



**REGIONAL WORKSHOP
FOR THE REVIEW OF DAFT INTERNATIONAL STANDARDS
FOR PHYTSANITARY MEASURES (ISPMs)
Near East
CAIRO, EGYPT 21-23 JULY, 2008**

REPORT

Opening of the Session:

The workshop was opened by Dr. Mohamad Albraithen, Assistant Director General and Regional Representative for the FAO Near East Region. The ADG emphasized the importance of this workshop for the region because it does not have a Regional Plant Protection Organization (RPPO), so this workshop was an important venue to capture the views of the Region on the Draft Standards. He urged the countries to speed up this Organization ratification process in order to be able to perform its duties regarding plant protection issues in the Region.

Dr. Ali Soliman, Director of the Egyptian Plant Quarantine Central Administration spoke on the importance of the standards in regulating their international trade in agricultural commodities and updating the national plant quarantine regulations for easier application.

The Standard Committee member Mr. Abdullah Alsayani, welcomed the participants on behalf of the SC, he spoke of the need for the Near East to work towards forming a Regional Plant Protection Organization which would assist greatly in harmonizing and updating plant protection issues on the Regional level.

The meeting was attended by 14 participants from 8 countries; Egypt, Jordan, Lebanon, Oman, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syria, and Yemen. **(List of participants Annex I).**

The Reporting Officer (RO) outlined that the purpose of the workshop was to provide participants from countries in the Near East Region with a regional forum to discuss the ISPMs. These discussions would help participants gain a better understanding of the Regional and National impact of the proposed standards and provide a base for the development and submission of a national commitment. This workshop covered the following topics;

- Regulating wood packaging material in international trade (revision of ISPM No.15).
- Categorization of commodities according to their phytosanitary risk.
- Fruit fly trapping (proposed Annex 1 to ISPM No. 26 (Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae).
- Glossary of phytosanitary terms (Amendments to ISPM No. 5).
- Terminology of the Convention on Biological Biodiversity terms (draft supplement to ISPM No. 5, Glossary of phytosanitary terms).

- Structure and operation of post-entry quarantine facilities.
- Pest free potato micropropagative material and microtubers for international trade.

The draft templates for submission of comments and guidelines for submission of comments are all available at: <http://www.ippc.int/id/183181?language=en>.

It was noted that Regional workshops are held to assist countries in the preparation of their comments on the draft ISPMs. Official comments should be submitted to the IPPC secretariat by the national IPPC contact point before 15 September 2008.

Financing the workshop;

The workshop was financed by the FAO Near East Region and the contribution of the RO from his backstopping earnings. Due to shortages in funds, the workshop was duration reduced to three days, starting from 8.00 in the morning and finish late after 18.00 hours.

Adoption of the Agenda:

The Agenda was discussed and adopted (**Annex II**).

Election of the chair and the rapporteur;

Participants agreed to have a different chair for each session in order to give chances for more than one participant to chair the meeting Ms. Shaza Omar from the Egyptian plant quarantine central administration elected as a rapporteur

Overview of the IPPC:

The RO gave an overview of the IPPC, ISPMs and the standard setting process. He also stressed the importance of keeping contact information for IPPC points up to date and encouraged participants to use the IPP in order to facilitate information sharing between NPPOs and between NPPOs and the IPPC Secretariat.

Overview of the workshop:

The RO gave an overview of the structure and objectives of the workshop; sessions, note taking and reporting.

Online comments submission:

The RO organized a special session for the participants to be trained and become familiar with online comments on the draft standards. The opportunity was given to each participant to introduce on line comments according to the instructions for use provided by the secretariat.

Review of documents and discussion on draft ISPMs:

A presentation was given on each of the drafts by an SC member, RO and three participants who are familiar with these workshops, after which the participants held a general discussion. The drafts were then reviewed in detail; technical, editorial and substantive comments were recorded. Participants were invited to take note of the comments collected at the workshop and to utilize them as they felt appropriate in their

preparation of national comments. Any points that could not be agreed were not recorded in the comments and participants agreed to address these issues when submitting their national comments.

National comments should be submitted through the NPPO's contact points to the IPPC Secretariat no later than 15. September 2008 and participants were reminded to follow the guidelines for the submission of comments on draft ISPMs (**Annex III**) and instructions for the use of the templates (found at the end of each template down loaded from the website given above).

1- Regulating wood packaging material in international trade (Revision of ISPM No. 15): Chair: Abdulla Alsayani, Yemen

A presentation on the proposed revision was given. The participants discussed the NPPO's responsibilities in verifying that the standards' requirements are met. The participants agreed that the standard mark should include also the type of treatment applied. The issue of applying the date of treatment as part of the information on the mark could assist the NPPOs in recognizing if the wood has been in service for a long time so re-treatment could be required, but this is subject to the judgment of the NPPO and the importing country requirements. The participants also discussed the issue of reuse, repair and manufacturing of the WPM. The participants agreed that, it is difficult to decide the percentages of the new untreated wood used in the repairing process so treatment of this kind of wood is required. The participants recommended including the recommendations of the Regional workshop on the implementation of the ISPM No. 15 in this report. (Annex 11) Comments (Annex 4)

2- Categorization of commodities according to their phytosanitary risks: Chair: Imad Nahal, Lebanon

A presentation on the proposed draft ISPM was given. The participants were reminded that this draft was submitted for the Regional Consultation in 2007 under the *title* "Classification of commodities into phytosanitary risk categories". It is indicated that the standard can be used to categorize commodities according to their phytosanitary risk. The standard is based on the idea that heavily processed commodities often have decreased ability to harbor and spread pests therefore have lower phytosanitary risks. Topics of discussion included method and degree of processing before export and how these commodities can be divided according to it. It has been indicated that the intended use of these commodities could play a role in introducing regulated pests than others. After extensive discussion the participants suggested to change this draft from proposed standard to a supplement to ISPM No 2, and re-drafted according to suit its status as supplement. The reason is that this draft explains procedures to categorize commodities according to their phytosanitary risks, which is a major component of PRA, which is why it could be considered as a supplement or integrated into ISPM No 2.

(Comments Annex 5)

3- Supplement of ISPM No. 5 on terminology of the Convention on Biological Diversity in relation to the Glossary of Phytosanitary terms: *Chair: Najat Al Tayeb, Sudan*

A presentation on the Supplement was given. Participants were reminded that this supplement was developed by the technical panel of the Glossary (TPG) in 2006, and reformatted by TPG as a proposed supplement to ISPM No. 5 for submission to SC -7 in May 2008 as the objectives of the conventions, are different from each other. The participants believe that even with the explanation it is still difficult, in the present draft, to come up with agreeable definitions that express views of the two conventions in one definition.

The participants agreed that the supplement draft text needs to be more concise and clear. (Comments Annex 8)

4-Amendments of ISPM No.5 (glossary of Phytosanitary terms) *Chair: Imad Nahal, Lebanon*

A presentation on the proposed amendments to the glossary was given, outlining the proposal for four new definitions (*incidence of a pest, tolerance level (of a pest), phytosanitary security (of a consignment) and corrective action plan (in an area)*).

Three revised terms and definitions are proposed; (*compliance procedure (for consignment), intended use and reference specimen*)

Substantial changes were made to the draft definition incidence of a pest, and editorial changes were made to the proposed definitions; phytosanitary of a consignment. The participants approved other draft definitions without any changes.

It was noted that the Arabic translation of all definitions was not clear, but as the Arabic translation of the draft is not unofficial so no changes were made on the Arabic text.

