



**Regional workshop for the review of draft International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures
English Speaking Africa
Accra, Ghana
11 -15 August 2008**

Report

1. Opening of the session

The meeting was opened by Mr. Modibo Traoré, the Assistant Director General/FAO Regional Representative for Africa. In his opening address, he stressed that the regional workshop for the review of draft International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures provides a platform for discussions on draft standards to increase understanding on their implications and expectations. He was however hopeful that participants of the workshop would make constructive comments that would enhance further development of seven draft standards and their subsequent approval.

He urged member countries of FAO who were not contracting parties to the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) to expedite action on becoming members to facilitate the exchange of information and their participation in programmes. He mentioned FAO's support to member countries in response to request made at the 2nd Commission of Phytosanitary measures in Rome in March 2007. These include a workshop on Pest Risk Analysis (held in September 2007 in Ghana), work done on *Bacterocera invadens* and upcoming discussions on critical issues on pests affecting agriculture in Africa which is schedule for August in Accra, Ghana.

He gave an update on the revision of the mandate of IPPC since 1997 to address contemporary issues and include the protection of forests, wild flora and ecosystems. He noted that, though there were perceptions that international standards for phytosanitary measures imposed obligation that were generally difficult to comply, they rather expedite trade by ensuring that export of products comply with technically justified requirements of importing trading partners. Phytosanitary measures were supposed to be technically justified, non discriminatory, commensurate with the associated risk and applied only to regulatory pest. He concluded that the concept of harmonization has been developed to ensure that national phytosanitary measure based on science.

The meeting was attended by sixteen experts from eleven countries and was facilitated by FAO and the IPPC Secretariat.

2. Purpose of the workshop

The FAO Regional Plant Protection Officer Hannah Clarendon outlined that the main purpose of this workshop was to provide participants from countries in each FAO region with a regional forum to discuss the draft International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPMs). These discussions would help participants gain a better understanding of the national and regional impact of these proposed standards and provide a basis for the development and submission of national comments. This workshop covered the following draft ISPMs:

- 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 Diversity (CBD) in relation to the Glossary of phytosanitary terms (proposed supplement to ISPM No. 5)

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

3. **Adoption of the agenda**

The agenda was discussed and adopted (Appendix 1). Dr. Ibrahim Shamie was elected as chair of the meeting and Mrs. Ruth Woode was elected as rapporteur. Delegate from Lesotho inputted data into the template. Mrs Awosusi presented the power points on each Draft ISPM.

4. **Overview of the IPPC**

Regional crop protection Officer, Hannah Clarendon gave an overview of the IPPC, ISPMs and the standard setting process. It was noted that this meeting is held to assist countries in the preparation of their comments on draft ISPMs. Official comments should be submitted to the IPPC Secretariat by the national IPPC contact point before the deadline of 30 September 2008. This was done in three different sessions

5. **Review of documents and discussion on draft ISPMs**

5.1 **Regulating wood packaging material in international trade (Revision of ISPM No. 15)**

Template attached. Main comments were as follows:

- The draft standard lays emphasizes on the uses of wood packaging materials, responsibilities of NPPO in ensuring compliance to the standard and guidance on re-use, repair and re-manufactured wood packaging materials
- The terms re-use, repair and re – manufacture though explained in the draft standard, definitions should be included in ISPM No 5 to ensure clarity and consistence in the use of the terms
- Type of treatment has not been indicated as a component of the mark because mark indicate that the wood packaging material has been subjected to approved phytosanitary treatment in accordance to ISPM 15.
- It was realized that close supervision and monitoring by NPPOs was necessary to check fraud with regards to the use of the Mark.
- Contracting parties would register the mark of their choice with IPPC at a cost.

5.2 **Categorization of commodities according to their phytosanitary**

Template attached. Main comments

- Importing countries should request for information on the level of processing of a commodity from exporting countries when issuing import permits. The NPPOs should establish mechanisms for importing.
- Definition on method and degree of processing of wood defined in the draft with reference to ISPM No 15 is more detailed in the this draft as compared to definition provided in the revision of ISPM No 15(paragraph 21, indent 2)
- When issuing import permits the clause on intended use must be explicit so that importers would not deviate from previous intentions
- Reference from Codex Alimentarius in paragraph 69 row 5 should be included to list of references in page 3
- List of processes to include some of the African commodities which have specialized processes to make them acceptable to the international market

5.3 **Fruit fly trapping (proposed Annex 1 to ISPM No. 26 (Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae))**

Template attached. Main comments

- The draft is a technical document, there is the need to see its practicability, adoption and implementation in Africa
- Contracting parties are encouraged to discuss the practicability of the standard with stakeholders

- There is the need for country fruit fly control programmes and a system for the management of fruit flies
- African countries should publish their regulated pest list. Inter African Phytosanitary council to consolidate the published lists.
- Limitations in the use of traps described in session 3.3 should be included in the document
- It was observed that countries were to develop strategies to manage the fruit fly situation
- Guidelines are needed to manage emergency situations
- There is the need for a strategic plan for a systematic supervision of trapping activities despite the cost and work involved.

5.4 Glossary of phytosanitary terms (amendments to ISPM No. 5)

Template attached. Main comments

- Glossary was used to guide the terms used in the national legislations.

5.5 Terminology of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) in relation to the Glossary of phytosanitary terms (proposed supplement to ISPM No. 5)

Template attached. Main comments

- Document should have been discussed with organizations responsible for Convention on Biological Diversity activities during in country consultations to determine the level of understanding and feedback
- Need to identify conflicting views in the use of terminologies and concepts among CBD and NPPOs at national levels

5.6 Structure and operation of post-entry quarantine facilities Chair:

Template attached. Main comments

- Contracting parties should endeavor to implement recommendation outlined in the standard once it is approved to safeguard their agriculture from exotic pest
- Partnership of the NPPOs with the research institutions, universities and private sector would expedite action in the implementation of the standards
- Animals to be seen as regulated articles (as pests can be carried on hide and as part of droppings)

5.7 Pest free potato micropropagative material and minitubers for international trade Chair:

Template attached. Main comments

- Recommendations outlined in the draft could be adopted for the production of pests free micropropagative materials of other crops
- A recommendation was made for the development of a standard for Cassava germplasm.
- Participants recognized the need to review other Solanaceous species which can also be host for the associated pests.

