transient: non-actionable". New Zealand believes even though a pest might be seasonal and is not expected to establish in a region, it can still pose a risk to other region should it become associated with commodity or production site, and if no actions are taken to mitigate this risk.</p> <p>6. An implementation issue with the proposed change is that current status of certain pests recorded as "transient" will need to be changed to align with the new wording.</p> <p>7. The proposed change of pest status will no longer align with other ISPMs e.g. ISPM 17 Pest reporting.</p> <p>8. The Appendix is very helpful and important as guidance. However New Zealand believes it is guidance material and should be separated from the ISPM. New Zealand further suggests that the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee to consider developing guidance materials for this ISPM and include the appendix in this draft as part of it.</p> <p><i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i></p>
9	G	(General Comment)	C	<p><b>Barbados</b></p> <p>The draft standard is important and has dealt with the major issues surrounding this topic.</p> <p><i>Category : EDITORIAL</i></p>
10	G	(General Comment)	C	<p><b>Canada</b></p> <p>Canada supports the proposed draft revision of ISPM 8.</p> <p><i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i></p>

11	G	(General Comment)	C	<b>Indonesia</b> 1) Indonesia strongly proposes to keep the "transient" category separately from "present" and "absent" and stand-alone as current ISPM 8 2) The table "Reliability of information sources" should remain as Appendix because information in the table is useful for NPPOs to decide pest status <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
12	G	(General Comment)	C	<b>Trinidad and Tobago</b> T&T is in agreement with the comments made and collated by CAHFSA at the IPPC Regional Workshop for the Caribbean 2019 <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
13	G	(General Comment)	C	<b>Paraguay</b> De acuerdo con los comentarios de COSAVE. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
14	G	(General Comment)	C	<b>Eswatini</b> Standard is relevant <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
15	G	(General Comment)	C	<b>Slovenia</b> Slovenia would like to formally endorse the EPPO comments submitted via the IPPC Online Comment System. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
16	G	(General Comment)	C	<b>Bahrain</b> no comment <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
17	G	(General Comment)	C	<b>Australia</b> Clarify that 3.3 Unable to determine pest status “unable to determine” is a situation and not a pest status category <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
18	G	(General Comment)	C	<b>Cuba</b> No tenemos comentarios sobre la norma, estamos de acuerdo con la propuesta. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
19	G	(General Comment)	C	<b>Israel</b> Israel would like to formally endorse the EPPO comments submitted via the IPPC Online Comment System <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
20	G	(General Comment)	C	<b>Myanmar</b> We agree all APPPC comments as the reviewers. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
21	G	(General Comment)	C	<b>Caribbean Agricultural Health and Food Safety Agency</b> Guyana has found under the revision of this standard that the additions made to ISPM 8: Determination of pest status in an area to be pertinent to the enhancement of information propagated towards the determination of the pest status in an area. We, therefore accept these revisions and support the adoption of this standard.

				<i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
22	G	(General Comment)	C	<b>Caribbean Agricultural Health and Food Safety Agency</b> Generally agree with the contents of this draft ISPM. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
23	G	(General Comment)	C	<b>Caribbean Agricultural Health and Food Safety Agency</b> T&T endorses the revision of the ISPM and the emphasis on the quality of information used in determining pest status. <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
24	G	(General Comment)	C	<b>PPPO</b> Appendix 1 is valuable as a guidance document and could be useful in encouraging the IC group to use the table as a guidance priority. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
25	G	(General Comment)	C	<b>PPPO</b> Paragraph 107-112; Clarity is needed in defining whether pests contained in a limited area changes the pest status under the specific conditions mentioned from para 108-112. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
26	G	(General Comment)	C	<b>Antigua and Barbuda</b> Antigua and Barbuda accepts the changes that were made in the first consultation and has no additional comments at this time. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
27	G	(General Comment)	C	<b>OIRSA</b> PROJECT OF ISPM GLOSSARY OF PHYTOSANITARY TERMS <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
28	G	(General Comment)	C	<b>Zambia</b> We are in support of the proposed revision of ISPM 8 <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
29	G	(General Comment)	C	<b>Mozambique</b> In general this standard is well drafted with clarity of terms and technical terminologies, it is can be in the contest of Mozambique <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
30	G	(General Comment)	C	<b>Botswana</b> The standard is elaborate on pest status. we are in agreement <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
31	G	(General Comment)	C	<b>Malawi</b> Malawi supports the draft revision of ISPM8. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
<b>Definitions</b>				
32	39	Definitions of <del>phytosanitary</del> <b>Phytosanitary</b> terms used in this standard can be found in ISPM 5 ( <i>Glossary of phytosanitary terms</i> ).	P	<b>Ghana</b> <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
<b>Outline of Requirements</b>				
33	41	National plant protection organizations (NPPOs) use pest status for various activities, such as pest risk analysis, <u>the establishment of Regulated pest lists</u> , the establishment of and compliance with phytosanitary regulations, and the	P	<b>Iran</b> <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>

		establishment and maintenance of pest free areas, areas of low pest prevalence, pest free places of production and pest free production sites.		
34	41	National <del>plant protection organizations</del> <u>Plant Protection Organizations</u> (NPPOs) use pest status for various activities, such as pest risk analysis, the establishment of and compliance with <del>phytosanitary</del> <u>Phytosanitary</u> regulations, and the establishment and maintenance of <del>pest free areas</del> <u>Pest Free Areas (PFA)</u> , areas of low pest prevalence, pest free places of production and pest free production sites.	P	<b>Ghana</b> <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
35	42	<del>Pest status is determined exclusively by the NPPO responsible for the area and is categorized under “presence” or “absence”.</del> <u>El estado de la plaga es determinado exclusivamente por la ONPF responsable del área y se clasifica en "presencia" o "ausencia".</u>	P	<b>OIRSA</b> Ampliar en este punto que existen varias categor&#237;as en ausente o presente <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
36	42	Pest status is determined exclusively by the NPPO responsible for the area and is categorized under “presence” or “absence”.	C	<b>OIRSA</b> Cada categor&#237;a cuenta con “situaciones acondicionadas” y quiz&#225; se debe mencionar este hecho. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
37	43	The quality of the reported information and <del>understanding the</del> reliability and uncertainty of the data are important considerations <u>to be taken into account by the NPPO</u> when determining pest status <del>and are outlined</del> <u>in this standard</u> <del>an area</del> .	P	<b>European Union</b> Clearer. <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
38	43	The quality of the reported information and <del>understanding the</del> reliability and uncertainty of the data are important considerations <u>to be taken into account by the NPPO</u> when determining pest status <del>and are outlined</del> <u>in this standard</u> <del>an area</del> .	P	<b>EPPO</b> Clearer. <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
Background				
39	45	Pest records and other information are used <u>by NPPOs</u> to determine the presence or absence of a pest in an area (i.e. an officially defined country, part of a country or all or parts of several countries). National plant protection organizations of importing and exporting countries need information concerning the status of pests for pest risk analysis, the establishment of and compliance with phytosanitary regulations, the establishment and maintenance of pest free areas, areas of low pest prevalence, pest free places of production and pest free production sites, and other activities.	P	<b>China</b> Support to APPPC comment <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
40	45	Pest records and other information are used <u>by NPPOs</u> to determine the presence or absence of a pest in an area (i.e. an officially defined country, part of a country or all or parts of several countries). National plant protection organizations of importing and exporting countries need information concerning the status of pests for pest risk analysis, the establishment of and compliance with phytosanitary regulations, the establishment and maintenance of pest free areas, areas of low pest prevalence, pest free places of production and pest free production sites, and other activities.	P	<b>Indonesia</b> Propose to add in &quot;by NPPOs&quot; to imply &quot;official&quot; status <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>

41	45	Pest records and other information are used to determine the presence or absence of a pest in an area <u>(i.e. an officially defined country, part NPPOs of a country or all or parts of several countries)</u> . National plant protection organizations of importing and exporting countries need information concerning the status of pests for pest risk analysis, the establishment of and compliance with phytosanitary regulations, the establishment and maintenance of pest free areas, areas of low pest prevalence, pest free places of production and pest free production sites, and other activities.	P	<b>European Union</b> 1. The ISPM 5 definition of 'area' given in brackets creates confusion in this context and is not needed. 2. The acronym NPPOs is first used in paragraph 41. <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
42	45	Pest records and other information are used <u>by NPPOs to officially</u> determine the presence or absence of a pest in an area (i.e. an officially defined country, part of a country or all or parts of several countries). National plant protection organizations of importing and exporting countries need information concerning the status of pests for pest risk analysis, the establishment of and compliance with phytosanitary regulations, the establishment and maintenance of pest free areas, areas of low pest prevalence, pest free places of production and pest free production sites, and other activities.	P	<b>Korea, Republic of</b> Proposed to add in "by NPPOs" to imply "officially" status. <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
43	45	Pest records and other information are used to determine the presence or absence of a pest in an area <u>(i.e. an officially defined country, part NPPOs of a country or all or parts of several countries)</u> . National plant protection organizations of importing and exporting countries need information concerning the status of pests for pest risk analysis, the establishment of and compliance with phytosanitary regulations, the establishment and maintenance of pest free areas, areas of low pest prevalence, pest free places of production and pest free production sites, and other activities.	P	<b>EPPO</b> The acronym NPPOs is first used in paragraph 41.  The ISPM 5 definition of 'area' given in brackets creates confusion in this context and is not needed. <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
44	45	Pest records and other information are used <u>by NPPOs</u> to determine the presence or absence of a pest in an area (i.e. an officially defined country, part of a country or all or parts of several countries). National plant protection organizations of importing and exporting countries need information concerning the status of pests for pest risk analysis, the establishment of and compliance with phytosanitary regulations, the establishment and maintenance of pest free areas, areas of low pest prevalence, pest free places of production and pest free production sites, and other activities.	P	<b>APPPC</b> To include "...used by NPPOs" for clarity and to imply official status. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
45	45	Pest records and other information are used <u>by NPPOs to official</u> determine the presence or absence of a pest in an area (i.e. an officially defined country, part of a country or all or parts of several countries). National plant protection organizations of importing and exporting countries need information concerning the status of pests for pest risk analysis, the establishment of and compliance with phytosanitary regulations, the establishment and maintenance of pest free areas, areas of low pest prevalence, pest free places of production and pest free production sites, and other activities.	P	<b>Thailand</b> Propose to add in "by NPPOs" to imply "official" status. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>