The same as with the last year ISPM consultation, participants discussed the Arabic translation and made suggestions for ways to improve the situation, such as having a technical panel on Arabic translation, or having a regional body to decide on the terms to be used and make the translation. It was noted that the unofficial translation of the draft standards in Arabic available for this workshop greatly facilitated the discussions.

(Comments Annex 7)

5- Review and discussion of the draft standard Annex to ISPM No.26 (Establishment of Pest Free Areas for Fruit Flies) *Chair: Najat Altayab, Sudan*

A presentation on the draft Annex to ISPM 26 was given. Participants were reminded that the draft document was submitted for consultation in 2006 and submitted for adoption by CPM in March 2007 who returned the standard to the SC for redrafting.

Giving the very technical nature of the Annex draft, the participants felt unable to make any specific comments. Participants agreed that they would have to speak to experts in their country to provide technical comments. **Comments: Annex 6**

6- Structure and operation of post-entry quarantine facilities: Chair: Soliman Aaltoubi, Oman

A presentation on the draft standard was given. The participants discussed the draft standard. The participants believe that this standard should be confined only to the imported consignments of plants. This standard is dealing only with rootstocks, where any disease symptoms might appear only after some time. The question raised by the participants was, what about seedling and seeds which need to be inspected and released on site. It was agreed by participants that the Issue of the NPPO direct supervision of the facility is very important particularly in countries where it is not possible to authorize a reliable agency to act on behalf of the NPPO.

Some of participants wish to amend the scope to include plants, plant products and biological control agents, but there was no consensus on this point, so the issue was left to countries to submit their comments individually.
(Comments Annex 9)

7- Pest free potato micropropagative material and microtubers for international trade. Chair: Souliman Altoubi, Oman

A presentation on the draft standard was given. Participants discussed the draft standard. Participants think that the term certification is confusing. The standard is mainly focusing on production issues. Participants think that handling infected and pest free potato in the same facility could create risks of cross contamination, therefore, it is better if the handling is separated.

(Comments Annex 10)

Review of agreed comments;

After discussion of all draft standards and supplements, participants reviewed the agreed comments and recommendations.

Tables of comments were reviewed and finalized.

Organization of the Draft ISPMs (2009)

Participants indicated the following:

- Participants to the workshop should be from the experts that are familiar with the ISPMs discussions and implementation
- Some participants (Saudi Arabia) expressed their desire to visit some countries implementing certain standards, they will cover the cost of their visit, the secretariat could help in identifying countries that are successfully implementing certain standards

Date and venue of 2009 consultation:

Participants initially decided to hold the 2009 consultation in second half of July 2009.

Participants requested FAO Regional Office and the secretariat to contact the potential financial institutions for possible funding of the 2009 consultation.

Call for experts:

Participants were asked the nomination of experts to take part in drafting ISPMs and diagnostic protocols. Participants were encouraged to search for qualified experts from their region and submit their nominations, through the NPPO contact point, to the IPPC secretariat, according to the experts recruiting criteria set by the secretariat.

Closing remarks:

Closing remarks were given by the RO. Participants were thanked for their valuable contributions and encouraged to coordinate the submission of national country comments to the secretariat. The SC representative (Yemen participant) was thanked for his contribution.

The participants recommended the following;

- 1- To take into consideration the recommendations of the Sub-regional workshop on the implementation of the ISPMs No. 15 “Wood Packaging Materials in the International Trade “held in Alexandria, Egypt 30 June – 3 July 2008. (**Annex V.**)
- 2- The participants commented on the Arabic interpretation of the standards as not being precise and recommended establishment of a group of Arabic speaking phytosanitary experts from the Near East Region to meet annually to review the interpretation of the drafts and adopted standards and any other Arabic language documents related to the IPPC activities.
- 3- **Regulating wood packaging material in international trade:** Obtaining scientific justifications of points 4.3.2 & 4.3.3 concerning repaired and manufactured wood packaging material respectively regarding the verification of the one third term.
- 4- The draft standard on the categorization of commodities should be considered as a supplement or be incorporated in ISPM No. 2.
- 5- To re-draft the supplement: ISPM No. 5 “Terminology of the Convention on biological Diversity in relation to the Glossary of phytosanitary terms “as the text needs to be made more concise, clear and simple.
- 6- Preparation of a new draft standard concerning structure and operation of post entry quarantine facilities for biological organisms.

Annex I.



**Regional workshop for the review of draft
International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPMs)**
21-23 July, 2008
Giza, Egypt

Participants List

Participants	
Mr Mohamed Abdel Gawad Agricultural Engineer Central Administration of Plant Quarantine 3 Al Amira Fatma Ismail Str., Dokki, Giza, Egypt Tel. Mobile: 012-4256502 Fax: 02-33363582 E.mail: mohammedagawad@yahoo.com	Ms Shaza Omar Phytosanitary Specialist Central Administration of Plant Quarantine 3 Al Amira Fatma Ismail Str., Dokki, Giza, Egypt Mobile: 012 350 2448 E.mail: shaza.roshdy@gmail.com
Mr. Ahmed Fawzy SPS Specialist Central Administration of Plant Quarantine 3 Al Amira Fatma Ismail St., Dokki, Giza, Egypt Tel: 00-202-374-986 73 Fax: 00-202-333-635-82 E.mail: ahmedfawzy_84@yahoo.com	Mr. Mohammed Magdy Phyto Sanitary Specialist Agriculture Quarantine Central Administration of Plant Quarantine 3 Al Amira Fatma Ismail St., Dokki, Giza, Egypt Tel (Mobile): 010 148 0134 Fax: 00-202-333 635 82 E.mail: mohamedagri@yahoo.com
Mr. Nawras Al Adwan Plant Quarantine – Queen Aliaa International Airport Ministry of Agriculture Amman, Jordan Tel: 5733359 - 0777656689	Mr. Imad Nahhal Head of Plant Protection Dept. Ministry of Agriculture Bir Hassan, Embassies Street Beirut Lebanon Phone: + 961 1 849639 e-mail: imadn@terra.net.lb e-mail2: imadnahhal@gmail.com

Participants	
<p>Mr. Sulaiman Mahfoodh Al-Toubi Director of Plant Quarantine Department Ministry of Agriculture Muscat, Oman Tel: 00968 24698937 Fax: 00968 692069 Email: Saltoubi@maf.gov.om</p>	<p>Mr. Fahad Al Saqan General Director, Plant Protection Department Ministry of Agriculture Riyadh, Saudi Arabia Tel: 009661 4035899 Fax: 009661 4035899 E.mail: falsaqan@yahoo.com</p>
<p>Mr. Suliman Al Sawi Plant Quarantine Department Ministry of Agriculture Riyadh, Saudi Arabia Tel: 00966 505 109055 E.mail: ssmss145@yahoo.com</p>	<p>Ms. Nagat Mubarak El Tayeb Director of Plant Quarantine Department Plant Protection General Directorate Ministry of Agriculture Khartoum, Sudan Mobile: +249 9 121 81812 +249 9 122 91 493. E-mail: neltayb@yahoo.com]</p>
<p>Mr. Amin Al-Azhar Chief of Plant Quarantine Center Ministry of Agriculture & Agrarian Reform Syria Home Tel: 00963 11 3217883 Mobile: 00963 933263995 E-mail: Ameen.AIAZHAR@yahoo.com</p>	<p>Mr. Abdullah Hussein Al- Sayani General Director of Plant Protection General Directorate of Plant Protection Sana'a, Yemen Mobile: 00967 733216206 Tel: 009671 250956 Fax: 009671 228064 E.mail: p-qurantine@yemen.net.ye gdpp-mai@yemen.net.ye</p>