Technical and editorial comments were made on the draft ISPMs and these comments are attached to the report (see Annex III). Participants were invited to take note of the comments collected at this workshop and utilize these comments as they felt appropriate in their preparation of national comments. National comments should be submitted through the NPPO contact point to the IPPC Secretariat no later than 30 September 2008 and participants were reminded to follow the *Instructions for the Use of the Template* (see Annex IV)

6. IPPC standard setting work programme and opportunities for participation in the standard setting process

The IPPC standard setting work programme was presented and the list of adopted ISPMs and topics for future ISPMs was discussed. Possibilities for input into the topics and priorities for standards already on the work programme and for future standards were outlined.

Following topics were recommended

- Given the critical role of cassava in food security in Africa and given the current pest, it is recommended that a standard be developed to govern the movement of germplasm.
- Guideline for Emergency action for eradication and suppression of larger grain borer be developed
- Guideline for post entry quarantine for the importation of genetic material from gene banks.

6.1 Call for work programme topics

The biennial call for new topics for the work programme will be made most likely in June 2009. Participants are encouraged to discuss priorities for future standards with their colleagues and be prepared to submit topics to the Secretariat. Initial priorities were discussed.

- A study of the biology, taxonomy and standard procedures for suppression and eradication of white flies in Africa
- Expand topic Appropriate level of protection to include Integrated Biosecurity. systems approach for Risk assessment in order to achieve appropriate levels of Protection
- Consider Climate change and its impact on Locust in Africa.
- Invasive alien species both aquatic and bush encroachment type.

6.2 Call for experts to take part in drafting ISPMs

The selection of experts for drafting ISPMs was discussed. A call for experts for expert working groups and technical panels is made after a topic has been included on the IPPC standard setting work programme. Participants were encouraged to check the IPP frequently and search for qualified experts from their region and submit their nominations, through the NPPO contact point, to the IPPC Secretariat. It was also requested that nominees follow the instructions in the call letter and ensure they submit CVs detailing the appropriate expertise and outlining specific experiences in relation to the requirements listed in the expertise section of the relevant specifications.

7. Progress reports by participants on the implementation of adopted ISPMs **EXPERIENCES SHARED BY COUNTRIES ON HOW THEY GOT ACROSS TO THE** **STAKEHOLDERS AND DIFFERENT ISPMs UNDER IMPLEMENTATION**

Consultation process

Major programme of activity in the year as part of work plan of NPPO. It will include budgetary provisions. Long term strategy should include presentations and sensitization of policy makers. In regard to the submission for September 2008, there should be the use of the various adhoc committees. Identify the key relevant stakeholders for the selected Draft ISPM- farmers, industry, researchers, customs. Where technical committees exist such as PRA, bring them on board. Countries shared various experiences on the methods used to consult such as meetings, mailings.

UGANDA.

Have a phytosanitary technical committee of 15 members from different areas of expertise like Environment Ministry, Animal sanitation, University, Private sector and others, who met and go through the draft ISPMs with their comments. Members are remunerated minimally through payment of fuel refund. ISPMs 1,2,3,5,6,7,11,12,15,19,20,23,and25 are been implemented either partially or completely. On infrastructure development, diagnostics/pesticide lab. are already constructed but yet to be equipped. FAO/UGANDA are into LMOs/GMOs identification project.

KENYA

Have a standing technical committee on Imports and Exports[KSTCIE] drawing membership from a variety of professionals deliberating on issues relating to importation of plant/plant products. Bilateral agreement/protocols already signed with the donor countries in respect of relief materials. ISPM 15 is being implemented in consultation with stakeholders. All ISPMs being implemented except 22 and 18.

LESOTHO

Distribute ISPMs to stakeholders through emails, phones and personal contacts. Use already existing committee with addition of specific experts. Seek audience from policy makers to solicit support in implementation of the ISPMs. ISPMs being implemented, 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 12, 17, 20, 23.

LIBERIA

Liberia is successfully implementing the following ISPMs-12, 15, 20, 23 and 24. Significant progress was made in the implementation of ISPMs 15 with the 2 major stakeholders with the use of Methyl bromide application. Addressing the issue of the draft ISPMs is a problem after the war but the government is now trying to revive the agricultural industry most especially the quarantine system.

GHANA

Group meetings to discuss the different draft ISPMs with the help of experts are held and feedback received from them. ISPMs-2, 7,11,12,15 and 21 are been implemented in the country.

TANZANIA

National plant protection advisory committee, with four sub committees - one of which is the plant quarantine and phytosanitary services. The sub committee has the pest risk analysis team and team of experts for fruit fly. This subcommittee discusses the Draft ISPMs by consultation with the stakeholders. ISPMs-1,2,3,7,11,12,15,17,20,21,23,25 and 27 are under implementation in the country.

GUINEA-BISSAU

ISPMs-1, 5, 17, 11, and 25 are been fully implemented while ISPM 3 partially implemented.

NAMIBIA

E-mail to stakeholders for comments with a meeting fixed by August ending with them, and notification through the IPP portal be done by 2nd September. ISPMs implemented 1, 2, 6, 7, 15, 21, 22, 25, 26, 27.

Proposed the following-

- The amalgamation of plant health and animal health into one unit under Agricultural health or biosecurity.
- All inspectors will be biosecurity inspectors.
- Separate plant and animal health quarantine.
- SPS enquiry point,IPP enquiry point and OIE focal point in one organization.
- Biosecurity risk assessment.
- Coordinating committees such as SPS,IPPC,OIE with the involvement of the stakeholders.

ANGOLA

ISPMs-1, 7 and 12 are been implemented. Trying to make changes in the laws inherited from their colonial masters and becoming a full member of IPPC before the end of September.

NIGERIA

Have a standby in-house technical committee of 17 members from different areas of expertise [plant pathologists, Entomologist, virologist, bacteriologist, Glasshouse horticultural specialist, and Biotechnologist] handling all the necessary phytosanitary issues in accordance with IPPC standards. Reach out to various experts from Universities, Research institutes, Ministries from time to time to have their views and opinions on various draft ISPMs whenever they are received. Already implementing ISPMs-1,2,3,5,7,12,13,15,20,23 and 25.

- A preliminary monitoring survey was carried out a year to determine the presence of *Bactrocera invadens* in the country. A nationwide survey has already been proposed, but yet to take off.