46	45	Pest records and other information are used to determine the presence or absence of a pest in an area_(i.e. an officially defined country, part of a country or all or parts of several countries). <del>National plant protection organizations</del> <u>NPPO</u> of importing and exporting countries need information concerning the status of pests for pest risk analysis, the establishment of and compliance with phytosanitary regulations, the establishment and maintenance of pest free areas, areas of low pest prevalence, pest free places of production and pest free production sites, and other activities.	P	<b>Japan</b> Editorial <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
47	45	Pest records and other information are used to determine the presence or absence of a pest in an area_(i.e. an officially defined country, part of a country or all or parts of several countries). National plant protection organizations of importing and exporting countries need information concerning the status of pests for pest risk analysis, <u>the establishment of Regulated pest lists</u> , the establishment of and compliance with phytosanitary regulations, the establishment and maintenance of pest free areas, areas of low pest prevalence, pest free places of production and pest free production sites, and other activities.	P	<b>Iran</b> <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
48	45	Pest records and other information are used to determine the presence or absence of a pest in an area_(i.e. an officially defined country, part of a country or all or parts of several countries). National <del>plant protection organizations</del> <u>Plant Protection Organizations</u> of importing and exporting countries need information concerning the status of pests for <del>pest risk analysis</del> <u>Pest Risk Analysis (PRA)</u> , the establishment of and compliance with <del>phytosanitary</del> <u>Phytosanitary</u> regulations, the establishment and maintenance of pest free areas, areas of low pest prevalence, pest free places of production and pest free production sites, and other activities.	P	<b>Ghana</b> <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
<b>IMPACTS ON BIODIVERSITY AND THE ENVIRONMENT</b>				
49	47	<b>IMPACTS ON BIODIVERSITY AND THE ENVIRONMENT</b>	C	<b>Argentina</b> We suggest to revise the relevance to maintain this section in all ISPMs through the appropriate CPM bodies, because it contains general declarations that do not provide guidance to NPPOs <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
50	47	<b>IMPACTS ON BIODIVERSITY AND THE ENVIRONMENT</b>	C	<b>Costa Rica</b> We suggest to revise the relevance to maintain this section in all ISPMs through the appropriate CPM bodies, because it contains general declarations that do not provide guidance to NPPOs <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
51	47	<b>IMPACTS ON BIODIVERSITY AND THE ENVIRONMENT</b>	C	<b>Uruguay</b> We suggest to revise the relevance to maintain this section in all ISPMs through the appropriate CPM bodies, because it contains general declarations that do not provide guidance to NPPOs <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>



52	47	<b>IMPACTS ON BIODIVERSITY AND THE ENVIRONMENT</b>	C	<p><b>COSAVE</b> Se sugiere que a trav&amp;#233;s de los &amp;#243;rganos de la CMF que correspondan se revise la pertinencia de mantener esta secci&amp;#243;n en las NIMF, dado que son declaraciones de car&amp;#225;cter general que no brindan orientaci&amp;#243;n a las ONPF.</p> <p>We suggest to revise the relevance to maintain this section in all ISPMs through the appropriate CPM bodies, because it contains general declarations that do not provide guidance to NPPOs <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i></p>
53	48	This standard may contribute to the protection of biodiversity and the environment by helping countries to determine the status of pests whose introduction and spread may have an environmental impact. Determining and describing pest status in a consistent manner may help countries identify risks associated with such pests and apply phytosanitary measures <u>contributing</u> to protect biodiversity and the environment.	P	<p><b>Argentina</b> The word “contributing” was added to clarify that phytosanitary measures may contribute to the protection of the biodiversity and environment, but this protection is not the objective of the application of phytosanitary measures. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i></p>
54	48	This standard may contribute to the protection of biodiversity and the environment by helping countries to determine the status of pests whose introduction and spread may have an environmental impact. Determining and describing pest status in a consistent manner may help countries identify risks associated with such pests and apply phytosanitary measures <u>that may contribute</u> to protect biodiversity and the environment.	P	<p><b>Costa Rica</b> The word “contributing” was added to clarify that phytosanitary measures may contribute to the protection of the biodiversity and environment, but this protection is not the objective of the application of phytosanitary measures. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i></p>
55	48	This standard may contribute to the protection of biodiversity and the environment by helping countries to determine the status of pests whose introduction and spread may have an environmental impact. Determining and describing pest status in a consistent manner may help countries identify risks associated with such pests and apply phytosanitary measures <u>contributing</u> to protect biodiversity and the environment.	P	<p><b>Uruguay</b> The word “contributing” was added to clarify that phytosanitary measures may contribute to the protection of the biodiversity and environment, but this protection is not the objective of the application of phytosanitary measures <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i></p>
56	48	This standard may contribute to the protection of biodiversity and the environment by helping countries to determine the status of pests whose introduction and spread may have an environmental impact. Determining and describing pest status in a consistent manner may help countries identify risks associated with such pests and apply phytosanitary measures <u>that may contribute</u> to protect biodiversity and the environment.	P	<p><b>CA</b>  <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i></p>
57	48	This standard may contribute to the protection of biodiversity and the environment by helping countries to determine the status of pests whose introduction and spread may have an environmental impact. Determining and describing pest status in a consistent manner may help countries identify risks associated with such pests and apply phytosanitary measures to protect biodiversity and the environment.	C	<p><b>CA</b> La protecci&amp;#243;n al &amp;#225;mbiente y la biodiversidad es un aspecto complementario a la aplicaci&amp;#243;n de las medidas. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i></p>

58	48	This standard may contribute to the protection of biodiversity and the environment by helping countries to determine the status of pests whose introduction and spread may have an environmental impact. Determining and describing pest status in a consistent manner may help countries identify risks associated with such pests and apply phytosanitary measures <a href="#">contributing</a> to protect biodiversity and the environment.	P	<b>COSAVE</b> <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
59	48	This standard may contribute to the protection of biodiversity and the environment by helping countries to determine the status of pests whose introduction and spread may have an environmental impact. Determining and describing pest status in a consistent manner may help countries identify risks associated with such pests and apply phytosanitary measures to protect biodiversity and the environment.	C	<b>COSAVE</b> The word "contributing" was added to clarify that phytosanitary measures may contribute to the protection of the biodiversity and environment, but this protection is not the objective of the application of phytosanitary measures.  Para clarificar que las medidas fitosanitarias podr&#225;n contribuir a la protecci&#243;n de la biodiversidad y el medio ambiente, pero que dicha protecci&#243;n no es el objetivo de la aplicaci&#243;n de medidas fitosanitarias. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
60	48	This standard may contribute to the protection of biodiversity and the environment by helping countries to determine the status of pests whose introduction and spread may have an environmental impact. Determining and describing pest status in a consistent manner may help countries identify risks associated with such pests and apply <del>phytosanitary</del> <a href="#">Phytosanitary</a> measures to protect biodiversity and the environment.	P	<b>Ghana</b> <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
<b>1. Purpose of Pest Status Determination</b>				
61	52	NPPOs may use pest status information when undertaking activities such as:	C	<b>OIRSA</b> Surveillance programs establishments Evaluate the pest behaviour in an area <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
62	55	planning national, regional or international pest <a href="#">surveillance and</a> management programmes	P	<b>Korea, Republic of</b> To include planning surveillance with pest management programme. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
63	60	exchanging information as outlined in the IPPC.- <a href="#">Surveillance programs establishments- evaluate the pest behaviour in an area</a>	P	<b>Mexico</b> Two more options to be considered <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
64	60	exchanging information as outlined in the IPPC.	C	<b>Nepal</b> - Surveillance activities <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
65	61	<del>NPPO responsibilities:</del> <a href="#">1 bis. NPPO responsibilities</a>	P	<b>European Union</b> NPPO responsibilities should be a new section because these are not part of Section 1 (Purpose of Pest Status Determination). <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>

66	61	<del>NPPO responsibilities:</del> <b><u>1bis. NPPO Responsibilities</u></b>	P	<b>EPPO</b> NPPO responsibilities should be a new section because there are not part of Section 1 (Purpose of Pest Status Determination). <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
67	62	Contracting parties have obligations under the IPPC (Article VIII.1(a)) to report “the occurrence, outbreak or spread of pests”. Pest status <del>should be</del> <u>is</u> determined exclusively by the NPPO responsible for the area.	P	<b>NEPPO</b> <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
68	62	Contracting parties have obligations under the IPPC (Article VIII.1(a)) to report “the occurrence, outbreak or spread of pests”. Pest status <del>should be</del> <u>is</u> determined exclusively by the NPPO responsible for the area.	P	<b>NEPPO</b> <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
69	65	maintain pest records and supporting <del>evidence</del> <u>evidence (field reports, pictures)</u> , taking into account that they may be needed to support the determination of pest status	P	<b>Ghana</b> <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
70	66	re-evaluate pest status if appropriate.	C	<b>Nepal</b> based on appropriate identification methods for new pests. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
<b>2. Information Used to Determine Pest Status</b>				
71	70	Information is available from many sources and has varying levels of reliability. 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 guidance that may be used by the responsible NPPO to assess the reliability of different information sources.	C	<b>Nigeria</b> NPPO Nigeria agrees that the Appendix on reliability of information sources should remain in this ISPM. <b>Nigeria</b> NPPO Nigeria agrees that the Appendix on reliability of information sources should remain in this ISPM. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
72	71	Highly reliable and current sources should be used to determine pest status. However, when such sources are not available, lower reliability sources may be used. This may increase uncertainty but can also help to identify information gaps which can be addressed through surveillance (see ISPM 6) and pest <del>diagnostics</del> <u>diagnostics (see ISPM 27 (Diagnostic protocols for regulated pests))</u> .	P	<b>European Union</b> Precision that may be given if it is deemed useful. <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
73	71	Highly reliable and current sources should be used to determine pest status. However, when such sources are not available, lower reliability sources may be used. This may increase uncertainty but can also help to identify information gaps which can be addressed through surveillance (see ISPM 6) and pest diagnostics. <u>The NPPO may need consultation and exchange of information with other NPPOs to fill information gaps.</u>	P	<b>Japan</b> Refer to the comment on paragraph 138. Add the text according to the deletion of section 3.3. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
74	71	Highly reliable and current sources should be used to determine pest status. However, when such sources are not available, lower reliability sources may be used. This may increase uncertainty but can also help to identify information gaps which can be addressed through surveillance (see ISPM 6) and pest <del>diagnostics</del> <u>diagnostics (see ISPM 27 (Diagnostic protocols for regulated pests))</u> .	P	<b>EPPO</b> Precision that may be given if it is deemed useful. <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>

75	71	Highly reliable and current sources should be used to determine pest status. However, when such sources are not available, lower reliability sources <del>may could</del> be <del>used. This may increase uncertainty but can also help used by NPPO</del> to identify information gaps which can be addressed through surveillance (see ISPM 6) and pest diagnostics.	P	<b>NEPPO</b> <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
76	71	Highly reliable and current sources should be used to determine pest status. However, when such sources are not available, lower <del>reliability-reliable</del> sources may be used. This may increase uncertainty but can also help to identify information gaps which can be addressed through surveillance (see ISPM 6) and pest diagnostics.	P	<b>PPPO</b> <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
77	72	Sometimes pest status can be difficult to determine because of <del>lack of information</del> <u>or</u> uncertainty associated with the available information. Sources of uncertainty may include:	P	<b>European Union</b> More complete. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
78	72	Sometimes pest status can be difficult to determine because of <del>lack of information</del> <u>or</u> uncertainty associated with the available information. Sources of uncertainty may include:	P	<b>EPPO</b> More complete. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
79	73	limited information on pest biology	C	<b>OIRSA</b> genomic ambiguity within closely related species <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
80	73	limited <u>available</u> information on pest biology	P	<b>PPPO</b> <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
81	74	<del>taxonomy</del> <del>taxonomic revisions or ambiguity</del>	P	<b>China</b> Support to APPPC comments <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
82	74	<del>taxonomic revisions or ambiguity</del> <u>taxonomy</u>	P	<b>Korea, Republic of</b> To cover multiple areas related to taxonomy, i.e. revision etc <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
83	74	<del>taxonomy</del> <del>taxonomic revisions or ambiguity</del>	P	<b>APPPC</b> To delete taxonomic etc and to replace with the word &quot;taxonomy&quot; to cover multiple possible areas under taxonomy that can contribute to uncertainty. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
84	74	<del>taxonomy</del> <del>taxonomic revisions or ambiguity</del>	P	<b>Philippines</b> more comprehensive/general term to cover all taxonomic concerns <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
85	74	taxonomic revisions or ambiguity	C	<b>Nepal</b> lack of taxonomic <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
86	78	insufficient <u>available</u> information on pest–host associations	P	<b>PPPO</b>