Other participants	
<p>Host Country (Opening Ceremony): Mr Ali Mahmoud Soliman Head of Central Administration for Plant Quarantine 3 Al Amira Fatma Ismail St., Dokki, Giza, Egypt, Mobile : 010-6622752 Fax : 00-202-33363582 E.mail : alisolimanA@epq.gov.eg</p>	<p>FAO/IPPC Secretariat: Mr. Taher El Azzabi Plant Protection Senior Officer Food & Agriculture Organization of the United Nations Regional Office for the Near East Cairo, Egypt Tel: 00-202-333 16000 Mobile: 010-344 9055 E.mail: taher.elazzabi@fao.org</p>

Other participants

FAO:

Ms. Heba Tokali
Food & Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
Regional Office for the Near East
Cairo,
Egypt
Tel: 00-202-333 1 6000
Mobile: 010-141-0366
E.mail: heba.tokali@fao.org



**Regional workshop for the review of draft
International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPMs)**
21 -23 June 2008
Cairo, Egypt

Provisional Agenda

Monday 21 July 2008	
08:00 – 08:30	Registration
08:30 – 10:30	Opening of the workshop Opening address - Dr. Ali Soliman – Director Central Administration for Plant Quarantine – Egypt - Dr. Mohamed Albraithen RNE ADG - Mr. Abdulla Alsayani SC member - Overview of the workshop (FAO Regional Officer- plant protection) - Introductions (FAO Regional Officer – Plant protection) - Adoption of the agenda
10:30 – 11:00	Coffee break
11:00 – 13:00	- Election of chair and rapporteur - Overview of the IPPC (FAO officer Regional officer – plant protection) - Overview of the review of draft ISPMs (FAO Regional officer – plant protection) <i>Review and discussion of draft standards;</i> - Revision of ISPM No.15 (Regulating Wood Packaging Material in International Trade)
13.00 – 14.00	Lunch
14.00 – 15.30	- Review of ISPM No. 15 (Wood Packaging Material in International Trade) Cont.,.. - Review of draft standard on Categorization of Commodities according to their Phytosanitary Risk
15:30 – 16.00	Coffee break
16.00 – 18.00	Review and discussion of draft standards - Revision of Draft Standard on Categorization of Commodities to their Phytosanitary Risks - Cont.,....
Tuesday 22 July 2008	
08:00 – 10:30	Review and discussion of draft standards - Draft Annex to ISPMs No. 26 on Fruit fly trapping

10:30 – 11:00	Coffee break
11:00 – 13:00	Review and discussion of draft standards - Revision of draft standard on amendments to ISPM No.5 (<i>Glossary of Phytosanitary Terms</i>)
13:00 – 14:00	Lunch
14:00 – 15:30	Review and discussion of draft standards - Revision of Draft standard on Terminology of the CBD in Relation to the Glossary of Phytosanitary Terms
15:30 – 16:00	Coffee break
16:00 – 18:00	Review and discussion of draft standards - Revision of Draft Standard on Structure and Operation of Post-entry Quarantine Facilities
Wednesday 23 July 2008	
08:00 – 10:30	Review and discussion of draft standards - Revision of Draft standard on Structure and Operation of Post-entry Quarantine Facilities Cont.,...
10:30 – 11:00	Coffee break
11:00 – 13:00	Review and discussion of draft standards - Revision of Draft Standard on Pest Free Potato Micropropagative Material and Minitubers for International Trade
13:00 – 14:00	Lunch
14.- 15.30	Review and discussion of draft standards - Review of Draft Standard on Pest Free Potato Micropropagative Material and Minitubers in International Trade Cont.,.....
15.30- 16.00	Coffee break
16:00 – 18:00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Review of agreed comments - Finalization of comment tables - Call for experts - Tentative Date and venue of 2009 consultation - Identification of 2009 consultation sponsors - Submission national comments - Recommendations - Close

Annex III.

GUIDELINES FOR THE SUBMISSION OF COMMENTS ON DRAFT INTERNATIONAL STANDARDS FOR PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES (ISPMS) [updated 31 May 2008]

Draft ISPMS are distributed by the Secretariat of the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) to National Plant Protection Organizations (NPPOs), Regional Plant Protection Organizations (RPPOs) and relevant international organizations upon the recommendation of the Standards Committee or Standards Committee Working Group (SC-7).

The following elements are part of the standard setting procedures:

- Members are provided 100 days to review the draft standards, consult on their content, and compile and submit comments to the Secretariat.
- The Secretariat provides a format for member comments. Members are asked to provide comments electronically using one of the formats provided to allow comments to be compiled more easily.
- Member comments should be submitted through the online submission form or, if appropriate internet facilities are not available and as a back up, through templates provided by the Secretariat. Member comments should be submitted through the IPPC contact point and this should be easily verifiable.
- Compiled member comments will be published on the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP).

The Secretariat encourages submissions as early as possible to facilitate the timely compilation of comments for the Standards Committee.

The following are guidelines for the submission of comments to help ensure maximum benefit from the consultation process, and faster compilation of comments:

1. Members may submit comments through one of the following methods:
 - **Online** through the IPP. This system is currently being developed and is scheduled to be released in July 2008. When it becomes available, the IPPC Secretariat will inform all IPPC contact points and will provide detailed instructions for using the system. The online method of submission of comments will be the main and preferred choice.
 - Using the **templates** provided by the Secretariat for each standard. This submission method should only be used if appropriate internet facilities are not available for using the online method described above. These templates are available as electronic documents that can be downloaded from the IPP (<https://www.ippc.int/id/201049>) or obtained by e-mail from the IPPC Secretariat on request to IPPC@fao.org. Instructions for the use of the templates are given at the end of each template. Templates with comments should be submitted by e-mail as a word processing file (Word or similar) to IPPC@fao.org. Comments should be submitted through the IPPC contact point and the accompanying e-mail message should contain sufficient information so that this can be verified. If this cannot be verified, the member comments will not be retained. The text of the e-mail should also clearly indicate the

country from which the comments are sent. Members are requested to submit **only one set** of comments for each standard and if several sets are received, the Secretariat will retain the last version received prior to the deadline.

2. If a contracting party wishes to support all of the comments submitted by another contracting party or RPPO, this should be indicated in the online submission form or a letter or e-mail (instead of sending the comments under the country's own name). The name of the country **will still appear** in the comments compiled for the Standards Committee.

Please note that comments from RPPOs are considered to represent the views of the organization and which may be based on consultation within the organization. Such comments, however, are **not** considered to represent the views of individual contracting parties unless specifically indicated as such **by the contracting party(ies)** (for example, by indicating this in the online submission form, templates of comments, or a letter or e-mail).

3. Comments should be supported by an explanation of their purpose. Alternative text should be proposed where appropriate. It is essential that care is taken to ensure all comments and their rationale are clear.

4. Note that paragraphs in the draft standards are numbered. It is essential to ensure that the paragraph numbers used when submitting comments correspond to that of the draft standard as sent for consultation as these numbers will be used to compile the comments for the Standards Committee. Comments submitted with errors in paragraph numbering will not be ordered properly in the compiled tables and will cause confusion.

5. Due to the short time available between the end of the consultation period and the Standards Committee meeting, and to avoid misinterpretation in translation, countries sending comments in a language other than English are encouraged to send an English translation as well.

Note: The Secretariat only distributes to the Standards Committee comments received from contracting parties, RPPOs and relevant international organizations. Any comments on the draft standards from the public should be channeled through the national IPPC contact point for the respective countries. IPPC contact points can be found on the IPP (<https://www.ippc.int/IPP/En/nppo.jsp>).