MOZAMBIQUE

IPPC assisted the country in revising the legal framework to ensure compliance with international standards. ISPMs-3, 7, 12, 20, 23 and 25 are been implemented in the country. On ISPM 2, a team was trained within

the TCP project funded by FAO involving scientists from the Ministry of Agriculture, Research institutes and Universities. For ISPM 15, two companies were approved but only one is already implementing it. A project on [lethal yellow disease of coconut] to be funded by WTO-SDTF is still under discussion.

ZAMBIA

The following ISPMs are currently been implemented-1,2,5,6,7,8,10,11,12,14,15,16,19,20,21,22,23,and26. Fruit fly[Tephritidae],White flies[*Bemisia tabaci*],and Thrips[*Thrips palmi*] surveys are ongoing in the country.

On ISPM 15, the NPPO is not issuing IPPC stamp but authorizes the private sector who apply, with 8 companies already registered. The NPPO carries out audit on the facilities of the companies.

Distribute ISPMs to stakeholders through official letters and personal contacts.

Use already existing phytosanitary committee with addition of specific experts from the University of Zambia, Environmental council, and researchers in the Ministry of Agriculture.

SIERRA LEONE

The NPPO has started implementing the following ISPMs No 2,3,5,7,12,15, and 23.

Consultations include National Codex committee and National Farmers Association. Consultation is carried out with private sector to get their feedback.

AGREED RECOMMENDATION FOR COUNTRY CONSULTATION ON THE DRAFT

Having **short-term plan** to implement necessary in country consultation of the draft ISPMs through the following ways-

- Identification of more relevant stakeholders through personal communication-mail and letters for proper awareness of the ISPMs and necessary inputs.
- Country consultation for the draft ISPMs will be made to be part of the yearly work programme.
- Provision for budgetary allocation to be made to take care of DSA for invited members to serve as an incentive.

8 Other issues

New online system for draft ISPMs developed by the IPPC was reviewed. However since changes had been made to the site/page the demonstration was not completed.

9. Next steps

Participants were asked to consider the future of regional workshops for the review of draft ISPMs. The following outlines the important points and conclusions of the discussion. As part of this discussion the Report of 2007 Draft ISPMs Consultation was reviewed and the following recommendations emanated.

9.1 Organization of future regional workshops on draft ISPMs

Participants were asked to consider the future of regional workshops for the review of draft ISPMs. The following outlines the important points and conclusions of the discussion.

Funding of future workshops

Suggested elements of discussion:

- Ideas for how long-term funding can be secured for the workshops:
 - Dealing with decreased resources
 - Consideration of alternative sources of funding
 - Lobbying for funding and resources for workshop and travel at national and regional levels
 - Assistance of IPPC Secretariat to inform NPPOs of need of funding

Review of report from 2007

Recommendations of 2007 were updated as follows

- Capacity building and networking for the purpose of pests diagnosis, analysis and assessment needed.
- Review of gap currently existing between status of countries phytosanitary programme and the interventions of assistance.
- That protocols to be established to govern the relationship between NPPOs and diagnostic services.
- That there should be comprehensive capacity building in understanding the issues and processes related to the reduction in the use of methyl bromide in order to develop alternate strategies.
- Amendment to definition of the term **commodity** to include its packaging.
- That training for inspectors to include statistical elements on sampling for inspection.- this can be conducted at national level and to be part of curriculum of inspectors.

Recommendation on the Organization of future regional workshops on Draft ISPMs was maintained

Suggested elements of discussion:

- Ideas for how future workshops could be organized:
 - **Africa Region take over organization and running of workshops possible to be maintain as 1 region Francophone and Anglophone working closely with IAPSC.**
 - Ideas for other topics that could be covered during the workshops (e.g. include a field trip to see how other countries implement ISPMs) Alternate topic ISPMs 22, 8 & 3.
 - Formation of a steering committee to coordinate workshop (including selection of Chair Sierra Leone(was recommended to replace Malawi as the country was not present at this years consultation), Vice-Chair Kenya, assigning of duties to each steering committee member, deadlines, etc.)
 - **That IAPSC be responsible for the workshop of 2009**

Terms of reference for the steering committee are as follows:

1. **Coordinate with IAPSC for the workshop of the 2009.**

The FAO regional office would provide support to the steering committee as required. While the steering committee would consult with the participants for further coordination of efforts to manage the workshop

9.3 Topics for consideration at future workshops

The following topics were put forward for consideration for discussion at future workshop agenda items:

- Strategy to enhance feedback mechanism.

Other comments

- Role of countries in ensuring that relief food is correctly inspected. Case study presented by Sierra Leone and Uganda. Uganda has an MOU with Relief organizations to have their food products inspected for pest before entry. The organization pays for treatment where necessary.
- That there should be Bilateral agreement between donor agencies (relief materials] and NPPOs to govern the importation of relief material.
- Update on ISPMs stating technical difficulties in implementation so that review could be suggested and carried out where necessary.
- Defining needs in a precise manner in order to facilitate response.
- That some of the guidelines developed, can be adapted for other crops where necessary.
- The four members of standard committee from Africa should be updated on African issues and should establish feedback mechanism between themselves and the NPPOs.

- Feedback on different draft ISPMs after due consultation by each country should be submitted prior to the Draft ISPMs Consultation.

Presentation by IAPSC (Dr. Jean Baptiste Bahama)

The work of IAPSC was highlighted including the PAN –SPSO Project. Recommendation from countries indicated that IAPSC should secure funds from the PAN-SPSO project to finance the Draft ISPMs consultations.

10. Date and location of the next meeting

The participants agreed that next year's meeting should be held in Ethiopia at the AU Headquarters where there is sufficient facility with simultaneous translation to host all the African countries.

11. Close

Closing remarks were given by Regional Crop Protection Officer. The USDA was thanked for funding the Consultation. The Participants were thanked for their valuable contributions and encouraged to coordinate the submission of national country comments to the Secretariat. The Participants in turn, thanked the FAO Regional Plant Protection Officer, Standards Committee Representative, the Chairperson and Rapporteurs. The special contribution of USDA was duly acknowledged. The Ministries were thanked for supporting the countries by paying the half of the per diem. SADC was acknowledged and thanked for supporting the participation of 2 non-contracting parties and Tanzania. The presence of IAPSC was acknowledged in particular for the future hosting and organization of the consultations. South Africa was again commended for submission of their completed templates though not present at the Consultation.