				<i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
87	79	unknown aetiology	C	<b>Mozambique</b> The word aetiology is not in the glossary of phytosanitary terms. In plant health issues is not commonly used although its meaning in common sense is applicable for all subjects <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
88	81	insufficient <a href="#">available</a> information on the pest distribution in an area	P	<b>PPPO</b> <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
89	82	unreliability of the information sources. <u>The pest has been detected for the first time and through surveillance actions it is verified that there are no more detections</u>	P	<b>OIRSA</b> It is suggested to add this condition <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
<b>3. Describing Pest Status in an Area</b>				
90	84	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 (see ISPM <del>6)-6</del> or official <a href="#">control programs</a> .	P	<b>Mexico</b> Better wording <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
91	84	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 (see ISPM <del>6)-6</del> or official <a href="#">control program</a> .	P	<b>OIRSA</b> Better wording <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
92	85	<del>Presence of pests</del> <a href="#">Pests</a> under quarantine for diagnostic or research purposes (e.g. in a laboratory), or pest interceptions on imported consignments <del>at points of entry,</del> <a href="#">while</a> under detention, do not affect the pest status in an area.	P	<b>European Union</b> The use of the word “presence” is somewhat ambiguous given the context.  Detention is the most important aspect because the pests possibly present in the consignment cannot escape. This is irrespective of the consignment being at the point of entry or elsewhere. Therefore ‘point of entry’ can be deleted. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
93	85	<del>Presenece of pests</del> <a href="#">Pests</a> under quarantine for diagnostic or research purposes (e.g. in a laboratory), or pest interceptions on imported consignments <del>at points of entry,</del> <a href="#">while</a> under detention, do not affect the pest status in an area.	P	<b>EPPO</b> The use of the word “presence” is somewhat ambiguous given the context. Detention is the most important aspect because the pests possibly present in the consignment cannot escape. This is irrespective of the consignment being at the point of entry or elsewhere. Therefore ‘point of entry’ can be deleted. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
94	85	Presence of pests under quarantine for diagnostic or research purposes (e.g. in a laboratory), or pest interceptions on imported consignments <del>at points of entry,</del> <a href="#">while</a> under detention, do not affect the pest status in an area.	P	<b>IPPC Regional Workshop Europe and Central Asia</b> Detention is the most important aspect because the pests possibly present in the consignment cannot escape. This is irrespective of the consignment being at the point of entry or elsewhere. Therefore ‘point of entry’ can be deleted. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>

95	85	Presence of pests under quarantine for diagnostic or research purposes (e.g. in a <del>laboratory</del> <u>an authorized laboratory by dedicated authority</u> ), or pest interceptions on imported consignments at points of entry, while under detention, do not affect the pest status in an area.	P	<b>NEPPO</b> <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
96	85	Presence of pests under quarantine for diagnostic or research purposes (e.g. in a <del>laboratory</del> <u>laboratory under confinement conditions</u> ), or pest interceptions on imported consignments at points of entry, while under detention, do not affect the pest status in an area.	P	<b>NEPPO</b> <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
97	86	Determination of pest status in an area requires evidence and expert judgement on the current <del>distribution-situation</del> of a pest in an area. This judgement should be based on a synthesis of available information from various sources, including current and historical pest records, where available.	P	<b>Japan</b> The word "distribution" should be replaced with "situation". According to ISPM 5, "determination of pest status" means "to determine presence or absence of a pest", and "to determine the distribution of a pest". Therefore, "determination of pest status" needs to cover both situations.  Pest status (ISPM5) : "Presence or absence, at the present time, of a pest in an area, including where appropriate its distribution, as officially determined using expert judgement on the basis of current and historical pest records and other information". <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
98	86	Determination of pest status in an area requires <u>current</u> evidence and expert <del>judgement on the current distribution of a pest in an area</del> <u>judgement</u> . This judgement should be based on a synthesis of available information from various sources, including current and historical pest records, where available.	P	<b>Korea, Republic of</b> To add the clear term "current"; evidence, and to delete unnecessary sentences "on the current distribution of a pest in an area." <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
99	86	Determination of pest status in an area requires evidence and expert judgement on the <del>current-presence, absence or</del> distribution of a pest in an area. This judgement should be based on a synthesis of available information from various sources, including current and historical pest records, where available.	P	<b>Thailand</b> Better clarification. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
100	86	Determination of pest status in an area requires evidence and expert judgement on the current distribution of a pest in an area. This judgement should be based on a synthesis of available information from various sources, including current and historical pest records, where available, <u>and approved by NPPOs</u> .	P	<b>NEPPO</b> <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
101	86	Determination of pest status in an area requires evidence and expert judgement on the current distribution of a pest in an area. This judgement should be based on a synthesis of available information from various sources, including current and historical pest records, <u>where available</u> .	C	<b>Mozambique</b> The expression where available can be used taking in to consideration paragraph 72 of this draft standard <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
102	87	Pest status should be determined for an area identified and specified by the NPPO. When pest status is determined, the area in <del>question (question including, for example, any pest free areas, pest free places of production or pest free production</del>	P	<b>European Union</b> Reporting pest free areas and pest free places of production or pest free production sites is not mandatory. The reporting of pest



		<del>sites within it)</del> and the date should be indicated. <u>Information on pest free areas, pest free places of production or pest free production sites may be added to the report, if appropriate.</u> Pest status should be described according to the categories identified below.		free places of production and pest free production sites may be very detailed and expand the report in an unjustified manner. ISPM 4 states (1.3) that the information can be communicated to all interested NPPOs on request. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
103	87	Pest status should be determined for an area identified and specified by the NPPO. When pest status is determined, the area in <del>question (question including, for example, any pest free areas, pest free places of production or pest free production sites within it)</del> and the date should be indicated. <u>Information on pest free areas, pest free places of production or pest free production sites may be added to the report, if appropriate.</u> Pest status should be described according to the categories identified below.	P	<b>EPPO</b> Reporting pest free areas and pest free places of production or pest free production sites is not mandatory. The reporting of pest free places of production and pest free production sites may be very detailed and expand the report in an unjustified manner. ISPM 4 states (1.3) that the information can be communicated to all interested NPPOs on request. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
104	87	Pest status should be determined for an area identified and specified by the NPPO. When pest status is determined, the area in <del>question (question including, for example, any pest free areas, pest free places of production or pest free production sites within it)</del> and the date should be indicated. <u>Pest free areas and pest free places of production or production sites may be added to the report on request, if appropriate.</u> Pest status should be described according to the categories identified below.	P	<b>IPPC Regional Workshop Europe and Central Asia</b> Reporting pest free areas and pest free places of production or pest free production sites is not mandatory. The reporting of pest free places of production and pest free production sites may be very detailed and expand the report in an unjustified manner. ISPM 4 states (1.3) that the information can be communicated to all interested NPPOs on request. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
105	87	Pest status should be determined for an area identified and specified by the NPPO. When pest status is determined, the area in question (including, for example, any pest free areas, pest free places of production or pest free production sites within it) and the date should be indicated.- <u>There may be insufficient information available from surveillance or other sources for the NPPO to determine the 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. This information can be provided to other NPPOs upon request.</u> Pest status should be described according to the categories identified below.	P	<b>Thailand</b> We would like to add a paragraph moved from section 3.3. It is better to describe about undetermined status under this section. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
<b>3.1 Presence</b>				
106	90	<b>Table 1.</b> Pest status – Present	C	<b>China</b> Change the sequence of “Present: except in specified pest free areas” and “Present: except in specified pest free places of production or production sites”. Because the area of the latter is bigger than the former. <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
107	95	Present: not widely distributed and not under official control	C	<b>European Union</b> The term “not widely distributed” is mentioned with a reference to Supplement 1 of ISPM 5. The current version of this supplement states on Page 23: “Not widely distributed” is not a term included

				in the description of pest status listed in ISPM 8.” This requires an update in ISPM 5 (Supplement 1) once the new draft revision of ISPM 8 is adopted. This can be done as an ink amendment. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
108	95	Present: not widely distributed and not under official control	C	<b>European Union</b> The term “not widely distributed” is mentioned with a reference to Supplement 1 of ISPM 5. The current version of this supplement states on Page 23: “Not widely distributed” is not a term included in the description of pest status listed in ISPM 8.” This requires an update in ISPM 5 (Supplement 1) once the new draft revision of ISPM 8 is adopted. This can be done as an ink amendment. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
109	95	Present: not widely distributed and not under official control	C	<b>EPPO</b> The term ‘not widely distributed’ is mentioned with a reference to Supplement 1 of ISPM 5. The current version of this supplement states on Page 23: “ ‘Not widely distributed’ is not a term included in the description of pest status listed in ISPM 8”. This requires an update in ISPM 5 (Supplement 1) once the new draft revision of ISPM 8 is adopted. This can be done as an ink amendment. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
110	95	Present: not widely distributed and not under official control	C	<b>OIRSA</b> Cu&#225;l ser&#237;a la aplicabilidad de este estatus de plaga? (p. ej: para plaga cuarentenaria no calificar&#237;a porque no se est&#225; bajo control oficial) <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
111	96	The pest is present in a part or parts of the area <u>and is not subject to "official control" as provided in accordance with</u> 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	<b>Argentina</b> The name of the pest status in this category refers to the absence of official control for not widely distributed pests, therefore the description of pest status should reflect this situation. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
112	96	The pest is present in a part or parts of the area <u>and 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	<b>Costa Rica</b> The category name refers to the absence of official control for pests not widely distributed, therefore the description of this status should be reflected. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
113	96	The pest is present in a part or parts of the area in accordance with Supplement 1 ( <del>Guidelines on the interpretation and application of the concepts of “official control” and “not widely distributed”</del> )-( <i>Guidelines on the interpretation and application of the concepts of “official control” and “not widely distributed”</i> ) to ISPM 5 ( <i>Glossary of phytosanitary terms</i> ).	P	<b>European Union</b> Should be in italics ? <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
114	96	The pest is present in a <u>local area</u> , a part or parts of the <u>area-area*</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> ). <u>*Specify the area in which the pest is present where possible.</u>	P	<b>Japan</b> After the first consultation, “local area” was added in para 98 because of clarifying that the term “area” covers “local area”. In line with this revision. “local area” should be also added in para 96 because the targeted area of both statuses “Present: not widely distributed and not under official control” and “Present: not widely



				distributed and under official control” is not different.  Add an asterisk “*” after “the area” and the annotation like the present ISPM8. In case a pest is present partially or locally in an area, it is important to specify which area the pest is present in. As the text of the annotation, we propose a revised text “Specify the area in which the pest is present where possible” Category : <i>SUBSTANTIVE</i>
115	96	The pest is present in a part or parts of the area <u>and not subject to official control as provided in accordance with</u> 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	<b>Uruguay</b> The name of the pest status in this category refers to the absence of official control for not widely distributed pests, therefore the description of pest status should reflect this situation Category : <i>TECHNICAL</i>
116	96	The pest is present in a part or parts of the area in accordance with Supplement 1 ( <del>Guidelines on the interpretation and application of the concepts of “official control” and “not widely distributed”</del> )-(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	<b>EPPO</b> In italics? Category : <i>EDITORIAL</i>
117	96	The pest is present in a part or parts of the area <u>area-area, and not subject to “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	<b>Australia</b> The second part of the sub-category refers to the pest not being under official control but this has been left out of the description. Category : <i>SUBSTANTIVE</i>
118	96	The pest is present in a part or parts of the area <del>in</del> -(and not 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> ).	P	<b>PPPO</b> The second part of the sub category refers to the pest not being under official control but it has been left out of the description. Propose to add the words...“and not subject to official control” Category : <i>SUBSTANTIVE</i>
119	96	The pest is present in a <u>local area, a</u> 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 terms</i> ).	P	<b>NEPPO</b>  Category : <i>SUBSTANTIVE</i>
120	96	The pest is present in a part or parts of the area <u>and 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	<b>CA</b> Por consintencia con la categoria de la plaga Category : <i>SUBSTANTIVE</i>
121	96	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 terms</i> ).	C	<b>COSAVE</b> El nombre de la categorí;a refiere a la ausencia de control oficial para las plagas no ampliamente distribuidas, por lo tanto la descripci;ón de este estatus debe reflejar esta situaci;ón.  The name of the pest status in this category refers to the absence of oficial control for not widely distributed pests, therefore the description of pest status should reflect this situation. Category : <i>TECHNICAL</i>
122	96	The pest is present in a part or parts of the area <u>and is not subjet to “official control” as provided in accordance with</u> Supplement 1 (Guidelines on the interpretation and application	P	<b>COSAVE</b>  Category : <i>TECHNICAL</i>