Template for comments - Draft ISPMs for country consultation, 2008

DRAFT 1/7: REVISED ISPM NO. 15 - REGULATING WOOD PACKAGING MATERIAL IN INTERNATIONAL TRADE

See [instructions](#) on how to use this template at the end of the document. Following these will greatly facilitate the compilation of comments and the work of the Standards Committee.

1. Section	2. Paragraph number	3. sentence/row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
<i>GENERAL COMMENTS</i>						
<i>SPECIFIC COMMENTS</i>						
TITLE	[1]					
CONTENTS	[2]					
INTRODUCTION	[3]					
SCOPE	[4]					
SCOPE	[5]					
SCOPE	[6]					
REFERENCES	[7]					
REFERENCES	[8]					
REFERENCES	[9]					
REFERENCES	[10]					
REFERENCES	[11]					
REFERENCES	[12]					
REFERENCES	[13]					
REFERENCES	[14]					
REFERENCES	[15]					
REFERENCES	[16]					
DEFINITIONS	[17]					
DEFINITIONS	[18]					

1. Section	2. Paragraph number	3. sentence/row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
OUTLINE OF REQUIREMENTS	[19]					
OUTLINE OF REQUIREMENTS	[20]					
OUTLINE OF REQUIREMENTS	[21]	Sentence 5	Technical	The NPPO of the importing country should accept the approved phytosanitary measures as the basis for authorizing entry of wood packaging material without further phytosanitary import requirements in the country of origin and should verify on import that the requirements of the standard have been met	It contradicts with the principle of sovereignty because it doesn't allow for further verifications such as inspection at entry points of importing countries.	
REQUIREMENTS	[22]					
1. Basis for regulating	[23]					
1. Basis for regulating	[24]					
2. Regulated Wood Packaging Material	[25]					
2. Regulated Wood Packaging Material	[26]	Sentence 1	Editorial	This standard covers all forms of wood packaging material ¹ that may serve as a pathway for plant pests posing a threat mainly to living trees	More clarification	NE
2.1 Exemptions	[27]					
2.1 Exemptions	[28]	Sentence 5	Technical	barrels for wine and spirit that have been manufactured and/or heated in a way that renders them free of pests	The process of heating is not a sufficient treatment to render these items free of pests	NE
3. Phytosanitary Measures for Wood Packaging...	[29]					
3.1 Approved phytosanitary measures	[30]					

¹ Wood packaging material is usually made from true woody plants such as conifers and woody dicots. However, packaging may also be made of wood-like material from certain monocotyledonous plants such as bamboo and palm. Such material also presents risks of quarantine pests and should be considered to be within the scope of this standard.

1. Section	2. Paragraph number	3. sentence/row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
3.1 Approved phytosanitary measures	[31]	Sentence 2	Technical	phytosanitary measures should be accepted by all NPPOs as the basis for authorizing the entry of wood packaging material without further requirements in the country of origin.	Consistency with paragraph 21	
3.1 Approved phytosanitary measures	[32]					
3.1 Approved phytosanitary measures	[33]					
3.2 Approval of new or revised treatments	[34]					
3.2 Approval of new or revised treatments	[35]					
3.3 Alternative requirements	[36]					
3.3 Alternative requirements	[37]					
4. Responsibilities of NPPOs	[38]					
4. Responsibilities of NPPOs	[39]					
4.1 Regulatory considerations	[40]					
4.1 Regulatory considerations	[41]					
4.1 Regulatory considerations	[42]					
4.2 Marking	[43]					
4.2 Marking	[44]					
4.3 Treatment and marking requirements...	[45]					

1. Section	2. Paragraph number	3. sentence/row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
4.3 Treatment and marking requirements ...	[46]					
4.3.1 Reuse of wood packaging material	[47]					
4.3.1 Reuse of wood packaging material	[48]					
4.3.2 Repaired wood packaging material	[49]	All	Technical	<p>Repaired wood packaging material is wood packaging material that has had one or more components removed and replaced. If less than approximately one-third of the components of a unit of wood packaging material are replaced, the unit is considered to be repaired. NPPOs of exporting countries should ensure that when marked wood packaging material is repaired, wood treated and marked in accordance with this standard is used.</p> <p>[51] — In circumstances where there is any doubt that all components of a unit of repaired wood packaging material have been treated in accordance with this standard, the NPPO of the exporting country should require the repaired wood packaging material to be re-treated. Any previous applications of the mark must be permanently obliterated (e.g. by covering with paint or grinding) or, in the case of tags or labels, destroyed. The mark must then be applied anew in accordance with this standard</p>	This paragraph creates confusion because there is no subjective scientific determination of the percentage of repairs made to wood packaging material and thus responsibility for treatments are undetermined.	
4.3.2 Repaired wood	[50]				as above	

1. Section	2. Paragraph number	3. sentence/row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
packaging material						
4.3.2 Repaired wood packaging material	[51]				as above	
4.3.3 Remanufactured wood packaging material	[52]			<p>Remanufactured wood packaging material If more than approximately one third of the components of a unit of wood packaging material are replaced, the unit is considered to be remanufactured. In a remanufacturing process, wood packaging material is dismantled (partially or completely), and the components (with additional reworking if necessary) are then reassembled into further wood packaging material. Remanufactured wood packaging material may therefore incorporate both new and previously used components.</p> <p>Remanufactured wood packaging material, regardless of its intended use, must have any previous applications of the mark permanently obliterated (e.g. by covering with paint or grinding) or, in the case of tags or labels, destroyed. If the wood packaging material is to be used in international trade, the remanufactured wood packaging material must be re-treated and the mark must then be applied anew in accordance with this standard.</p>	This paragraph creates confusion because there is no subjective scientific determination of the percentage of repairs made to wood packaging material and thus responsibility for treatments are undetermined.	
4.3.3 Remanufactured wood packaging material	[53]					
4.3.3 Remanufactured	[54]					

1. Section	2. Paragraph number	3. sentence/row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
wood packaging material						
4.4 Transit arrangements	[55]					
4.4 Transit arrangements	[56]					
4.5 Procedures upon import	[57]					
4.5 Procedures upon import	[58]					
4.5 Procedures upon import	[59]					
4.6 Measures for non-compliance at point of ...	[60]					
4.6 Measures for non-compliance at point of ...	[61]					
4.6 Measures for non-compliance at point of ...	[62]					
ANNEX 1	[63]					
ANNEX 1: TITLE	[64]					
ANNEX 1: TEXT	[65]					
ANNEX 1: TEXT	[66]		Technical	<p>Removal of bark is to be applied in addition to one of the other treatments as specified below. However, any number of small pieces of bark may remain after removal of bark:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - if they are less than <u>3 centimetres</u> in width (regardless of the length) or - if greater than <u>3 centimetres</u> in width, with the total surface area of an individual piece of bark less than <u>50 square centimetres</u>. 	Needs scientific justification for the underlined fragments.	
ANNEX 1: Heat treatment	[67]					