Appendices:

Appendix 1: Agenda



Regional Workshop for the Review of Draft International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures for English speaking Africa

11 - 15 August 2008
Accra, Ghana (FAO Regional Office Conference Room)

Agenda

Monday, 11 August 2008

Session 1.

8.30 – 9.30 am

Registration

9.30 – 10.30 am

Opening Session

Chairperson: Hannah Clarendon Crop Protection Officer

Welcome:

- Assistant Director-General / Regional Representative for Africa, Mr. Modibo T. Traoré

Address

- Honourable Minister of Agriculture, Ghana, Mr. Ernest Debrah

10.30 – 11:00 am

Coffee

Session 2.

11:00 – 11:30 pm

Purpose of workshop

Overview of workshop Regional FAO Officer

- **Local and logistical information**
- **Introduction**

Session 3.

11:30 – 12:00 pm

Overview of the IPPC Regional FAO Officer- IPPC Secretariat

Session 4

12:00 – 12:30 pm

Adoption of agenda

- election of chair
- election of rapporteur
- any other business (e.g. topics for consideration at future workshop)

1:00 – 2:00 pm

Lunch at Venue

Session 5.

2:00 – 3:30 pm

Review of Draft ISPMs

1. *Regulating wood packaging material in international trade*
(Revision of ISPM No. 15) (20 mins SC member introduces the standard)

3:30 – 4:00 pm **Coffee**

4:00 – 6:00 pm **Review of Draft ISPMs** Continued
2. Categorization of commodities according to their phytosanitary risk

Tuesday, 12 August 2008

8.30 – 10.30 am *3. Fruit fly trapping (proposed Annex 1 to ISPM No. 26 (Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae))*

10.30 – 11:00 am **Coffee**

11:00 – 1:00 pm *4 Glossary of phytosanitary terms (amendments to ISPM No. 5) (20 mins SC member introduces the standard)*

1:00 – 2:00 pm **Lunch at Venue**

2:00 – 3:30 pm **Continue review of Draft ISPMs**

3:30 – 4:00 pm **Coffee**

4:00 – 6:00 pm **Continue review of Draft ISPMs**

Wednesday, 13 August 2008

8.30 – 10.30 am *5. Terminology of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) in relation to the Glossary of phytosanitary terms (proposed supplement to ISPM No. 5) (20 mins SC member introduces the standard)*

10.30 – 11:00 am **Coffee**

11:00 – 1:00 pm **Continue review of Draft ISPMs**

1:00 – 2:00 pm **Lunch at Venue**

2:00 – 3:30 pm **Continue review of Draft ISPMs**

3:30 – 4:00 pm **Coffee**

4:00 – 6:00 pm **Continue review of Draft ISPMs**

Thursday, 14 August 2008

8.30 – 10.30 am *6. Structure and operation of post-entry quarantine facilities*

10.30 – 11:00 am **Coffee**

11:00 – 1:00 pm **Continue review of Draft ISPMs**

1:00 – 2:00 pm	Lunch at Venue
2:00 – 3:30 pm	<i>7. Pest free potato micropropagative material and minitubers for international trade (20 mins SC member introduces the standard)</i>
3:30 – 4:00 pm	Coffee
4:00 – 6:00 pm	Continue review of Draft ISPMs

Friday, 15 August 2008

Session 6	
8.30 – 10.30 am	Organization of future regional workshops on draft ISPMs (2009 session)
	<p>-Report preparation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - tentative date and venue 2009 consultation (between July – September 18, 2009) - identification of sponsors - funding strategy and action plan <p>Topics for New Standards & Priorities for Standards; Participation of Regions in Expert Working Groups</p>
10.30 – 11:00 am	Coffee
11:00 – 11:30 pm	Participation of Regions in Expert Working Groups
Session7	
11:30 – 12:00 pm	Any other business
Session 8.	
12:30pm – 12:40pm	Adoption of report Acceptance of Report Wrap up and Close of meeting
Session 9.	
12:40 13.00 pm	Close
Lunch on your own	

Appendix 2: List of participants

Regional Workshop for the Review of Draft International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPM) for English speaking Africa, Accra, Ghana, 11 – 15 August 2008

List of Participants

ANGOLA

Mr. Sidonio MATEUS
Agricultural Head of Plant Protection Department
Avenida Cdagika Largo
Dr. Antoniojacinto
Direccao Nacional AgricultuRA
Pecuaria e Florestas
Ministry of Agriculture
Luanda
Tel: +244923402401
Email: sidoniomateus309@hotmail.com

GHANA

Mrs. Ruth WOODE
Plant Protection and Regulatory Services
Ministry of Food and Agriculture
P.O. Box M199
Accra
Tel: +233 244507687
Email: wooderuth@yahoo.com

GUINEA-BISSAU

Mr. Luis Antonio TAVARES
Supervisor of Quarantine
Crop Protection Services
Ministry of Agriculture
P.O. Box 844
Bissau
Tel: +245 663 8208
Fax: +245 221019
Email: lusanta2@hotmail.com or lusanta2@yahoo.com.fr

KENYA

Mr. Omuyitsi Nassir RAJAB
Plant Inspector
Kenya Plant Health Inspectorate Service (KEPHIS)
P.O. Box 49592 00100
Nairobi
Tel: +254 0203536171/2
Fax: +254-0203536175
Email: nrajab@kephis.org

LESOTHO

Esaiah Chetane TJELELE
Senior Research Officer
Department of Agricultural Research
P.O. Box 829
Maseru
Tel : +266 22312395
Fax :+266 22 310362
Email : etjelele@yahoo.co.uk

LIBERIA

Mr. Lawrence MASSAQUOI
Deputy Director
Ministry of Agriculture
Monrovia W/A
Tel: +231 6 543623
Email: lamasa_2g6@yahoo.com

MOZAMBIQUE

Mrs. Serafina Ernesto MANGANA
Biologist
Departamento de Sanidade Vegetal, Recinto IIAM, Av.
Forças Populares
No. 3658, Mavalane
Maputo
Tel: +258 21 460591
Fax: +258 21 460591
Email: serafinamangana@gmail.com

NAMIBIA

Mrs. Hilma IIPUMBU
Senior Agricultural Extension Technician
Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry
Private Bag 13184
Windhoek
Tel. + 264 61 208 7467
Fax. +264 61 208 7786
Email: leopewa@hotmail.com; official
iipumbuh@mawf.gov.na