		of the concepts of “official control” and “not widely distributed”) to ISPM 5 ( <i>Glossary of phytosanitary terms</i> ).		
123	97	Present: not widely distributed and under official control	C	<b>EPPO</b> The term ‘not widely distributed’ is mentioned with a reference to Supplement 1 of ISPM 5. The current version of this supplement states on Page 23: “ ‘Not widely distributed’ is not a term included in the description of pest status listed in ISPM 8”. This requires an update in ISPM 5 (Supplement 1) once the new draft revision of ISPM 8 is adopted. This can be done as an ink amendment. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
124	98	The pest is present in <del>a local area</del> area, part or parts of 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 pest status determination.	P	<b>Mexico</b> Better wording <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
125	98	The pest is present in a <del>local area</del> , part or parts of 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 pest status determination.	P	<b>Argentina</b> A “part or parts of an area” may also be local areas or very small areas within an area. Therefore, “a part or parts of an area” would include the concept of “local area”. In addition the concept of area is defined in ISPM 5 and the definition does not establish limits regarding the size of the area <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
126	98	The pest is present in a <del>local area</del> , part or parts of 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 pest status determination.	P	<b>Costa Rica</b> A “part or parts of an area” may also be local areas or very small areas within an area. Therefore, “a part or parts of an area” would include the concept of “local area”. In addition the concept of area is defined in ISPM 5 and the definition does not establish limits regarding the size of the area <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
127	98	The pest is present in <del>a local area</del> , part or parts of 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 pest status determination.	P	<b>Canada</b> Suggest deleting “local area”; Local area would be covered under “part or parts of the area”; Local area is used in section 2.6 of Supplement 1 of ISPM 5 in relation to application of official control programme. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
128	98	The pest is present in a local area, part or parts of the area, and subject to “official control” in accordance with Supplement 1 ( <del>Guidelines on the interpretation and application of the concepts of “official control” and “not widely distributed”</del> ) ( <i>Guidelines on the interpretation and application of the concepts of “official control” and “not widely distributed”</i> ) to ISPM 5 ( <i>Glossary of phytosanitary terms</i> ). The purpose of the official control should be stated alongside the pest status determination.	P	<b>European Union</b> Should be in italics ? <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
129	98	The pest is present in a <del>local area</del> , part or parts of 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</i>	P	<b>Uruguay</b> A “part or parts of the area” may also be local areas or very small areas within an area. Therefore, “a part or parts of an area” would include the concept of “local area”. In addition the concept of area

		<i>phytosanitary terms</i> ). The purpose of the official control should be stated alongside the pest status determination.		is defined in ISPM 5 and the definition does not establish limits regarding the size of the area <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
130	98	The pest is present in a local area, part or parts of the <del>area</del> 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 pest status determination. <u>*Specify the area in which the pest is present where possible.</u>	P	<b>Japan</b> Add an asterisk “*” after “the area” and the annotation like the present ISPM8. In case a pest is present partially or locally in an area, it is important to specify which area the pest is present in. As the text of the annotation, we propose a revised text “Specify the area in which the pest is present where possible”; <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
131	98	The pest is present in a local area, part or parts of the area, and subject to “official control” in accordance with Supplement 1 ( <del>Guidelines on the interpretation and application of the concepts of “official control” and “not widely distributed”</del> ) ( <i>Guidelines on the interpretation and application of the concepts of “official control” and “not widely distributed”</i> ) to ISPM 5 ( <i>Glossary of phytosanitary terms</i> ). The purpose of the official control should be stated alongside the pest status determination.	P	<b>EPPO</b> In italics? <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
132	98	The pest is <del>present-localized</del> in a <del>local area</del> , part <del>or parts (or parts)</del> of 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 pest status determination.	P	<b>United States of America</b> For clarification of the meaning “local”; <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
133	98	The pest is present in a <del>local</del> area, part or parts of 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 pest status determination.	P	<b>OIRSA</b> for better understanding <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
134	98	The pest is present in a local area, part or parts of 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 pest status determination.	C	<b>COSAVE</b> Una “parte de un área” o partes de un área; también se podrá ser partes localizadas o muy pequeñas de un área. Por lo tanto una “parte o parte de un área” incluirá el concepto de “área local”. Adicionalmente el concepto de “área” está definida en la NIMF 5 y no establece límites de dimensión o tamaño de un área.  A “part or parts of an area” may also be local areas or very small areas within an area. Therefore, “a part or parts of an area” would include the concept of “local area”. In addition the concept of area is defined in ISPM 5 and the definition does not establish limits regarding the size of the area <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
135	98	The pest is present in a <del>local area</del> , part or parts of 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 pest status determination.	P	<b>COSAVE</b> <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>

136	99	Present: at low prevalence	C	<b>Nigeria</b> NPPO Nigeria suggests this category of Pest status should be split into: (a) Present: at low prevalence and not under official control, and (b) Present: at low prevalence and under official control. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
137	102	The pest is present in the area except in parts of the area which are free from the pest in accordance with ISPM 4 ( <i>Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas</i> ). These parts should be described alongside the pest status determination.	C	<b>PPPO</b> editorial correction, removing underscores <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
138	103	<del>Present: except in specified pest free places of production or production sites</del>	P	<b>Australia</b> PFPP and PFPS are not related to the distribution of a pest within a country. These should not be considered as pest status categories, rather as potential risk mitigation measures. (PFPP and PFPS are generally defined in bilateral agreements.) They should not be included in this table. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
139	104	The pest is present in <del>an the</del> 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 or sites should be described alongside the pest status determination.	P	<b>Argentina</b> For consistency with other terms <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
140	104	The pest is present in <del>an the</del> 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 or sites should be described alongside the pest status determination.	P	<b>Costa Rica</b> For consistency with the other categories <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
141	104	The pest is present in <del>an the</del> 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 or sites should be described alongside the pest status determination.	P	<b>Uruguay</b> For consistency <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
142	104	<del>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 or sites should be described alongside the pest status determination.</del>	P	<b>Australia</b> Remove from table as per reasoning in Para 103 <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
143	105	Present: <del>transient</del> transient (conditions are not suitable for establishment)Present: transient (phytosanitary measures have been applied)	P	<b>Japan</b> Refer to paragraph 106 <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
144	105	Present: transient	C	<b>PPPO</b> proposal to have an additional category, to be called transient and the description to stay the same but placed into a separate table. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
145	105	Present: transient	C	<b>PPPO</b> propose to include an additional table to deal with transient pest status <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
146	105	<del>Present: transient</del> Present: Unique detection	P	<b>OIRSA</b> The proposal is to eliminate this term, since the classification of

				transitory corresponds to an aspect of temporality of the pest, not being a defined status. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
147	105	Present: transient	C	<b>Indonesia</b> Indonesia proposes "transient" to be excluded from present status and stand-alone (like previous ISPM 8) <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
148	105	Present: transient	C	<b>New Zealand</b> New Zealand strongly proposes to reinstate the "transient" category in parallel with "Present" and "Absent" for reasons stated in the "General comment". <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
149	106	<del>Evidence</del> The pest is present but evidence supports the conclusion that the pest is not expected to establish because conditions (e.g. hosts, climate, other seasons) are not suitable for establishment (see ISPM 5) or appropriate phytosanitary measures have been applied (e.g. during outbreaks in a pest free area).	P	<b>Argentina</b> For consistency with the others present categories. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
150	106	<del>Evidence</del> The pest is present in the area, but evidence supports the conclusion that the pest is not expected to establish because conditions (e.g. hosts, climate, other seasons) are not suitable for establishment (see ISPM 5) or appropriate phytosanitary measures have been applied (e.g. during outbreaks in a pest free area).	P	<b>Costa Rica</b> For consistency with the others present categories <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
151	106	Evidence supports the conclusion that the pest is not expected to establish because conditions (e.g. hosts, <del>climate, other seasons</del> climate) are not suitable for establishment (see ISPM 5) or appropriate phytosanitary measures have been applied (e.g. during outbreaks in a pest free area).	P	<b>European Union</b> Not clear: what 'other seasons' mean, it creates confusion and the idea is already included in the term 'climate'.  The definition of transience is "presence of a pest that is not expected to lead to establishment". Therefore we suggest deleting "(see ISPM 5)" that is not deemed necessary, as it is unclear and not in the right place. <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
152	106	<del>Evidence</del> The pest is present but evidence supports the conclusion that the pest is not expected to establish because conditions (e.g. hosts, climate, other seasons) are not suitable for establishment (see ISPM 5) or appropriate phytosanitary measures have been applied (e.g. during outbreaks in a pest free area).	P	<b>Uruguay</b> For consistency with the others present categories <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
153	106	<del>Evidence supports</del> The pest is transiently present in the <del>conclusion that area and</del> the pest is not expected to establish because <del>evidence supports that</del> conditions (e.g. hosts, climate, other seasons) are <del>evaluated as not to be</del> suitable for establishment (see (e.g. section 2.2.2 of ISPM 5) or 11). The pest is transiently present in the area and the pest is not expected to establish because appropriate phytosanitary measures have been applied (e.g. during outbreaks in a pest free area).	P	<b>Japan</b> As the status "Present: transient" has covered broad situations, it should be divided into "Present: transient (conditions are not suitable for establishment)" and "Present: transient (phytosanitary measures have been applied)".  The former status can be given under natural factors (e.g. hosts, climate, other seasons). On the other hand, the latter status can be given under a human factor, i.e. phytosanitary measures. Therefore both statuses should not be dealt with together. And by separating the status, the pest status of the target area can be indicated in more detail.