1. Section	2. Paragraph number	3. sentence/row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
ANNEX 1: Heat treatment	[68]					
ANNEX 1: Heat treatment	[69]					
ANNEX 1: Methyl bromide treatment	[70]					
ANNEX 1: Methyl bromide treatment	[71]					
ANNEX 1: Methyl bromide treatment	[72]					
ANNEX 1: Methyl bromide treatment	[73]					
ANNEX 1: Methyl bromide treatment (table 1)	[74]					
ANNEX 1: Methyl bromide treatment	[75]					
ANNEX 1: Methyl bromide treatment (table 2)	[76]					
ANNEX 1: Methyl bromide treatment	[77]					
ANNEX 2	[78]					
ANNEX 2: TITLE	[79]					
ANNEX 2: TEXT	[80]					
ANNEX 2: Symbol	[81]					
ANNEX 2: Symbol	[82]					
ANNEX 2: Country code	[83]					
ANNEX 2: Country code	[84]					
ANNEX 2: Producer code	[85]					
ANNEX 2: Producer code	[86]					
ANNEX 2: Text on mark	[87]					
ANNEX 2: Text on mark	[88]					

1. Section	2. Paragraph number	3. sentence/row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
ANNEX 2: Text on mark	[89]					
ANNEX 2: Text on mark	[90]					
ANNEX 2: Text on mark	[91]					
ANNEX 2: Text on mark	[92]					
ANNEX 2: Text on mark	[93]					
ANNEX 2: Text on mark	[94]					
ANNEX 2: Text on mark	[95]	Example 1	Substantive	Keep the treatment code (HT or MB or other)	More informative	RNE
ANNEX 2: Text on mark	[96]	Example 2	Substantive	Keep the treatment code (HT or MB or other)	More informative	RNE
ANNEX 2: Text on mark	[97]	Example 3	Substantive	Keep the treatment code (HT or MB or other)	More informative	RNE
ANNEX 2: Text on mark	[98]	Example 4	Substantive	Keep the treatment code (HT or MB or other)	More informative	RNE
ANNEX 2: Text on mark	[99]	Example 5	Substantive	Keep the treatment code (HT or MB or other)	More informative	RNE
ANNEX 2: Text on mark	[100]	Example 6	Substantive	Keep the treatment code (HT or MB or other)	More informative	RNE
APPENDIX 1	[101]					
APPENDIX 1: TITLE	[102]					
APPENDIX 1: TEXT	[103]					
APPENDIX 1: TEXT	[104]					
APPENDIX 1: TEXT	[105]					
APPENDIX 2	[106]					
APPENDIX 2: TITLE	[107]					
APPENDIX 2: TEXT	[108]					

Annex 5

Template for comments - Draft ISPMs for country consultation, 2008

DRAFT 2/7: CATEGORIZATION OF COMMODITIES ACCORDING TO THEIR PHYTOSANITARY RISK

See [instructions](#) on how to use this template at the end of the document. Following these will greatly facilitate the compilation of comments and the work of the Standards Committee.

1. Section	2. Para nber	3. sentence/ row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
GENERAL COMMENTS			Substantive	Make this Draft ISPM as a supplement to ISPM #2	This draft explains procedures to categorize commodities according to their phytosanitary risk which is a major component in PRA, that's why it could be considered as a supplement or integrated into ISPM # 2	NE
SPECIFIC COMMENTS						
TITLE	[1]					
CONTENTS	[2]					
INTRODUCTION	[3]					
SCOPE	[4]					
SCOPE	[5]					
SCOPE	[6]					
SCOPE	[7]					
REFERENCES	[8]					
REFERENCES	[9]					
REFERENCES	[10]					
REFERENCES	[11]					
REFERENCES	[12]					
REFERENCES	[13]					

1. Section	2. Paragraph number	3. sentence/row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
REFERENCES	[14]					
REFERENCES	[15]					
REFERENCES	[16]					
REFERENCES	[17]					
DEFINITIONS	[18]					
DEFINITIONS	[19]					
OUTLINE OF REQUIREMENTS	[20]					
OUTLINE OF REQUIREMENTS	[21]					
OUTLINE OF REQUIREMENTS	[22]					
OUTLINE OF REQUIREMENTS	[23]					
BACKGROUND	[24]					
BACKGROUND	[25]					
BACKGROUND	[26]					
BACKGROUND	[27]					
BACKGROUND	[28]					
BACKGROUND	[29]					
BACKGROUND	[30]					
BACKGROUND	[31]					
BACKGROUND	[32]					
REQUIREMENTS	[33]					
REQUIREMENTS	[34]					
REQUIREMENTS	[35]					
REQUIREMENTS	[36]					

1. Section	2. Paragraph number	3. sentence/row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
REQUIREMENTS	[37]					
1. Elements of Categorization ...	[38]					
1. Elements of Categorization ...	[39]					
1. Elements of Categorization ...	[40]					
1. Elements of Categorization ...	[41]					
1.1 Method and degree of ...	[42]					
1.1 Method and degree of...	[43]					
1.1 Method and degree of ..	[44]					
1.1 Method and degree of ...	[45]					
1.1 Method and degree of...	[46]					
1.1 Method and degree of ...	[47]					
1.1 Method and degree of...	[48]					
1.2 Intended use after import	[49]					
1.2 Intended use after import	[50]					
1.2 Intended use after import	[51]					
2. Phytosanitary Risk Categories and ...	[52]					

1. Section	2. Paragraph	3. sentence/row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
2. Phytosanitary Risk Categories and ...	[53]					
2. Phytosanitary Risk Categories and ...	[54]					
2. Phytosanitary Risk Categories and ...	[55]					
2. Phytosanitary Risk Categories and ...	[56]					
2. Phytosanitary Risk Categories and ...	[57]					
2. Phytosanitary Risk Categories and ...	[58]					
2. Phytosanitary Risk Categories and ...	[59]					
2. Phytosanitary Risk Categories and ...	[60]					
2. Phytosanitary Risk Categories and ...	[61]					
2. Phytosanitary Risk Categories and ...	[62]					
2. Phytosanitary Risk Categories and ...	[63]					

1. Section	2. Paragraph number	3. sentence/row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
2. Phytosanitary Risk Categories and ...	[64]					
2. Phytosanitary Risk Categories and ...	[65]					
2. Phytosanitary Risk Categories and ...	[66]					
ANNEX 1	[67]					
ANNEX 1: TITLE	[68]					
ANNEX 1: TABLE	[69]					
ANNEX 2	[70]					
ANNEX 2: TITLE	[71]					
ANNEX 2: TABLE	[72]					
APPENDIX 1	[73]					
APPENDIX 1: TITLE	[74]					
APPENDIX 1: FLOW CHART	[75]					

Annex 6

Template for comments - Draft ISPMs for country consultation, 2008

DRAFT 3/7: FRUIT FLY TRAPPING (ANNEX 1 TO ISPM NO. 26 (ESTABLISHMENT OF PEST FREE AREAS FOR FRUIT FLIES (TEPHRITIDAE))

See [instructions](#) on how to use this template at the end of the document. Following these will greatly facilitate the compilation of comments and the work of the Standards Committee.