Mr. Renier Dawid BURGER
Head, Plant Quarantine and IPPC Enquiry Point
Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry
Private Bag 13184
Windhoek
Tel. + 264 61 208 7461 or +264 811242829
Fax. +264 61 208 7786
Email: burgerr@mawf.gov.na

NIGERIA

Akindede Oluwole OGUNFUNMILAYO
Nigeria Agricultural Quarantine Service
Plant Quarantine Service
P.M.B. 5672 - Moor Plantation
Ibadan
Tel: +234 8056219200
E-mail: aogunfunmilayo@yahoo.co.uk

SIERRA LEONE

Dr. Ibrahim M.O. SHAMIE
Head of Crop Protection Services
Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Food Security
Youyi Building
Freetown.
Tel: +232 77542939
Email: imo1shamie@yahoo.co.uk or
slnppo@yahoo.com

TANZANIA

Mrs. Rebecca Jackson MAWISHE
Principal Agricultural Officer
Ministry of Agriculture
P.O. Box 9192
Dar -Es-Salaam
Email: ppp@kilimo.go.tz

UGANDA

Mr. Robert KARYEIJIA
Principal Agricultural Inspector
Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries
P.O. Box 102
Entebbe
Tel: +256 414 322458
Fax: +256 414 320642
Email: robertkaryeija@yahoo.ca

ZAMBIA

Mr. Clement SIAMPONDO
Plant Health Inspector
Zambia Agriculture Research Institute
Private Bag 7
Chilanga
Tel: +260 211 271093
Fax: +260 211 278141
Email: csiampondo@yahoo.com

FACILITATOR

Mrs. Olufunke Olusola AWOSUSI
Nigeria Agricultural Quarantine Service
Plant Quarantine Service
P.M.B. 5672 - Moor Plantation
Ibadan
Tel: +234 8059608494
E-mail: awosusifunke@yahoo.com

AU/IAPSC

Dr. Jean-Baptiste BAHAMA
Senior Scientific Secretary, Phytopathology
IAPSC
African Union/IAPSC
P.O.Box 4170
Yaounde
Tel: +237 22 211969
Fax: +237 22 211967
Email: jbbaham2002@yahoo.fr or
au-cpi@au-appo.org

FAO

Ms Hannah CLARENDON
Crop Protection Officer
FAO Regional Office for Africa
P.O. Box GP 1628
Accra
Ghana
Tel: +233 21 675000 or +233 21 7010930
Fax: +233 21 668427 or +233 21 7010943
Email: hannah.clarendon@fao.org

Appendix 3: Guidelines for use of templates for comments

INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE USE OF THE TEMPLATE

A template is provided to facilitate the submission and compilation of member comments. Paragraph numbers have been included in the draft standards, and each paragraph has a corresponding row in the template. It is important to be accurate in allocating comments to paragraphs, since the compilation of comments will be done automatically and only based on paragraph numbers.

To facilitate compilation of comments and the work of the Standards Committee, please apply the following and refer to the table of examples below:

- do not add or delete columns, and do not change their width
- ensure that all comments refer to the appropriate section of the text and paragraph number
- if proposals are made to add, delete or move paragraphs, subsequent comments should continue to refer to the paragraph numbers used in the draft standard sent for consultation
- when making several comments on the same paragraph, assign a number to each comment in the location, type of comment and explanation columns. Do not use automatic numbering.
- ensure that all cells of the row are completed when a comment is made
- use formatting to indicate proposed additions (e.g. underline) and deletions (e.g. ~~strikethrough~~), with colour as appropriate (e.g. red or blue) and not tracked changes
- only include enough text from the draft standard to display the suggested modifications. Do not include paragraphs or sentences for which no modifications are suggested
- delete the rows in which no comments are made.

Specific guidelines for each column in the template and examples of comments

1. Section

- This gives the titles of sections as they appear in the draft, plus rows for general and specific comments. To propose changes to section titles, include new wording in the "proposed rewording" column.
- General comments apply to the entirety of the standard. Specific comments apply to a defined section of the draft, which should be clearly identified.

2. Paragraph number (Para nber)

- To propose a new paragraph, add a row and qualify the paragraph number with a letter (e.g. 12a, to indicate that the new paragraph follows paragraph 12).
- To propose to move a paragraph, indicate the new location in the "proposed rewording" column (e.g. move para 51 to after para 47). Do not alter the paragraph numbers.

3. Sentence/row/indent, etc.

- Clearly identify the specific place in the paragraph, such as sentence, row of a table, indent, etc, where the comment applies (e.g. sentence 2, indent 5, row 2, footnote 3, figure 15, etc). Table rows have been numbered in the drafts where possible. If bullets, indents or rows in a table are not numbered, they should be counted and the number indicated in this column.
- The text as circulated for consultation should be used as a basis for counting sentences, bullet points, etc. Please do not refer to page or line numbers as these may vary depending on the word processor used or language version of the draft.

4. Type of comment

Indicate whether the comment refers to a technical, substantive, editorial, or translation issue:

- technical comments change the technical content of the text. This includes scientific corrections, technical adjustments, etc.
- substantive comments change the meaning or intention of the text. This includes conceptual changes, addition of new aspects or ideas, etc.
- editorial comments clarify or simplify the text without changing the meaning. This includes spelling or grammatical corrections, suggestions of different but equivalent words, and simplification of sentence structure.
- translation comments correct points that are considered to be inaccurately translated into another language version of the text.

5. Proposed rewording

Suggestions to change the text should always include proposed rewording. Modifications to the original text should be clearly identifiable (i.e. text that is added or deleted should appear in a distinct way from unchanged text). For example, text added can be underlined and text deleted can be ~~struck through~~ (with colours as appropriate). Tracked changes should not be used.

6. Explanation

Detailed explanations should give justification for the comment made and should be sufficient for the Standard Committee to understand the intention of the comment and the proposed rewording.

7. Country

- There should be only one name in this column.
- The country name should be indicated in every row for which a comment is made. The country name should be that of the country submitting the comments.
- Comments made on behalf of an organization (such as an RPPO) should include only the organization name, and not the names of the member countries.