				Whether conditions are not suitable for establishment can be referred to the elements of "section 2.2.2 of ISPM 11", not ISPM5. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
154	106	Evidence supports the conclusion that the pest is not expected to establish because conditions (e.g. hosts, <del>climate, other seasons</del> -climate) are not suitable for establishment ( <del>see ISPM 5</del> ) or appropriate phytosanitary measures have been applied (e.g. during outbreaks in a pest free area).	P	<b>EPPO</b> Not clear: what 'other seasons' mean, it creates confusion and the idea is already included in the term 'climate'.  The definition of transience is "presence of a pest that is not expected to lead to establishment". Therefore we suggest deleting "(see ISPM 5)" that is not deemed necessary, as it is unclear and not in the right place. <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
155	106	Evidence supports the conclusion that the pest is not expected to establish because conditions (e.g. hosts, climate, other seasons) are not suitable for establishment (see ISPM 5) or appropriate phytosanitary measures have been applied (e.g. during outbreaks in a pest free area).	C	<b>United States of America</b> The last part seems more appropriate under "Present: not widely distributed and under official control" than for transient. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
156	106	<del>Evidence supports the conclusion that the pest is not expected to establish because conditions (e.g. hosts, climate, other seasons) are not suitable for establishment (see ISPM 5) or appropriate phytosanitary measures have been applied (e.g. during outbreaks in a pest free area).</del>	P	<b>OIRSA</b> The proposal is to eliminate this term, since the classification of transitory corresponds to an aspect of temporality of the pest, not being a defined status.  It is suggested to include a new category <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
157	106	Evidence supports the conclusion that the pest is not expected to establish because conditions (e.g. hosts, climate, other seasons) are not suitable for establishment (see ISPM 5) or appropriate phytosanitary measures have been applied (e.g. during outbreaks in a pest free area).	C	<b>COSAVE</b> For consistency with the others present categories. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
158	106	<del>Evidence</del> The pest is present but evidence supports the conclusion that the pest is not expected to establish because conditions (e.g. hosts, climate, other seasons) are not suitable for establishment (see ISPM 5) or appropriate phytosanitary measures have been applied (e.g. during outbreaks in a pest free area).	P	<b>COSAVE</b>  <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
159	107	In some cases, it may be necessary to provide additional information about pest presence, for <del>instance</del> -instance:- the extent of a localized outbreak- official control measures taken- that the pest has only been reported under specific conditions, such as:	P	<b>European Union</b> Additional information about these two important aspects might need to be provided. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
160	107	In some cases, it may be necessary to provide additional information about pest presence, for <del>instance</del> -instance:- the extent of a localized outbreak- official control measures taken- that the pest has only been reported under specific conditions, such as:	P	<b>EPPO</b> Additional information about these two important aspects might need to be provided. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
161	107	In some cases, it may be necessary to provide additional information about pest presence, for instance that the pest has only been reported under specific conditions, such as:	C	<b>IPPC Regional Workshop Europe and Central Asia</b> Additional information need to be provided e.g. on the extent of a localized outbreak and official control measures taken. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>

162	107	In some cases, it <del>may be</del> <u>is</u> necessary to provide additional information about pest presence, for instance that the pest has only been reported under specific conditions, such as:	P	<b>China</b> More information needs to be collected to determine the status of pests in all the following cases. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
163	109	in enclosed structures (e.g. in a greenhouse) <u>- in urban areas</u>	P	<b>COSAVE</b> Urban areas are also a relevant example <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
164	109	in enclosed structures (e.g. in a greenhouse)	C	<b>PPPO</b> Clarity in defining pests in a contained area, whether this changes the pest status of a country. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
165	109	in enclosed structures (e.g. in a greenhouse) <u>excluding conditions for post-entry quarantine (e.g. grow-in test)</u>	P	<b>Philippines</b> <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
166	110	in botanical gardens- <u>in urban areas</u>	P	<b>Costa Rica</b> For those situations where the host is not a commercial crop in the country <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
167	111	in the environment but not on a plant host (e.g. <u>in</u> soil or water)	P	<b>European Union</b> Clearer. <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
168	111	in the environment but not on a plant host (e.g. <u>in</u> soil or water)	P	<b>EPPO</b> Clearer. <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
169	112	at certain times of the year. <u>- in interceptions at entry points</u>	P	<b>Mexico</b> One more condition to consider, if appropriate. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
170	112	at certain times of the year. <u>- in urban areas</u>	P	<b>Argentina</b> Urban areas are also a relevant example <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
171	112	at certain times of the year. <u>- in urban areas</u>	P	<b>Uruguay</b> Urban areas are also a relevant example <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
172	112	at certain times of the year.	C	<b>Nepal</b> at post quarantine area/place <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
<b>3.2 Absence</b>				
173	113	<b><u>3.2 Pest status - Transient</u></b> [to insert a table here for Transient]: <b><u>Table 2. Pest status - Transient [that includes the following two types]Transient: actionable, under surveillanceTransient: actionable, under eradication</u></b> <b>3.2 Absence</b>	P	<b>New Zealand</b> Please also see General comment. New Zealand proposes to reinstate the pest status of "transient". New Zealand proposes to delete the type of "transient: non actionable" as in the current ISPM. New Zealand proposes two types of "transient": transient: actionable, under surveillance; and transient: actionable, under eradication. Please see general comment for suggested pest status description (as in the current ISPM). <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>

174	119	Surveillance supports the conclusion that the pest is absent and has not been recorded (see ISPM 6 ( <i>Surveillance</i> )) <del>or evidence supports the conclusion that the pest cannot establish.</del>	P	<b>Argentina</b> The fact that a pest can or cannot establish does not define its presence or absence. The assessment of the probability of establishment is after the determination of the pest status in an area <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
175	119	Surveillance supports the conclusion that the pest is absent and has not been recorded (see ISPM 6 ( <i>Surveillance</i> )) <del>or evidence supports the conclusion that the pest cannot establish.</del>	P	<b>Costa Rica</b> The fact that a pest can or cannot establish does not define its presence or absence. The assessment of the probability of establishment is after the determination of the pest status in an area <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
176	119	Surveillance supports the conclusion that the pest is absent and has not been recorded (see ISPM 6 ( <i>Surveillance</i> )) <del>or evidence supports the conclusion that the pest cannot establish.</del>	P	<b>Japan</b> Delete the latter part of the description of this status, i.e. "or evidence supports the conclusion that the pest cannot establish" for the following reasons: First, evidence that supports the conclusion can be generally got through general surveillance and specific surveillance. Therefore, there may be no other evidences than "surveillance" that lead to the status "Absent: pest not recorded". Second, the event "the pest cannot establish" does not become an factor to judge the status "Absent: pest not recorded", it is one of factors for other statuses "Absent: pest no longer present" and "Present: transient". Because the "establishment" is the event after "entry" in the process of pest introduction. So whether the pest cannot establish can be judged after "entry", which means that the pest was present in the past (Absent: pest no longer present) or the pest is present now (Present: transient). <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
177	119	Surveillance supports the conclusion that the pest is absent and has not been recorded (see ISPM 6 ( <i>Surveillance</i> )) <del>or evidence supports the conclusion that the pest cannot establish.</del>	P	<b>Uruguay</b> The fact that a pest can or cannot establish does not define its presence or absence. The assessment of the probability of establishment is after the determination of the pest status in an area <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
178	119	Surveillance supports the conclusion that the pest is absent and has not been recorded (see ISPM 6 ( <i>Surveillance</i> )) <del>or evidence supports the conclusion that the pest cannot establish.</del>	P	<b>CA</b> La evaluaci&#243;n de la probabilidad de establecimiento es posterior a la determinaci&#243;n de la condi&#243;n de la plaga en el area <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
179	119	Surveillance supports the conclusion that the pest is absent and has not been recorded (see ISPM 6 ( <i>Surveillance</i> )) or evidence supports the conclusion that the pest cannot establish.	C	<b>COSAVE</b> Que una plaga pueda o no establecerse no define que este presente o ausente. Y la evaluaci&#243;n de la probabilidad de establecimiento es posterior a la determinaci&#243;n de la condi&#243;n de la plaga en el &#225;rea.  The fact that a pest can or cannot establish does not define its presence or absence. The assessment of the probability of



				establishment is after the determination of the pest status in an area <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
180	119	Surveillance supports the conclusion that the pest is absent and has not been recorded (see ISPM 6 ( <i>Surveillance</i> )) <del>or evidence supports the conclusion that the pest cannot establish</del> .	P	<b>COSAVE</b>  <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
181	120	Absent: the entire <del>country</del> -area is a pest free area	P	<b>Argentina</b>  <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
182	120	Absent: the entire <del>country</del> -area is a pest free area	P	<b>China</b> (APPPC comment) This standard is about the pest status in an area (title, background and purpose). According to ISPM5, an area can be a country, but not equal to a country. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
183	120	Absent: the entire <del>country</del> -area is a pest free area	P	<b>Uruguay</b> Modified to include the "pest free area" as a pest status under absent, including entire countries. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
184	120	Absent: the entire <del>country</del> -area is a pest free area	P	<b>Korea, Republic of</b> The term "country" is not appropriate to pest status, to clarify the term "country" to "area" is aligned to describe the pest status. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
185	120	Absent: the <del>entire country</del> -entire area is a pest free area	P	<b>APPPC</b> To replace country with area to be consistent with the background description of the area. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
186	120	Absent: the entire country is a pest free area	C	<b>Philippines</b> The second row can be put under the first row of the table: Absent: Pest not recorded. After surveillance and concluded that the pest is absent in the country, they can apply, establish and maintain as PFA in accordance with ISPM 4, generally for trade related concerns <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
187	120	Absent: the entire <del>country</del> -area is a pest free area	P	<b>COSAVE</b>  <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
188	121	The entire <del>country</del> -area (including country) is established and maintained as a pest free area in accordance with ISPM 4 ( <i>Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas</i> ).	P	<b>Argentina</b> Modified to include the "pest free area" as a pest status under absent, including entire countries. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
189	121	The entire <del>country</del> -area (including country) is established and maintained as a pest free area in accordance with ISPM 4 ( <i>Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas</i> ).	P	<b>Uruguay</b> Modified to include the "pest free area" as a pest status under absent, including entire countries. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
190	121	The entire <del>country</del> -area is established and maintained as a pest free area in accordance with ISPM 4 ( <i>Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas</i> ).	P	<b>Korea, Republic of</b> To be consistent with the term. <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>

191	121	The entire country is established and maintained as a pest free area in accordance with ISPM 4 ( <i>Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas</i> ).	C	<b>OIRSA</b> En este caso, en las &#225;reas libres una plaga puede introducirse en una &#225;rea limitada, estar bajo control oficial y considerarse ausente. Este concepto se contradice con el parafo 97. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
192	121	The entire <del>country-area</del> is established and maintained as a pest free area in accordance with ISPM 4 ( <i>Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas</i> ).	P	<b>China</b> This standard is about the pest status in an area (title, background and purpose). According to ISPM5, an area can be a country, but not equal to a country. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
193	121	The entire country is established and maintained as a pest free area in accordance with ISPM 4 ( <i>Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas</i> ).	C	<b>COSAVE</b> Esta modificaci&#243;n se realiza para incorporar al &quot;&#225;rea libre de plagas&quot; como condici&#243;n de ausente de una plaga en un &#225;rea, incluyendo a los pa&#237;ses enteros.  Modified to include the "pest free area" as a pest status under absent, including entire countries. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
194	121	The entire <del>country-area</del> ( <u>including country</u> ) is established and maintained as a pest free area in accordance with ISPM 4 ( <i>Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas</i> ).	P	<b>COSAVE</b> <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
195	123	Pest records indicate the presence of a pest, but the conclusion is reached that the records are invalid or no longer valid, such as in the following cases: <del>- old record that was not updated- single report was never confirmed</del>	P	<b>United States of America</b> To clarify other situations when the record is invalid. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
196	124	- <u>changes in taxonomy have occurred</u>	C	<b>Mozambique</b> There is a need of clarification for this sentence as it can means different things. In which cases the taxonomy changes may affect the pest status? <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
197	127	<del>- changes in national borders have occurred.</del> <u>se han producido cambios en las fronteras nacionales.</u>	P	<b>OIRSA</b> Agregar: Publicaci&#243;n inconsistente <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
198	129	Pest records indicate that the pest was present in the past, but surveillance indicates that the pest is no longer present (see ISPM 6 ( <i>Surveillance</i> )). The reason <del>or reasons</del> may include:	P	<b>Argentina</b> Editorial change. <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
199	129	Pest records indicate that the pest was present in the past, but surveillance indicates that the pest is no longer present (see ISPM 6 ( <i>Surveillance</i> )), <u>or there is no new report on the occurrence of this pest.</u> -The reason or reasons may include:	P	<b>China</b> If there is no surveillance data, information from scientific paper can also be used. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
200	129	Pest records indicate that the pest was present in the past, but surveillance indicates that the pest is no longer present (see ISPM 6 ( <i>Surveillance</i> )). The <del>reason or</del> reasons may include:	P	<b>Uruguay</b> Editorial change <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>