1. Section	2. Para nber	3. Sentence/ row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
<i>GENERAL COMMENTS</i>					Technical comments are better to be sent by Technical experts from individual countries after reviewing the ISPM.	NE
<i>SPECIFIC COMMENTS</i>						
TITLE	[1]					
CONTENTS	[2]					
FRUIT FLY TRAPPING	[3]					
FRUIT FLY TRAPPING	[4]					
1. Trapping Survey Objectives and ...	[5]					
1. Trapping Survey Objectives and ...	[6]					
1. Trapping Survey Objectives and ...	[7]					
2. Trapping Scenarios	[8]					
2. Trapping Scenarios	[9]					
2. Trapping Scenarios	[10]					
2. Trapping Scenarios: Table 1	[11]					
2. Trapping Scenarios	[12]					

1. Section	2. Paragraph number	3. Sentence/row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
3. Trapping Systems for Fruit Fly Surveys	[13]					
3. Trapping Systems for Fruit Fly Surveys	[14]					
3. Trapping Systems for Fruit Fly Surveys	[15]					
3. Trapping Systems for Fruit Fly Surveys: Table 2	[16]					
3.1 Attractants and lures	[17]					
3.1.1 Male specific	[18]					
3.1.1 Male specific	[19]					
3.1.2 Female biased	[20]					
3.1.2 Female biased	[21]					
3.1.2 Female biased	[22]					
3.1.2 Female biased: Table 3a	[23]					
3.1.2 Female biased: Table 3b	[24]					
3.1.2 Female biased: Table 4	[25]					
3.1.2 Female biased	[26]					
3.2 Killing agents	[27]					
3.2 Killing agents	[28]					
3.2 Killing agents	[29]					
3.3 Trapping devices	[30]					
3.3 Trapping devices	[31]					
3.3 Trapping devices	[32]					
3.3 Trapping devices: Cook and Cunningham Trap	[33]					

Annex 7

Template for comments - Draft ISPMs for country consultation, 2008

DRAFT 4/7: AMENDMENTS TO ISPM NO. 5 (GLOSSARY OF PHYTOSANITARY TERMS)

See [instructions](#) on how to use this template at the end of the document. Following these will greatly facilitate the compilation of comments and the work of the Standards Committee.

1. Section	2. Paragraph number	3. sentence/row/indent etc.	4. Type of comment	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
<i>GENERAL COMMENTS</i>						
<i>SPECIFIC COMMENTS</i>						
TITLE	[1]					
Proposed definition: <i>incidence (of a pest)</i>	[2]	All	Substantive	Proportion or number of units in a sample, consignment, field or other defined population that is affected by a pest	The fragment to be deleted as the defined population is already covered in the definition of the consignment. The term population causes confusion.	NE
Proposed definition: <i>tolerance level (of a pest)</i>	[3]				Approved	NE
Proposed definition: <i>phytosanitary security (of a consignment)</i>	[4]	All	Editorial	Maintenance of the integrity of a consignment and prevention of its infestation and/or contamination by regulated pests , through the application of appropriate phytosanitary measures	Addition of “or” for more elaboration	NE
Proposed definition: <i>corrective action plan (in an area)</i>	[5]	All			Approved as appeared in the draft	NE
Proposed definition: <i>compliance procedure (for a consignment)</i>	[6]	All			Approved as appeared in the draft	NE
Proposed definition: <i>intended use</i>	[7]	All			Approved as appeared in the draft	NE
Proposed definition: <i>reference specimen</i>	[8]	All			Approved as appeared in the draft	NE

Annex 8

Template for comments - Draft ISPMs for country consultation, 2008

**DRAFT 5/7: SUPPLEMENT TO ISPM NO. 5: TERMINOLOGY OF THE CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY
IN RELATION TO THE GLOSSARY OF PHYTOSANITARY TERMS**

See [instructions](#) on how to use this template at the end of the document. Following these will greatly facilitate the compilation of comments and the work of the Standards Committee.

1. Section	2. Paragraph number	3. sentence/row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
<i>GENERAL COMMENTS</i>		The whole text	Sustantive Technical	The text needed to be re-drafted	The text needs to be more concise, clear and simple.	NE
<i>SPECIFIC COMMENTS</i>						
TITLE	[1]					
1. Introduction	[2]					
1. Introduction	[3]					
1. Introduction	[4]					
2. Presentation	[5]					
2. Presentation	[6]					
3. Terminology	[7]					
3.1 Alien species	[8]					
3.1 Alien species	[9]					
3.1 Alien species	[10]					
3.1 Alien species: Notes	[11]					
3.1 Alien species: Note 1	[12]					
3.1 Alien species: Note 2	[13]					
3.1 Alien species: Note 3	[14]					
3.1 Alien species: Note 4	[15]					
3.2 Introduction	[16]					

1. Section	2. Paragraph number	3. sentence/row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
3.2 Introduction	[17]					
3.2 Introduction	[18]					
3.2 Introduction: Notes	[19]					
3.2 Introduction: Note 5	[20]					
3.2 Introduction: Note 6	[21]					
3.2 Introduction: Note 7	[22]					
3.3 Invasive alien species	[23]					
3.3 Invasive alien species	[24]					
3.3 Invasive alien species	[25]					
3.3 Invasive alien species: Notes	[26]					
3.3 Invasive alien species: Note 8	[27]					
3.3 Invasive alien species: Note 9	[28]					
3.3 Invasive alien species: Note 10	[29]					
3.3 Invasive alien species: Note 11	[30]					
3.3 Invasive alien species: Note 12	[31]					
3.4 Establishment	[32]					
3.4 Establishment	[33]					
3.4 Establishment	[34]					
3.4 Establishment: Notes	[35]					
3.4 Establishment: Note 13	[36]					
3.4 Establishment: Note 14	[37]					
3.4 Establishment: Note 15	[38]					
3.5 Intentional introduction	[39]					
3.5 Intentional introduction	[40]					

1. Section	2. Paragraph number	3. sentence/row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
3.5 Intentional introduction	[41]					
3.6 Unintentional introduction	[42]					
3.6 Unintentional introduction	[43]					
3.6 Unintentional introduction	[44]					
3.6 Unintentional introduction: Notes	[45]					
3.6 Unintentional introduction: Note 16	[46]					
3.7 Risk analysis	[47]					
3.7 Risk analysis	[48]					
3.7 Risk analysis	[49]					
3.7 Risk analysis: Notes	[50]					
3.7 Risk analysis: Note 17	[51]					
3.7 Risk analysis: Note 18	[52]					
3.7 Risk analysis: Note 19	[53]					
3.7 Risk analysis: Note 20	[54]					
4. Other Concepts	[55]					
4. Other Concepts	[56]					
5. Reference	[57]					
5. Reference	[58]					

Annex 9

Template for comments - Draft ISPMs for country consultation, 2008

DRAFT 6/7: STRUCTURE AND OPERATION OF POST-ENTRY QUARANTINE FACILITIES

See [instructions](#) on how to use this template at the end of the document. Following these will greatly facilitate the compilation of comments and the work of the Standards Committee.

1. Section	2. Paragraph number	3. sentence/row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
<i>GENERAL COMMENTS</i>			Substantive		The standard should tackle the disposal and/or decontamination equipments, treatments and processes	NE
<i>SPECIFIC COMMENTS</i>			Substantive		Addition of 2 more references: ISPM No 20: Guidelines for phytosanitary import regulatory system ISPM No 23: Guidelines for Inspection	NE
TITLE	[1]					
CONTENTS	[2]					
INTRODUCTION	[3]					
SCOPE	[4]					
SCOPE	[5]					
REFERENCES	[6]					
REFERENCES	[7]					
REFERENCES	[8]					
REFERENCES	[9]					
DEFINITIONS	[10]					
DEFINITIONS	[11]					
OUTLINE OF REQUIREMENTS	[12]					

1. Section	2. Paragraph number	3. sentence/row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
OUTLINE OF REQUIREMENTS	[13]					
OUTLINE OF REQUIREMENTS	[14]					
OUTLINE OF REQUIREMENTS	[15]	First line	Technical	Field sites or screen house	Both screen house and field site are PEQ level 1	RNE
BACKGROUND	[16]					
BACKGROUND	[17]	Line eight	Technical	NPPOs might decide that certain suspected consignments ...	Only suspected consignments are held	RNE
BACKGROUND	[18]					
BACKGROUND	[19]		Editorial	Detected by inspection measures available at the point of entry	Detection measures are applied by the entry point staff of the facilities are available	RNE
BACKGROUND	[20]					
GENERAL REQUIREMENTS	[21]					
1. PEQ Containment	[22]					
1. PEQ Containment	[23]					
1. PEQ Containment	[24]	Third line	Technical	The NPPO should determine the containment level required for a specific consignment of plants entering PEQ facilities based on a pest risk assessment for the potential pests that may be associated with imported plant material or for the imported organism itself	To be consistent with the scope of the standard	RNE
		Fifth line	Technical	Country and the biology and behavior of the pest	Pest behavior is an important factor	RNE
1. PEQ Containment	[25]					