Examples of comments using the template

1. Section	2. Paragraph	3. Sentence/row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
BACKGROUND	[9]	1. Sentence 1 2. Sentence 2	1. Substantive 2. Technical	The main purpose of the IPPC is to protect <u>plants secure common and effective actions to prevent the spread and introduction of pests of plants and plant products</u> . In doing so, contracting parties undertake the promotion of appropriate measures for the control of <u>regulated</u> pests.	1. To be consistent with the text of the IPPC. 2. The scope of the IPPC addresses regulated pests.	COUNTRY NAME
BACKGROUND	[17]	Sentence 4	Editorial	Thus <u>Additionally</u> , while pursuing the	Clearer wording	COUNTRY NAME
1.4 Supervision activities	[26]	Sentence 3	Substantive	The FF-ALPP programme, including regulatory control <u>domestic regulation</u>	The term regulatory control is unclear and text should use specific terms clarifying what is meant.	COUNTRY NAME
1.4 Supervision activities	[32]	New 2nd indent	Substantive	- operation of surveillance procedures <u>- fruit sampling</u>	Fruit sampling is necessary as part of surveillance	COUNTRY NAME

1. Section	2. Paragraph number	3. Sentence/row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
				- surveillance capability		
1.6 Tolerance level	[44a]	After para 44	Substantive	add new paragraph after 44: <u>For quarantine pests the tolerance level generally equals zero. Setting the level of detection to zero implies that all units of the consignment must be included in the sample. Hence, for quarantine pests, a detection level that is as small as technically possible approaches the zero tolerance level.</u>	to explain the particular situation for quarantine pests	COUNTRY NAME
3. Phytosanitary Risk Categories and Measures	[61]	Whole para	Substantive	Move para 61 to after para 47	More appropriate location.	COUNTRY NAME

Appendix 4: Completed templates with workshop comments on each ISPM

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. Para nber	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]		substantive	This standard describes phytosanitary measures that reduce the risk of introduction and/or spread of quarantine pests associated with the movement of wood packaging material made from raw wood in international trade . Wood packaging material covered by this standard includes dunnage but excludes wood packaging made from wood processed in such a way that it is free from pests.	Consistence with grammar	
SCOPE	[6]	Sentence 1	substantive	The phytosanitary measures described in this standard are not intended to provide ongoing protection from contaminating pests (e.g. termites, mould fungi, snails, weed seeds) or other organisms (e.g. spiders). [7]	Add phytosanitary to clarify which measures are meant	
REFERENCES	[7]					
REFERENCES	[8]					

1. Section	2. Paragraph number	3. sentence/row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
REFERENCES	[9]					
REFERENCES	[10]					
REFERENCES	[11]					
REFERENCES	[12]					
REFERENCES	[13]					
REFERENCES	[14]					
REFERENCES	[15]					
REFERENCES	[16]					
DEFINITIONS	[17]					
DEFINITIONS	[18]					
OUTLINE OF REQUIREMENTS	[19]					
OUTLINE OF REQUIREMENTS	[20]		Editorial	Approved phytosanitary measures that significantly reduce the risk of pest introduction and spread	clarity	
OUTLINE OF REQUIREMENTS	[21]		substantive	Reuse, repair and remanufacture be included in the glossary.	To ensure clarity and consistency in use of terms.	
REQUIREMENTS	[22]					
1. Basis for regulating	[23]		Editorial	For this reason, this standard describes internationally accepted measures that are approved and that may be applied to wood packaging material by all countries to <u>significantly</u> reduce significantly the risk of spread and introduction of most quarantine pests as well as a number of other pests that may be associated with that material	Proposed rewording to correct grammar	
1. Basis for regulating	[24]					

1. Section	2. Paragraph number	3. sentence/row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
2. Regulated Wood Packaging Material	[25]					
2. Regulated Wood Packaging Material	[26]					
2.1 Exemptions	[27]					
2.1 Exemptions	[28]					
3. Phytosanitary Measures for Wood Packaging...	[29]					
3.1 Approved phytosanitary measures	[30]					
3.1 Approved phytosanitary measures	[31]					
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]		editorial	To meet the objective of preventing the introduction and spread of pests	consistency	
4.1 Regulatory considerations	[40]					
4.1 Regulatory	[41]					

1. Section	2. Paragraph number	3. sentence/row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
considerations						
4.1 Regulatory considerations	[42]					
4.2 Marking	[43]					
4.2 Marking	[44]					
4.3 Treatment and marking requirements...	[45]					
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]					
4.3.2 Repaired wood packaging material	[50]		editorial	NPPOs of exporting countries should ensure that when marked wood packaging material is repaired, wood treated and marked should be done in accordance with this standard	Proposed rewording to correct grammar	
4.3.2 Repaired wood packaging material	[51]					
4.3.3 Remanufactured wood packaging material	[52]					
4.3.3 Remanufactured wood packaging material	[53]					
4.3.3 Remanufactured wood packaging material	[54]					
4.4 Transit arrangements	[55]					
4.4 Transit arrangements	[56]					
4.5 Procedures upon import	[57]					
4.5 Procedures upon import	[58]					

1. Section	2. Paragraph number	3. sentence/row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
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]					
ANNEX 1: Heat treatment	[67]					
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]		Editorial	Care should be taken to ensure <u>that</u> any product associated with the wood packaging material will not be damaged by the	Grammar	

1. Section	2. Paragraph number	3. sentence/row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
				application of a methyl bromide treatment.		
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]					
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				
ANNEX 2: Text on mark	[96]	Example 2				
ANNEX 2: Text on mark	[97]	Example 3				
ANNEX 2: Text on mark	[98]	Example 4				
ANNEX 2: Text on mark	[99]	Example 5				
ANNEX 2: Text on mark	[100]	Example 6				
APPENDIX 1	[101]					
APPENDIX 1: TITLE	[102]					
APPENDIX 1: TEXT	[103]					

1. Section	2. Para nber	3. sentence/ row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
APPENDIX 1: TEXT	[104]					
APPENDIX 1: TEXT	[105]					
APPENDIX 2	[106]					
APPENDIX 2: TITLE	[107]					
APPENDIX 2: TEXT	[108]					

Template for comments - Draft ISPMs for country consultation, 2008

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

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>						
<i>SPECIFIC COMMENTS</i>						
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]					
REFERENCES	[14]					
REFERENCES	[15]					
REFERENCES	[16]					
REFERENCES	[17]					
DEFINITIONS	[18]					