201	129	Pest records indicate that the pest was present in the past, but surveillance indicates that the pest is no longer present (see ISPM 6 ( <i>Surveillance</i> )). The reason or reasons may include:	C	<b>COSAVE</b> Cambio editorial.  Editorial change. <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
202	129	Pest records indicate that the pest was present in the past, but surveillance indicates that the pest is no longer present (see ISPM 6 ( <i>Surveillance</i> )). The <del>reason or</del> reasons may include:	P	<b>COSAVE</b>  <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
203	132	- <b>changes in production practices.</b>	C	<b>Mozambique</b> There is also a need of clarification, in which cases the changes affect the pest status <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
204	133	Absent: pest eradicated <b>Absent only intercepted</b>	P	<b>OIRSA</b> It is suggested to include this category <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
205	134	Pest records indicate that the pest was present in the past. Documented pest eradication measures were implemented and were successful (see ISPM 9 ( <i>Guidelines for pest eradication programmes</i> )). Surveillance confirms continued absence (see ISPM 6 ( <i>Surveillance</i> )). <b>The record indicate that the pest only has been intercepted at international entry points</b>	P	<b>OIRSA</b> It is suggested to include this category <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
206	135	Absence of findings of the pest during specific surveillance may be the basis for an NPPO to determine that the pest is absent. If information on pest presence is unreliable, the NPPO may conclude that the pest is absent. However, lack of information does not constitute a basis for determining pest absence. <b>Nevertheless, regarding general surveillance, the lack of information may indicates that the pest has no economical importance or is absent.</b>	P	<b>Brazil</b> If the presence of a pest has never been mentioned in any report or research, there is an evidence of its absence. If it is present but never mentioned, it may not be a pest. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
207	135	Absence of findings of the pest during specific surveillance may be the basis for an NPPO to determine that the pest is absent. If information on pest presence is unreliable, the NPPO may <b>erroneously</b> conclude that the pest is absent. However, lack of information does not constitute a basis for determining pest absence.	P	<b>Barbados</b> This strengthens the paragraph since it notes that the NPPO may have made an error. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
208	135	Absence of findings of the pest during <del>specific</del> surveillance may be the basis for an NPPO to determine that the pest is absent. If information on pest presence is unreliable, the NPPO may conclude that the pest is absent. However, lack of information does not constitute a basis for determining pest absence.	P	<b>European Union</b> The basis can also be general surveillance. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
209	135	Absence of findings of the pest during specific surveillance may be the basis for an NPPO to determine that the pest is absent. If information on pest presence is unreliable, the NPPO may conclude that the pest is absent. However, lack of <del>information</del> <b>surveillance</b> does not constitute a basis for determining pest absence.	P	<b>Uruguay</b> Lack of information could be interpreted, as that as a result of the surveillance, no information about the pest was found, if this is so the NPPO can conclude that the pest is absent. However, the absence of surveillance is what should not be the basis for determining the absence of a pest. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
210	135	Absence of findings of the pest during <del>specific</del> surveillance may be the basis for an NPPO to determine that the pest is absent. If information on pest presence is	P	<b>EPPO</b> The basis can also be general surveillance. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>

		unreliable, the NPPO may conclude that the pest is absent. However, lack of information does not constitute a basis for determining pest absence.		
211	135	Absence of findings of the pest during specific surveillance may be the basis for an NPPO to determine that the pest is absent. If information on pest presence is unreliable, the NPPO may conclude that the pest is absent. However, lack of information does not constitute a basis for determining pest absence.	C	<b>OIRSA</b> Cambiar con "May erroneously conclude" de la forma redactada se lee como que esto puede ser una opcion para la ONPF. <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
212	135	Absence of findings of the pest during specific surveillance may be the basis for an NPPO to determine that the pest is absent. If information on pest presence is unreliable, the NPPO may conclude that the pest is absent. However, lack of information does not constitute a basis for determining pest absence.	C	<b>Indonesia</b> Indonesia proposes to add information regarding the time span (in year) needed to declare that a country has been free from specific pest after it was not found for several years surveillance <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
213	135	Absence of findings of the pest during specific surveillance may be the basis for an NPPO to determine that the pest is absent. If information on pest presence is unreliable, the NPPO may conclude that the pest is absent. However, lack of information does not constitute a basis for determining pest absence.	C	<b>COSAVE</b> Se propone este cambio porque la referencia a la falta de informaci#243;n podr#237;a interpretarse, que como resultado de la vigilancia no se encontr#243; informaci#243;n de la plaga y concluir que la plaga esta ausente. Sin embargo la ausencia de vigilancia es la que no debe constituir la base para determinar la ausencia de una plaga.  The reference to the lack of information could be interpreted, that as a result of the surveillance, no information about the pest was found about and conclude that the pest is absent. However, the absence of surveillance is what should not be the basis for determining the absence of a pest. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
214	135	Absence of findings of the pest during specific surveillance may be the basis for an NPPO to determine that the pest is absent. If information on pest presence is unreliable, the NPPO may conclude that the pest is absent. However, lack of information does not constitute a basis for determining pest absence.	C	<b>COSAVE</b> However the lack of surveillance does not constitute a basis for determining pest absence. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
215	136	Similarly, detection of a pest in an area, shown by surveillance <del>not to that it does</del> <u>not</u> represent a population (e.g. detection of an individual specimen), does not affect the pest status in the area.	P	<b>Kenya</b> <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
216	136	Similarly, detection of a pest in an area, <del>shown</del> <u>proven</u> by surveillance not to represent a population (e.g. detection of an individual specimen), does not affect the pest status in the area.	P	<b>Kenya</b> <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
217	136	Similarly, detection of a pest in an area, <del>shown</del> <u>confirmed</u> by surveillance not to represent a population (e.g. detection of an individual specimen), <del>does may</del> not affect the pest status in the area.	P	<b>European Union</b> This is to clarify that detection of an individual specimen should always be followed by surveillance to confirm that a population is not present.  'May' because it should be determined on a case by case basis and not generally speaking. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>

218	136	Similarly, detection of a pest in an area, <del>shown-confirmed</del> by surveillance not to represent a population (e.g. detection of an individual specimen), <del>does-may</del> not affect the pest status in the area.	P	<b>EPPO</b> This is to clarify that detection of an individual specimen should always be followed by surveillance to confirm that a population is not present.  'May' because it should be determined on a case by case basis and not generally speaking. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
219	136	Similarly, detection of a pest in an area, shown by <del>subsequent</del> surveillance not to represent a population (e.g. detection of an individual specimen), <del>does-may</del> not affect the pest status in the area.	P	<b>IPPC Regional Workshop Europe and Central Asia</b> &#39;subsequent&#39; to clarify that detection of an individual specimen should always be followed by surveillance  &#39;may&#39; because this should be determined on a case by case basis and not generally speaking. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
220	136	<del>Similarly, detection</del> <u>Detection</u> of a pest in an area, shown by surveillance not to represent a population (e.g. detection of an individual specimen), does not affect the pest status in the area.	P	<b>Japan</b> &quot;Similarly&quot; is not necessary in this text. <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
<b>3.3 Unable to determine pest status</b>				
221	137	<del>3.3 Unable to determine pest status</del>	P	<b>Argentina</b>  <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
222	137	<del>3.3 Unable to determine pest status</del>	P	<b>Costa Rica</b> It does not provide a clear technical guideline <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
223	137	<del>3.3 Unable to determine pest status</del>	P	<b>Japan</b> Refer to paragraph 138. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
224	137	<del>3.3 Unable to determine pest status</del> <u>Pest status undetermined</u>	P	<b>European Union</b> The 'undetermined' pest status should be clearly distinguished from the 'absence' pest status. The wording 'Unable to determine pest status' is not appropriate for a pest status category. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
225	137	<del>3.3 Unable to determine pest status</del>	P	<b>Uruguay</b> We suggest to delete section 3.3 because it does not describe a pest status <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
226	137	<del>3.3 Unable to determine pest status</del>	P	<b>Korea, Republic of</b> To suggest all bullet &quot; 3.3 Unable to determine pest status&quot; <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
227	137	<del>3.3 Unable to determine pest status</del> <u>Pest status undetermined</u>	P	<b>EPPO</b> The 'undetermined' pest status should be clearly distinguished from the 'absence' pest status. The wording 'Unable to determine pest status' is not appropriate for a pest status category. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>

228	137	<b>3.3</b> <del>Unable</del> <u>When unable</u> to determine pest status	P	<b>Caribbean Agricultural Health and Food Safety Agency</b> Consider including as a new section 4 as section 3 deals specifically with determining pest status and unable to determine is not a pest status <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
229	137	<b>3.3</b> Unable to determine pest status	C	<b>Caribbean Agricultural Health and Food Safety Agency</b> Consider including as a new section 4 as section 3 deals specifically with determining pest status and unable to determine is not a pest status  Change the Para Title to When Unable to determine the pest status <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
230	137	<b>3.3</b> Unable to determine pest status	C	<b>IPPC Regional Workshop Europe and Central Asia</b> This title is not appropriate. The 'undetermined' pest status should be clearly distinguished from the 'absence' pest status. The wording 'Unable to determine pest status' is not suitable for a pest status category. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
231	137	<b>3.3</b> <del>Unable to determine pest status</del>	P	<b>Thailand</b> The title of section 3.3 should be deleted as it could be misunderstood to be one of the pest status category. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
232	138	There may be insufficient information available from surveillance or other sources for the NPPO to determine the 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, <u>further surveillance and pest diagnostics</u> may be necessary to <del>meet obligations under determine</del> the <u>IPPC status of a particular pest</u> . This information can be provided to other NPPOs upon request.	P	<b>Saint Kitts And Nevis</b> The amendments to the paragraph should help to focus the NPPO to trying the determine the status of a particular pest. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
233	138	<del>There may be insufficient information available from surveillance or other sources for the NPPO to determine the 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. This information can be provided to other NPPOs upon request.</del>	P	<b>Argentina</b> This paragraph does not provide clear guidance and is unnecessary. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
234	138	<del>There may be insufficient information available from surveillance or other sources for the NPPO to determine the 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. This information can be provided to other NPPOs upon request.</del>	P	<b>Costa Rica</b> It does not provide a clear technical guideline <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>



235	138	There may be insufficient information available from surveillance or other sources for the NPPO to determine the 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. <del>This</del> <u>Ounce surveillance is don, the new</u> information can be provided to other NPPOs upon request.	P	<b>Kenya</b>  <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
236	138	There may be insufficient information available from surveillance or other sources for the NPPO to determine the 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, <u>further specific</u> surveillance <u>and authoritative pest diagnosis</u> may be necessary <u>to finally determine pest status. to meet obligations under the IPPC. This information can be provided to other NPPOs upon request.</u>	P	<b>Barbados</b>  <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
237	138	There may be insufficient information available from surveillance or other sources for the NPPO to determine the 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. <del>This information can be provided to other NPPOs upon request.</del>	P	<b>European Union</b> Useless sentence, which is redundant with Section 4. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
238	138	<del>There may be insufficient information available from surveillance or other sources for the NPPO to determine the 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. This information can be provided to other NPPOs upon request.</del>	P	<b>Japan</b> Section 3.3 "Unable to determine pest status" is not a category of a status and it is just a guidance to deal with when NPPOs face the situation "Unable to determine pest status". However, as it is placed parallelly with the present category of section 3.1 and the absent category of section 3.2, Section 3.3 is likely to be confused as the 3rd category.  Additionally, the contents in section 3.3 have been almost covered in section 2 "Information Used to Determine Pest Status". For example, The information of 1st sentence of para 138 is included in para 72. The examples of the 2nd sentence of para 138 are included in para 74 and 75. The 3rd sentence of para 138 is included in para 71.  However, the information of the last sentence of para 138 is not covered in the Section 2, so the relevant text should be added to the section 2 such as "The NPPO may need consultation and exchange of information with other NPPOs to fill information gaps" in line with the requirements of Section 2. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>