1. Section	2. Paragraph number	3. sentence/row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
1. PEQ Containment	[26]	Sentence 1	Substantive	Once the required level of containment has been determined for a specific consignment of plants entering quarantine, the NPPO determines whether that containment level can be provided by	To be consistent with the scope of the standard	NE
2. PEQ Facilities	[27]					
2. PEQ Facilities	[28]					
2. PEQ Facilities	[29]	Sentence 1	Substantive	PEQ facilities should provide the appropriate level of containment for the level of risk associated with the import of consignments of plants . PEQ facilities may consist of a field site, screen house, glasshouse and/or laboratory.	To be consistent with the scope of the standard	NE
2.1 Location	[30]	Line one	Editorial	PEQ facilities should be located in areas that provide adequate isolation	The word Some isolation is not clear	
2.1 Location	[31]					
2.2 Physical requirements	[32]					
2.2 Physical requirements	[33]					
2.2 Physical requirements	[34]					
2.3 Operational requirements	[35]					
2.3 Operational requirements	[36]	Sentence 1	substantive	PEQ facilities should either be operated by or be authorized by the NPPO and remains under its supervision.	More specific	NE
2.3 Operational requirements	[37]					
2.3 Operational	[38]					

1. Section	2. Paragraph number	3. sentence/row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
requirements						
2.3 Operational requirements	[39]	Add point at the end	Technical	- Maintenance staff should be part of the facility staff to carry out all the facility maintenance work	Each facility should have trained technicians as part of the staff to carry out all maintenance work required	RNE
2.4 Release from containment	[40]					
2.4 Release from containment	[41]	Sentence 1	Substantive	Consignments <u>of plants</u> should be released from quarantine facilities on completion of the required inspection, testing, treatment and verification	To be consistent with the scope of the standard	NE
3. Specific Requirements for PEQ Facilities by Containment Level	[42]					
3. Specific Requirements for PEQ Facilities by Containment Level	[43]					
3. Specific Requirements for PEQ Facilities by Containment Level	[44]					
3. Specific Requirements for PEQ Facilities by Containment Level	[45]					
3.1 PEQ containment level 1	[46]					
3.1.1 Type of facility and use, PEQ1	[47]					
3.1.1 Type of facility and use, PEQ1	[48]					
3.1.2 Physical requirements, PEQ1	[49]					
3.1.2 Physical requirements, PEQ1	[50]					

1. Section	2. Paragraph number	3. sentence/row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
3.1.3 Operational requirements, PEQ1	[51]					
3.1.3 Operational requirements, PEQ1	[52]	Line one	Technical	Access to the site should be restricted only for authorized staff	To avoid contamination only authorized staff can enter the facility	RNE
3.2 PEQ containment level 2	[53]					
3.2.1 Type of facility and use, PEQ2	[54]					
3.2.1 Type of facility and use, PEQ2	[55]					
3.2.2 Physical requirements, PEQ2	[56]					
3.2.2 Physical requirements, PEQ2	[57]					
3.2.2 Physical requirements, PEQ2	[58]					
3.2.2 Physical requirements, PEQ2	[59]					
3.2.3 Operational requirements, PEQ2	[60]					
3.2.3 Operational requirements, PEQ2	[61]					
3.2.3 Operational requirements, PEQ2	[62]					
3.3 PEQ containment level 3	[63]					
3.3.1 Type of facility and use, PEQ3	[64]					
3.3.1 Type of facility and use, PEQ3	[65]					
3.3.2 Physical requirements, PEQ3	[66]					

1. Section	2. Paragraph number	3. sentence/row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
3.3.2 Physical requirements, PEQ3	[67]					
3.3.2 Physical requirements, PEQ3	[68]					
3.3.2 Physical requirements, PEQ3	[69]					
3.3.2 Physical requirements, PEQ3	[70]					
3.3.3 Operational requirements, PEQ3	[71]					
3.3.3 Operational requirements, PEQ3	[72]					
3.3.3 Operational requirements, PEQ3	[73]					
3.3.3 Operational requirements, PEQ3	[74]					
3.4 PEQ containment level 4	[75]					
3.4.1 Type of facility and use, PEQ4	[76]					
3.4.1 Type of facility and use, PEQ4	[77]					
3.4.2 Physical requirements, PEQ4	[78]					
3.4.2 Physical requirements, PEQ4	[79]					
3.4.2 Physical requirements, PEQ4	[80]					
3.4.2 Physical requirements, PEQ4	[81]					
3.4.2 Physical requirements, PEQ4	[82]					

1. Section	2. Paragraph number	3. sentence/row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
3.4.2 Physical requirements, PEQ4	[83]					
3.4.3 Operational requirements, PEQ4	[84]					
3.4.3 Operational requirements, PEQ4	[85]					
3.4.3 Operational requirements, PEQ4	[86]					
3.4.3 Operational requirements, PEQ4	[87]					
ANNEX 1	[88]					
ANNEX 1: TITLE	[89]					
ANNEX 1: TEXT	[90]					
ANNEX 1: TEXT	[91]					
ANNEX 1: TABLE 1	[92]					
ANNEX 1: TEXT	[93]					
APPENDIX 1	[94]					
APPENDIX 1: TITLE	[95]					
APPENDIX 1: TABLE	[96]					

Annex 10

Template for comments - Draft ISPMs for country consultation, 2008

DRAFT 7/7: PEST FREE POTATO MICROPROPAGATIVE MATERIAL AND MINITUBERS FOR INTERNATIONAL TRADE

See [instructions](#) on how to use this template at the end of the document. Following these will greatly facilitate the compilation of comments and the work of the Standards Committee.

1. Section	2. Paragraph number	3. sentence/row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
GENERAL COMMENTS						
SPECIFIC COMMENTS					Addition of ISPM No 1: Phytosanitary Principles for the protection of plants and the application of phytosanitary measures in international trade as a Reference	RNE
TITLE	[1]					
CONTENTS	[2]					
INTRODUCTION	[3]					
SCOPE	[4]					
SCOPE	[5]		Technical	This standard provides guidance on the production, maintenance and certification of pest free potato (<i>Solanum</i> spp.) micropropagative material and minitubers intended to be moved in international trade.	The use of the term certification is confusing and need to be clarified	RNE
SCOPE	[6]					
REFERENCES	[7]					
REFERENCES	[8]					
REFERENCES	[9]					
REFERENCES	[10]					
REFERENCES	[11]					
REFERENCES	[12]					
DEFINITIONS	[13]					
DEFINITIONS	[14]					