1. Section	2. Para number	3. sentence/ row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
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]	indent	Editorial	ISPM No 23 (Guidelines for inspection) , section 3.2.3 <u>states</u> : <i>“Inspection can be used to verify the compliance with some phytosanitary requirement s”</i> . Examples include degree of processing	Add “states” to the reference for consistency with format of previous indents. Also, use italics and inverted comma/ quotation mark for consistency with format of similar references in this standard.	
BACKGROUND	[32]					
REQUIREMENTS	[33]					
REQUIREMENTS	[34]					
REQUIREMENTS	[35]					
REQUIREMENTS	[36]					
REQUIREMENTS	[37]					
1. Elements of Categorization ...	[38]					
1. Elements of	[39]					

1. Section	2. Paragraph number	3. sentence/row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
Categorization ...						
1. Elements of Categorization ...	[40]					
1. Elements of Categorization ...	[41]		Editorial	However, it is important to note that the methods of processing described in this standard will, in most cases, render the commodity free of pests at the time of processing, but that some of such commodities may have the capacity to become subsequently contaminated, infested or reinfested.	Grammar	
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	[52]					

1. Section	2. Paragraph number	3. sentence/row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
Categories and ...						
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]					
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]					

1. Section	2. Paragraph number	3. sentence/row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
ANNEX 1: TABLE	[69]					
ANNEX 2	[70]					
ANNEX 2: TITLE	[71]					
ANNEX 2: TABLE	[72]		Editorial	Making homogenized and spreadable fruit and/or vegetable tissues, e.g. by high-speed mixing, screening <u>through</u> a sieve or using a blender	spelling	
APPENDIX 1	[73]					
APPENDIX 1: TITLE	[74]					
APPENDIX 1: FLOW CHART	[75]					

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))

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]					
FRUIT FLY TRAPPING	[3]					
FRUIT FLY TRAPPING	[4]					
1. Trapping Survey Objectives and ...	[5]					
1. Trapping Survey Objectives and ...	[6]	Whole paragraph	Editorial	Depending on the pest status, there are three objectives of trapping surveys that should be implemented: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To verify the characteristics of the pest population, monitoring surveys should be implemented. - To determine if the pest is present in an area, detection surveys should be implemented. - To determine the boundaries of an area considered to be infested or free from the pest, delimiting surveys should be implemented. 	For clarity, avoid repetition	
1. Trapping Survey Objectives and ...	[7]			- Exclusion. The pest population is absent, PFA is under exclusion measures, and surveys are required to	Abbreviation PFA already defined in paragraph 4 sentence 2.	

1. Section	2. Paragraph number	3. Sentence/row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
				detect the entry of the pest.	It is proponed that exclusion measures be defined with refernce to ISPM no. 4 paragraph 1.2.2. that refers to phytosanitary measures.	
2. Trapping Scenarios	[8]					
2. Trapping Scenarios	[9]					
2. Trapping Scenarios	[10]					
2. Trapping Scenarios: Table 1	[11]					
2. Trapping Scenarios	[12]					
3. Trapping Systems for Fruit Fly Surveys	[13]					
3. Trapping Systems for Fruit Fly Surveys	[14]		editorial	killing agents (dry; wet; or dry or wet)	Delete or for clarity	
			editorial	attractants (pheromones, para-pheromones or attractants)	Remove attractant for consistency	
3. Trapping Systems for Fruit Fly Surveys	[15]					
3. Trapping Systems for Fruit Fly Surveys: Table 2	[16]	List of scientific names	Technical technical technical	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Batrocera cucurbitae</i> (Coquillett) 2. <i>Ceratitis rosa</i> (karsh) (karsch) 3. <i>Mytopardalis pardalina</i> 	Spelling Spelling spelling	
3.1 Attractants and lures	[17]					
3.1.1 Male specific	[18]					
3.1.1 Male specific	[19]					
3.1.2 Female biased	[20]		technical	The most widely used traps contain para-pheromone attractants that are male specific. The para-pheromone trimedlure (TML) captures <i>Ceratitis</i> species (including <i>C. capitata</i> and <i>C. rosa</i>). The para-pheromone methyl eugenol (ME) captures a large number of <i>Bactrocera</i> species (including <i>B. dorsalis</i> , <i>B. zonata</i> , <i>B. carambolae</i> , <i>B. philippinensis</i>	include <i>Batrocera invadens</i> .	

1. Section	2. Paragraph number	3. Sentence/row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
				material board or killed by a chemical agent. Some of the most widely used dry traps are Cook and Cunningham (C & C), ChamP		
3.3 Trapping devices	[32]					
3.3 Trapping devices: Cook and Cunningham Trap	[33]					
3.3 Cook and Cunningham Trap (general description)	[34]					
3.3 Cook and Cunningham Trap (general description)	[35]		substantive	The standard panel (15.2 cm × 15.2 cm) contains 20 g of TML , while the half size (7.6 cm × 15.2 cm) contains 10 g.	To specify which attractant is meant.	
3.3 Cook and Cunningham Trap (use)	[36]					
3.3 Cook and Cunningham Trap (use)	[37]					
3.3 Cook and Cunningham Trap (use)	[38]					
3.3 Cook and Cunningham Trap (use)	[39]					
3.3 Cook and Cunningham Trap (use)	[40]					
3.3 Trapping devices: ChamP Trap	[41]					
3.3 ChamP Trap (general description)	[42]					
3.3 ChamP Trap (general description)	[43]					
3.3 ChamP Trap (use)	[44]					
3.3 ChamP Trap (use)	[45]					
3.3 ChamP Trap (use)	[46]					
3.3 ChamP Trap (use)	[47]					

1. Section	2. Paragraph number	3. Sentence/row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
3.3 ChamP Trap (use)	[48]					
3.3 Trapping devices: Easy Trap	[49]					
3.3 Easy Trap (general description)	[50]					
3.3 Easy Trap (general description)	[51]					
3.3 Easy Trap (use)	[52]					
3.3 Easy Trap (use)	[53]					
3.3 Easy Trap (use)	[54]					
3.3 Easy Trap (use)	[55]					
3.3 Easy Trap (use)	[56]					
3.3 Easy Trap (use)	[57]					
3.3 Trapping devices: Jackson Trap or Delta Trap	[58]					
3.3 Jackson Trap or Delta Trap (general description)	[59]					
3.3 Jackson Trap or Delta Trap (general description)	[60]		substantive	Additional parts include a white or yellow rectangular insert of waxed cardboard which is covered with a thin layer of adhesive known as “sticky material” used to trap fruit flies once they land inside the trap body;	The standard deals with fruit flies hence it should be indicated accordingly.	
3.3 Jackson Trap or Delta Trap (use)	[61]					
3.3 Jackson Trap or Delta Trap (use)	[62]					
3.3 Jackson Trap or Delta Trap (use)	[63]		substantive	1. JT/Delta traps may not be suitable for some environmental conditions (e.g. rain or dust). 2. and surveying sterile fruit fly populations in areas subjected to sterile fruit fly mass releases.	Consistent use of word “trap(s)” and for clarity The standard deals with fruit flies hence it	