239	138	<del>There may be insufficient information available from surveillance or other sources for the NPPO to determine the 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. This information can be provided to other NPPOs upon request.</del>	P	<b>Uruguay</b> This paragraph does not provide clear guidance and is unnecessary <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
240	138	<del>There may be insufficient information available from surveillance or other sources for the NPPO to determine the 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. This information can be provided to other NPPOs upon request.</del>	P	<b>Korea, Republic of</b> To suggest deleting all paragraph, "unable to determine pest status" as there are pest status can clearly determine presence and absence status. To make new concept "unable to determine pest status" can cause ambiguous meaning for the pest status and insufficient information to support "unable to determine pest status". To delete the all bullet and all paragraph are reasonable. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
241	138	There may be insufficient information available from surveillance or other sources for the NPPO to determine the 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. <del>This information can be provided to other NPPOs upon request.</del>	P	<b>EPPO</b> Useless sentence, which is redundant with Section 4. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
242	138	There may be insufficient information available from surveillance or other sources for the NPPO to determine the 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, <u>further specific</u> surveillance <u>and authoritative pest diagnosis</u> may be necessary <u>to finally determine pest status. to meet obligations under the IPPC. This information can be provided to other NPPOs upon request.</u>	P	<b>Caribbean Agricultural Health and Food Safety Agency</b> <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
243	138	There may be insufficient information available from <u>historical/past</u> surveillance or other sources for the NPPO to determine the 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, <u>new</u> surveillance may be necessary to meet obligations under the IPPC. This information can be provided to other NPPOs upon request.	P	<b>PPPO</b> Propose to provide clarity on the word "surveillance" twice in the paragraph and ammend the 1st line to include the use of the word (or to that effect)"historical or past" surveillance. In the 2nd last line, ammend, to include words such as "added, new or another" (to that effect) surveillance <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
244	138	There may be insufficient information available from surveillance or other sources for the NPPO to determine the 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. <del>This</del>	P	<b>IPPC Regional Workshop Africa</b> <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>



		<u>Once surveillance is done, the new</u> information can be provided to other NPPOs upon request.		
245	138	There may be insufficient information available from surveillance or other sources for the NPPO to determine the 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. This information can be provided to other NPPOs upon request.	C	<b>OIRSA</b> Adicionar "Surveillance and authoritative pest diagnostic processes" el diagnostic es tan importante como la vigilancia para determinar estatus. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
246	138	<del>There may be insufficient information available from surveillance or other sources for the NPPO to determine the 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. This information can be provided to other NPPOs upon request.</del>	P	<b>Thailand</b> The paragraph under section 3.3 could be moved to be a description of section 3 Describing Pest Status in an Area. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
247	138	There may be insufficient information available from surveillance or other sources for the NPPO to determine the 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. <u>This/ These</u> information can be provided to other NPPOs upon request.	P	<b>China</b> "This information" refer to the surveillance information or all those information above is not clear. Needs clarify <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
<b>4. Exchange of Pest Status Information between NPPOs</b>				
248	140	Information pertaining to pest status in an area contributes to pest <del>reports</del> <u>reports</u> (see ISPM 17). It is the responsibility of an NPPO to provide pest records and other supporting evidence on pest status upon request from another NPPO.	P	<b>European Union</b> It may be a useful addition. <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
249	140	Information pertaining to pest status in an area contributes to pest <del>reports</del> <u>reports</u> (see ISPM 17). It is the responsibility of an NPPO to provide pest records and other supporting evidence on pest status upon request from another NPPO.	P	<b>EPPO</b> It might be a useful addition. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
250	140	Information pertaining to pest status in an area contributes to pest reports. It is the responsibility of an NPPO to provide pest records and other supporting evidence on pest status upon request from another <del>NPPO</del> <u>NPPO (IPPC. Article VIII1a).</u>	P	<b>NEPPO</b> <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
251	140	Information pertaining to pest status in an area contributes to pest reports. It is the responsibility of an NPPO to provide pest records and other supporting evidence on pest status upon request from another <del>NPPO</del> <u>NPPO (IPPC Article IV3a).</u>	P	<b>NEPPO</b> <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
252	141	There may be some cases where a pest status declared by an NPPO is questioned by another NPPO (e.g. when there are repeated interceptions by importing countries or contradictory pest records). In these situations, bilateral contacts between NPPOs should be made to clarify the situation, and if needed the pest	P	<b>Barbados</b> Addition seeks to give guidance to NPPO <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>

		status may be revised by the NPPO responsible for the area-. <u>The affected NPPO may also solicit technical assistance from other NPPOs to determine pest status</u>		
253	141	There may be some cases where a pest status declared by an NPPO is questioned by another NPPO (e.g. when there are repeated interceptions by importing countries or contradictory pest records). In <del>these situations</del> such cases, 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	<b>European Union</b> Better wording. <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
254	141	There may be some cases where a pest status declared by an NPPO is questioned by another NPPO (e.g. when there are repeated interceptions by importing countries or contradictory pest records). In these situations, bilateral contacts between NPPOs should be made to clarify the situation, and if needed the pest status <del>may should</del> be revised by the NPPO responsible for the area.	P	<b>European Union</b> For consistency with "if needed". <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
255	141	There may be some cases where a pest status declared by an NPPO is questioned by another NPPO (e.g. when there are repeated interceptions by importing countries or contradictory pest records). In <del>these situations</del> such cases, bilateral contacts between NPPOs should be made to clarify the situation, and if needed the pest status <del>may should</del> be revised by the NPPO responsible for the area.	P	<b>EPPO</b> Better wording.  For consistency with "if needed". <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
256	141	There may be some cases where a pest status declared by an NPPO is questioned by another NPPO (e.g. when there are repeated interceptions by importing countries 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-. <u>The affected NPPO may also solicit technical assistance from other NPPOs to determine pest status</u>	P	<b>Caribbean Agricultural Health and Food Safety Agency</b>  <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
257	141	There may be some cases where a pest status declared by an NPPO is questioned by another NPPO (e.g. when there are repeated interceptions by importing countries 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.	C	<b>OIRSA</b> La ONPF afectada tambi&#233;n podr&#237;a solicitar asistencia t&#233;cnica de una ONPF importadora o interesada en el estatus. (desarrollo de capacidades) <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
258	144	inform other NPPOs and their regional plant protection organization, where <del>appropriate</del> <u>appropriate and within a reasonable time frame</u> , of relevant changes in pest status according to ISPM 17.	P	<b>United States of America</b> Clarifies that when pest status changes, there should be a reasonable time frame to notify the trading partners. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
259	145	This appendix is for reference purposes only and is not a prescriptive part of the standard.	C	<b>Australia</b> Agree with the placement of the table (Reliability of information sources) in an Appendix to the Standard. <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
APPENDIX 1: Reliability of information sources				
260	146	<b>APPENDIX 1: Reliability of information sources</b>	C	<b>Canada</b> Suggest retaining the table as an appendix to the standard. The

				table could provide a framework for the development of implementation material on reliability of information sources at a suitable time. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
261	146	<b>APPENDIX 1: Reliability of information sources</b>	C	<b>Australia</b> Suggestion to replace the table in Appendix 1 of revised ISPM 8 with the table sent to the IPPC secretariat. for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Table in standard is too prescriptive</li> <li>• The number of reliability categories (high, moderately high, moderately low, low) too complex and difficult to define</li> <li>• Just because information came from sources other than the NPPO, peer-reviewed journals, etc. does not mean it is not reliable</li> <li>• Surveillance includes both specific and general surveillance. General surveillance is covered by [181, 195, 207, 220]</li> <li>• ISPM 6 states that Specific Surveillance should be carried out by the NPPO (does not include other entities)</li> <li>• Pest reports obtained from reference collections is not included in the table</li> </ul> <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
262	146	<b>APPENDIX 1: Reliability of information sources</b>	C	<b>Philippines</b> The Philippines is seeking for clarification on the purpose of identifying the reliability of information sources? Does this affect the status of an area?  The Philippines suggests that any information/report coming from the NPPO will be considered only as reliable and official as based and justified by surveillance or other means. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
263	146	<b>APPENDIX 1: Reliability of information sources</b>	C	<b>China</b> Keep information source and Reliability in the appendix and rank them by the reliability of the information. The reliability of information from surveillance conducted by NPPO should be the highest. Other content could be moved into the implementation material.  NPPO's primary problem is how to make decision if information from two sources conflicted with each other. The core content should remain in the appendix. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
264	146	<b>APPENDIX 1: Reliability of information sources</b>	C	<b>Malawi</b> Malawi supports that the Appendix1: on reliability of the information sources should remain in this ISPM <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
265	146	<b>APPENDIX 1: Reliability of information sources</b>	C	<b>New Zealand</b> 1. The Appendix is very helpful and important as guidance. However New Zealand believes it is guidance material and should be separated from the ISPM. 2. New Zealand suggests that the Implementation and Capacity

				Development Committee consider developing guidance materials for this ISPM and include the appendix in this draft as part of it. 3. it is important to note that pest status is determined by the NPPO solely based on available information, NPPO's decision on the pest status in its jurisdictional territory should prevail incorrect/outdated information, e.g. even if it may be published in a very reputable, peer reviewed journal by a reputable author but on the basis of historical data which may be wrong. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
266	156	- <del>official NPPO laboratories</del> diagnostic laboratories with a high degree of expertise and high-quality infrastructure	P	<b>OIRSA</b> Better wording <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
267	159	- implementation of <del>quality management systems documented porcedures</del>	P	<b>Japan</b> According to paragraph No.100 and No.101 of SC7 report, Quality management system (QMS), quality manuals and Standard operating procedures (SOP) in the draft ISPM for 1st member consultation were replaced as "documented procedures". <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
268	159	- implementation of <del>quality management systems administrative procedures (as discribed in ISPM 6)</del>	P	<b>Thailand</b> 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>
269	161	- <del>or combinations of the above</del>	P	<b>Kenya</b> <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
270	161	-	P	<b>Japan</b> <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
271	171	Structured general surveillance programmes with <del>some no</del> degree of NPPO oversight, where:	P	<b>Argentina</b> The NPPO's involvement increases the reliability. With a minimum oversight are expected, at least, expert participation and the use of appropriate methodologies <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
272	171	Structured general surveillance programmes with <del>some no</del> degree of NPPO oversight, where:	P	<b>Costa Rica</b> The NPPO's involmtment increases the reliability. With a minimum oversight are expected, at least, expert participation and the use of aproprate methodologies <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
273	171	Structured general surveillance programmes with <del>some no</del> degree of NPPO oversight, where:	P	<b>COSAVE</b> The NPPO's involvement increases the reliability. With a minimum oversight are expected, at least, expert participation and the use of appropriate methodologies