1. Section	2. Para number	3. sentence/ row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
DEFINITIONS	[15]					
DEFINITIONS	[16]					
DEFINITIONS	[17]					
DEFINITIONS	[18]					
DEFINITIONS	[19]					
OUTLINE OF REQUIREMENTS	[20]					
OUTLINE OF REQUIREMENTS	[21]	Third line	Technical	Responsible for the operation , control or supervision	Control is an important measure in the facility	RNE
OUTLINE OF REQUIREMENTS	[22]	Fourth line	Technical	Change the word of environment by atmosphere	For laboratory work atmosphere the most common expression	RNE
OUTLINE OF REQUIREMENTS	[23]	Ninth line	Technical	Add ; testing process	Testing is a process f (for more clarification)	RNE
OUTLINE OF REQUIREMENTS	[24]	Second line	Technical	Change officially by periodically	Periodical inspection is important	
BACKGROUND	[25]					
BACKGROUND	[26]	Third line	Technical	Considerable risk of introducing and spreading	Spreading is occurring after introducing	RNE
REQUIREMENTS	[27]					
1. Responsibilities	[28]					
1. Responsibilities	[29]					
2. Pest Risk Analysis	[30]					
2. Pest Risk Analysis	[31]					
2.1 Pathway-specific lists of potato pests	[32]	Third line	Technicalfor potato micropropagative material and minitubers respectively . The exporting country should be notified of the PRA results	As a matter of transparency the exported countries should be notified	RNE
2.1 Pathway-specific lists of potato pests	[33]					
2.2 Risk management options	[34]					
2.2 Risk management options	[35]					

1. Section	2. Paragraph number	3. sentence/row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
2.2.1 Potato micropropagative material	[36]					
2.2.1 Potato micropropagative material	[37]					
2.2.2 Minitubers	[38]					
2.2.2 Minitubers	[39]	Fifth line	Technical	Production in pest free approved growing medium	Growing medium should be approved for use by the facility to avoid any contaminated growing media	RNE
3. Production of Pest Free Potato Micropropagative Material	[40]					
3.1 Establishment of pest free ...	[41]					
3.1 Establishment of pest free ...	[42]					
3.1.1 Testing	[43]					
3.1.1 Testing	[44]					
3.1.2 Secure phytosanitary environment	[45]					
3.1.2 Secure phytosanitary environment	[46]	Line seven	Technical	Control of the enter of authorized staff	Only authorized staff should be allowed to enter in order to avoid contamination	RNE
3.2 Maintenance and propagation of ...	[47]					
3.2 Maintenance and propagation of ...	[48]					
3.3 Combined establishment and...	[49]					
3.3 Combined establishment and ...	[50]	First line	Technical Providing that strict procedures are adopted and applied	All adopted procedures should be put into action	RNE
3.3 Combined establishment and ...	[51]					
3.3 Combined establishment and ...	[52]					

1. Section	2. Paragraph	3. sentence/row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
3.3 Combined establishment and ...	[53]					
4. Production of Pest Free Minitubers	[54]					
4. Production of Pest Free Minitubers	[55]					
4. Production of Pest Free Minitubers	[56]					
4. Production of Pest Free Minitubers	[57]					
4. Production of Pest Free Minitubers	[58]					
4. Production of Pest Free Minitubers	[59]					
4. Production of Pest Free Minitubers	[60]	Third line	Technical	The entry of staff to the facility should be only for authorized staff .	To avoid contamination only authorized staff can enter the facility	RNE
4. Production of Pest Free Minitubers	[61]	Third line	Technical	The facility should be cleaned and maintained after each production run	Facility maintenance is important after each production run	RNE
4. Production of Pest Free Minitubers	[62]					
4. Production of Pest Free Minitubers	[63]					
5. Staff Competence	[64]					
5. Staff Competence	[65]	Fourth line	Technical	Following administrative , management and record - keeping and tracing procedure	Traceability in important for the materials released from the facility	RNE
5. Staff Competence	[66]					
6. Documentation	[67]					
6. Documentation	[68]					
6. Documentation	[69]					
7. Auditing	[70]					
7. Auditing	[71]					
7. Auditing	[72]					

1. Section	2. Para nber	3. sentence/ row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
8. Official Verification of Pest Freedom	[73]					
8. Official Verification of Pest Freedom	[74]					
8. Official Verification of Pest Freedom	[75]					
9. Certification	[76]					
9. Certification	[77]					
ANNEX 1	[78]					
ANNEX 1: TITLE	[79]					
ANNEX 1: TEXT	[80]	Third line	Technical	Serological , molecular and bioassay and pathogenic tests , and interpreting the results	Pathogenic test in on the pans in the facility should be carried out to make sure they re from any pathogens	RNE
ANNEX 2	[81]					
ANNEX 2: TITLE	[82]					
ANNEX 2: TEXT	[83]	Line 16	Technical Contamination in the subculture room , cabinet and growth room	Some laboratories has moving isolation and subculturing cabinets	RNE
ANNEX 2: TEXT	[84]					
ANNEX 3	[85]					
ANNEX 3: TITLE	[86]					
ANNEX 3: TEXT	[87]					
ANNEX 3: Physical structure	[88]					
ANNEX 3: Environment controls	[89]	Line one	Technical	Appropriate temperature , light , air circulation and humidity controls	Air circulation inside the growth rooms is important to keep the level of humidity	RNE
ANNEX 3: Crop management	[90]					
ANNEX 3: Growing media, fertilizer, water	[91]					
ANNEX 3: Post harvest handling	[92]	Paragraph	Technical	Adequate transport facility of containers to the shipping site	Moving the containers to shipping site need adequate transport facilities	

1. Section	2. Paragraph number	3. sentence/row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
ANNEX 3: TEXT	[93]					
APPENDIX 1	[94]					
APPENDIX 1: TITLE	[95]					
APPENDIX 1: TABLE	[96]					
APPENDIX 2	[97]					
APPENDIX 2: TITLE	[98]					
APPENDIX 2: TEXT	[99]					
APPENDIX 2: Bacteria	[100]					
APPENDIX 2: Fungi	[101]					
APPENDIX 2: Insects	[102]					
APPENDIX 2: Nematodes	[103]					
APPENDIX 2: Protozoa	[104]					

Annex 11

Recommendations of the Sub-regional workshop on the implementation of the ISPMs No. 15 “Wood Packaging Materials in the International Trade

Alexandria, Egypt 30 June – 3 July 2008

- The standards mark should follow the model in the Annex II of the ISPM 15, permanent and legible.
- NPPOs should have different sizes of the standard mark that can be used for the different WPM sizes and shapes
- Avoid hand painted marks, and use hydraulic marks to save time and efforts.
- Use persistent ink, does not damage the mark rubber parts, avoid mixing other chemicals with the used ink, this is to prolong the life of the rubber marks.
- Make use of the Lebanese experience in assigning local private companies for WPM treatments under the supervision of the plant quarantine authorities.
- Awareness raising among the exporters and importers, through workshops, seminars and publications on the importance of the standard and its role in facilitating trade exchange.
- Organize training sessions for the technicians and plant quarantine officers in the NPPOs.
- The NPPOs should seek the assistance of countries with a good training system in place in training their plant quarantine officers on the standard implementation
- Information exchange with the related national and international organizations regarding the standard implementation is required.
- Establish a regional Network, connecting all plant quarantine systems in the region; this is in order to facilitate collaboration regarding the standard implementation.
- Encourage countries to search for alternatives to WPM such as use of plastic packaging materials.
- Focus more on the use of HT as a substitute for MB.
- Exporting countries should accept penalties related to non-compliance in the standard implementation imposed by importing countries.
- In case there is a need to implement certain measures not included in the standard requirements, parties could arrange for bilateral collaboration to solve the problem.
- The consignments packaging companies should not ship any non-compliance WPM, and ship it back to the country of origin.
- Request technical assistance from trading partners, the IPPC secretariat and related organizations in implementing the standard.
- Each country should establish a legal system in place regarding the standard implementation.