				<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
274	171	Structured general surveillance programmes with <del>some degree of no</del> NPPO oversight, where:	P	<b>Uruguay</b> The NPPO's involvement increases the reliability. With a minimum oversight are expected, at least, expert participation and the use of appropriate methodologies <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
275	177	General surveillance activities with <del>low or</del> no NPPO oversight and participation, where:	P	<b>Brazil</b> If there is at least a minimum of NPPO's participation, the reliability is higher. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
276	177	General surveillance activities with <del>low or</del> no NPPO oversight and participation, where:	P	<b>Argentina</b> The NPPO's involvement increases the reliability, from no involvement. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
277	177	General surveillance activities with <del>low or</del> no NPPO oversight and participation, where:	P	<b>Costa Rica</b> The NPPO's involvement increases the reliability. With a minimum oversight are expected, at least, expert participation and the use of appropriate methodologies <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
278	177	<del>General surveillance activities with low or no NPPO oversight and participation, where:</del> <del>General surveillance activities with no NPPO oversight and participation, where:</del>	P	<b>COSAVE</b> The NPPO's involvement increases the reliability, from no involvement. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
279	177	General surveillance activities with <del>low or</del> no NPPO oversight and participation, where:	P	<b>Uruguay</b> The NPPO's involvement increases the reliability, from no involvement <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
280	183	Multiple original research papers with detailed description of the methodological approach or approaches used; approaches are widely accepted; Published in highly regarded peer-reviewed journals relevant to the subject matter. <del>(Some time if one the author is well known, article is published on behalf of him without any insurance that the pest occurs! It should be taken into consideration)</del>	P	<b>NEPPO</b> <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
281	191	Only one <del>old</del> or a few original research papers; any original research paper found does not describe methodology <del>or</del> methodology used is not widely accepted; published in low impact-factor journals.	P	<b>Argentina</b> Not sure if the word "original" here gives the idea of "old" to both "one or a few research papers". Nevertheless, only one but recent paper has a higher reliability degree <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
282	191	Only one <del>old</del> or a few original research papers; any original research paper found does not describe methodology <del>or</del> methodology used is not widely <del>accepted</del> <del>accepted or is outdated</del> ; published in low impact-factor journals.	P	<b>Costa Rica</b> Not sure if the word "original" here gives the idea of "old" to both "one or a few research papers". Nevertheless, only one but recent paper has a higher reliability degree. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
283	191	<del>Only one or a few original research papers; any original research paper found does not describe methodology or methodology used is not widely accepted; published in low impact-factor journals.</del> Only one old or a few original research papers; any original research paper	P	<b>COSAVE</b> Not sure if the word "original" here gives the idea of "old" to both "one or a few research

		<a href="#">found does not describe methodology or methodology used is not widely accepted or is outdated; published in low impact-factor journals.</a>		papers". Nevertheless, only one but recent paper has a higher reliability degree <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
284	191	Only one or a few original research papers; any original research paper found does not describe methodology <b>or</b> methodology used is not widely accepted; <del>published in low impact-factor journals.</del>	P	<b>Japan</b> "Low impact-factor journals" should be deleted. "Impact factor" as a requirement for "High reliability" in the 1st draft has been modified to "highly regarded peer reviewed journals relevant to the subject matter" after the 1st country consultation. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
285	191	Only one <del>old</del> or a few original research papers; any original research paper found does not describe methodology <b>or</b> methodology used is not widely <del>accepted</del> <b>accepted or is outdated</b> ; published in low impact-factor journals.	P	<b>Uruguay</b> Not sure if the word "original" here gives the idea of "old" to both "one or a few research papers". Nevertheless, only one but recent paper has a higher reliability degree <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
286	191	Only one or a few original research papers; any original research paper found does not describe methodology <b>or</b> methodology used is not widely accepted; <del>published in low impact-factor journals.</del>	P	<b>China</b> Low impact factor does not mean that the study is unreliable <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
287	193	<del>Low</del>	P	<b>Japan</b> <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
288	194	<del>No peer-reviewed literature available.</del>	P	<b>Japan</b> This could be included in "[207]Other published expert sources that are not peer-reviewed" as the literatures are not peer-reviewed. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
289	197	Published by a reputable <del>organization</del> <b>organization or authority</b> ; uses authoritative scientific sources and terminology; provides links or details to locate primary records and the dates of the primary records or last review of content; has a published updating and quality control policy.	P	<b>Argentina</b> Some websites may be developed and maintained by international experts <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
290	197	<del>Published by a reputable organization; uses authoritative scientific sources and terminology; provides links or details to locate primary records and the dates of the primary records or last review of content; has a published updating and quality control policy.</del> <b>Published by a reputable organization or authority; uses authoritative scientific sources and terminology; provides links or details to locate primary records and the dates of the primary records or last review of content; has a published updating and quality control policy.</b>	P	<b>COSAVE</b> Some websites may be developed and maintained by international experts <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
291	197	Published by a reputable <del>organization</del> <b>organization or authority</b> ; uses authoritative scientific sources and terminology; provides links or details to locate primary records and the dates of the primary records or last review of content; has a published updating and quality control policy.	P	<b>Uruguay</b> Some websites may be developed and maintained by international experts <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
292	200	Published by a reputable <del>organization</del> <b>organization or authority</b> ; uses authoritative scientific sources and terminology but may not provide all of the following: links or details to locate primary records; the dates of the primary records or last review of content; a published updating and quality control policy.	P	<b>Costa Rica</b> Some websites may be developed and maintained by international experts. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>



293	203	One or two of the above criteria are met, but most information not verified or traceable.	C	<b>China</b> There are many criteria mentioned before. Needs clarify. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
294	215	A few articles or reports that may or may not have <del>each</del> been based on independent <del>(different)</del> information sources.	P	<b>Kenya</b> <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
295	218	- <del>Single article</del> Single or <del>report, more articles or more than one article or report but reports</del> based only on one primary information source.	P	<b>Kenya</b> <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
296	223	- Personal communication <u>from a recognized expert</u> that has been archived.	P	<b>Kenya</b> <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
297	225	<b>Low</b>	P	<b>Costa Rica</b> We believe that this type of personal communications should not be taken into account in this table, since they are not considered "low" as a reliable source (especially in a negotiation) <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
298	226	<del>Informal or un-archived personal communication.</del>	P	<b>Costa Rica</b> We believe that this type of personal communications should not be taken into account in this table, since they are not considered "low" as a reliable source (especially in a negotiation) <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
299	228	This section is not part of the standard. The Standards Committee in May 2016 requested that the Secretariat 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	<b>Saint Kitts And Nevis</b> Possible Implementation issues include: -Lack of adequately trained human resource: if the general surveillance activities are low or there is no NPPO oversight and participation, identification expertise is low and there is little diagnostic laboratory support, the information management structure is weak and training and expertise are minimal or variable; then making pest determinations will be difficult. Possible solution: training e.g. developing country NPPO does an internship with a NPPO of a developed country, national/ regional workshops on surveillance, training for laboratory personnel in diagnostics. -Lack of finances: some countries lack adequate financial resources to conduct regular surveillance activities. Possible solution: create a fund (if it doesn't already exist) to assist Contracting Parties with surveillance and diagnostic laboratory support. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
300	228	This section is not part of the standard. The Standards Committee in May 2016 requested that the Secretariat 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	<b>Costa Rica</b> Regional workshop concluded that this aspect should be maintained as an appendix of the standard and the categorization of the reliability column should be simplified as high and low or from greater to less reliable. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
301	228	This section is not part of the standard. The Standards Committee in May 2016 requested that the Secretariat gather information on any potential implementation	C	<b>Caribbean Agricultural Health and Food Safety Agency</b> If the NPPO general surveillance activities are low with little to no

		issues related to this draft. Please provide details and proposals on how to address these potential implementation issues.		oversight and participation, where identification expertise is low and there is little diagnostic laboratory support, information management structures are weak and training and expertise are minimal, then surveillance as an information source from the NPPO will have a low reliability. Proposed solution: training for NPPO personnel, access to financing. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
302	229	Contracting parties, regional plant protection organizations and other relevant organizations are invited to comment on whether the appendix should remain in this ISPM or whether it would be better to place it in implementation material.	C	<b>Saint Kitts And Nevis</b> The appendix should remain in the ISPM. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
303	229	Contracting parties, regional plant protection organizations and other relevant organizations are invited to comment on whether the appendix should remain in this ISPM or whether it would be better to place it in implementation material.	C	<b>European Union</b> The appendix 1 should be deleted from the draft and it would be better placed in implementation material. The table needs to be easily available as it includes important information that might be useful for some countries. The table needs however to be reviewed before publication, in particular the terminology used needs to be carefully considered e.g. the term 'surveillance' seems to be used inappropriately and not consistently with ISPM 6 for example in paragraph 177 (because according to its Glossary definition, surveillance is always official). The expression 'extension reports' in para 207 is not clear (extension services reports?). <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
304	229	Contracting parties, regional plant protection organizations and other relevant organizations are invited to comment on whether the appendix should remain in this ISPM or whether it would be better to place it in implementation material.	C	<b>EPPO</b> The appendix 1 should be deleted from the draft and it would be better placed in implementation material. The table needs to be easily available as it includes important information that might be useful for some countries. The table needs however to be reviewed before publication, in particular the terminology used needs to be carefully considered e.g. the term 'surveillance' seems to be used inappropriately and not consistently with ISPM 6 for example in paragraph 177 (because according to its Glossary definition, surveillance is always official). The expression 'extension reports' in para 207 is not clear (extension services reports?). <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
305	229	Contracting parties, regional plant protection organizations and other relevant organizations are invited to comment on whether the appendix should remain in this ISPM or whether it would be better to place it in implementation material.	C	<b>Caribbean Agricultural Health and Food Safety Agency</b> The appendix should remain in this ISPM <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
306	229	Contracting parties, regional plant protection organizations and other relevant organizations are invited to comment on whether the appendix should remain in this ISPM or whether it would be better to place it in implementation material.	C	<b>Caribbean Agricultural Health and Food Safety Agency</b> The appendix should remain in the ISPM. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
307	229	Contracting parties, regional plant protection organizations and other relevant organizations are invited to comment on whether the appendix should remain in this ISPM or whether it would be better to place it in implementation material.	C	<b>United States of America</b> The guidance in the appendix is based on the NAPPO RSPM 40 and



				is found helpful for categorizing and assessing the quality of information sources. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
308	229	Contracting parties, regional plant protection organizations and other relevant organizations are invited to comment on whether the appendix should remain in this ISPM or whether it would be better to place it in implementation material.	C	<b>IPPC Regional Workshop Europe and Central Asia</b> The appendix 1 could also be placed in implementation material. The RWS participants noted that the appendix can also be kept in the ISPM and implementation material should be developed in addition to it. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
309	229	Contracting parties, regional plant protection organizations and other relevant organizations are invited to comment on whether the appendix should remain in this ISPM or whether it would be better to place it in implementation material.	C	<b>OIRSA</b> it is better to place it inside the document <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
310	229	Contracting parties, regional plant protection organizations and other relevant organizations are invited to comment on whether the appendix should remain in this ISPM or whether it would be better to place it in implementation material.	C	<b>Japan</b> The table “Reliability of information sources” should remain as Appendix because information in the table is useful for NPPOs to decide pest status. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
311	229	Contracting parties, regional plant protection organizations and other relevant organizations are invited to comment on whether the appendix should remain in this ISPM or whether it would be better to place it in implementation material.	C	<b>New Zealand</b> It should better be placed in implementation material. New Zealand suggests the IC to consider developing guidance material for this standard. We are aware there is a call for experts for this, and we will be happy to provide working material during the process. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>