1. Section	2. Paragraph number	3. Sentence/row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
					should be indicated accordingly	
3.3 Jackson Trap or Delta Trap (use)	[64]					
3.3 Jackson Trap or Delta Trap (use)	[65]					
3.3 Jackson Trap or Delta Trap (use)	[66]					
3.3 Jackson Trap or Delta Trap (use)	[67]					
3.3 Trapping devices: Lynfield Trap	[68]					
3.3 Lynfield Trap (general description)	[69]					
3.3 Lynfield Trap (general description)	[70]					
3.3 Lynfield Trap (use)	[71]					
3.3 Lynfield Trap (use)	[72]					
3.3 Lynfield Trap (use)	[73]		substantive	a dichlorvos-impregnated matrix is placed inside the trap to kill fruit flies that enter	The standard deals with fruit flies hence it should be indicated accordingly	
3.3 Lynfield Trap (use)	[74]					
3.3 Lynfield Trap (use)	[75]					
3.3 Lynfield Trap (use)	[76]					
3.3 Trapping devices: McPhail Trap Type	[77]					
3.3 McPhail Trap Type (general description)	[78]					
3.3 McPhail Trap Type (general description)	[79]					
3.3 McPhail Trap Type (use)	[80]					
3.3 McPhail Trap Type	[81]					

1. Section	2. Paragraph number	3. Sentence/row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
(use)						
3.3 McPhail Trap Type (use)	[82]					
3.3 McPhail Trap Type (use)	[83]					
3.3 McPhail Trap Type (use)	[84]		Editorial	McP traps tend to also catch a wide range of other non-target tephritid and non-tephritid fruit flies in addition to the target species.	The standard deals with fruit flies hence it should be indicated accordingly	
3.3 McPhail Trap Type (use)	[85]					
3.3 McPhail Trap Type (use)	[86]					
3.3 McPhail Trap Type (use)	[87]					
3.3 McPhail Trap Type (use)	[88]					
3.3 McPhail Trap Type (use)	[89]					
3.3 Trapping devices: Multilure Trap	[90]					
3.3 Multilure Trap (general description)	[91]					
3.3 Multilure Trap (general description)	[92]					
3.3 Multilure Trap (use)	[93]					
3.3 Multilure Trap (use)	[94]		Substantive	This trap follows the same principles as those of the McP trap . However, an MLT trap used with dry synthetic attractant is more efficient and selective than an MLT or McP trap used with liquid protein attractant	Clarity and consistency	
3.3 Multilure Trap (use)	[95]					

1. Section	2. Paragraph number	3. Sentence/row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
3.3 Multilure Trap (use)	[96]		Substantive	insecticide such as dichlorvos or a deltamethrin (DM) strip is placed inside the trap to kill the fruit flies.	Clarity and consistency	
3.3 Multilure Trap (use)	[97]		Editorial	To be used for the following species: all fruit fly species	Grammar	
3.3 Multilure Trap (use)	[98]					
3.3 Multilure Trap (use)	[99]					
3.3 Trapping devices: Open Bottom Dry or (Phase IV) Trap	[100]					
3.3 Open Bottom Dry or (Phase IV) Trap (general description)	[101]					
3.3 Open Bottom Dry or (Phase IV) Trap (general description)	[102]					
3.3 Open Bottom Dry or (Phase IV) Trap (use)	[103]					
3.3 Open Bottom Dry or (Phase IV) Trap (use)	[104]		Editorial	similar to the inserts used in the JT trap.	Clarity and consistency	
3.3 Open Bottom Dry or (Phase IV) Trap (use)	[105]					
3.3 Open Bottom Dry or (Phase IV) Trap (use)	[106]					
3.3 Open Bottom Dry or (Phase IV) Trap (use)	[107]					
3.3 Trapping devices: Red Sphere Trap	[108]					
3.3 Red Sphere Trap (general description)	[109]					
3.3 Red Sphere Trap (general description)	[110]					

1. Section	2. Paragraph number	3. Sentence/row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
3.3 Red Sphere Trap (use)	[111]					
3.3 Red Sphere Trap (use)	[112]		Editorial	but it is much more efficient in catching fruit flies when baited. Fruit flies that are sexually mature and ready to lay eggs are attracted to this trap.	Clarity and consistency	
3.3 Red Sphere Trap (use)	[113]		substantive	it will be necessary to positively identify the target fruit fly from the non-target insects likely to be present on the traps	The Standard deals with fruit flies, as such should be indicated accordingly.	
3.3 Red Sphere Trap (use)	[114]					
3.3 Red Sphere Trap (use)	[115]					
3.3 Red Sphere Trap (use)	[116]					
3.3 Trapping devices: Sensus Trap	[117]					
3.3 Sensus Trap (general description)	[118]					
3.3 Sensus Trap (general description)	[119]		Substantive	The Sensus trap consists of a vertical plastic bucket 12.5 cm in height and 11.5 cm in diameter (Figure 12). It has a transparent body and a blue overhanging lid which has entrance holes just underneath it.	Clarity and consistency	
3.3 Sensus Trap (use)	[120]					
3.3 Sensus Trap (use)	[121]		substantive	A dichlorvos block is placed in the comb on the lid to kill the fruit flies.	The Standard deals with fruit flies as such should be indicated accordingly.	
3.3 Sensus Trap (use)	[122]					
3.3 Sensus Trap (use)	[123]					
3.3 Sensus Trap (use)	[124]					
3.3 Trapping devices: Steiner Trap	[125]					
3.3 Steiner Trap (general description)	[126]					

1. Section	2. Paragraph number	3. Sentence/row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
3.3 Steiner Trap (general description)	[127]					
3.3 Steiner Trap (use)	[128]					
3.3 Steiner Trap (use)	[129]					
3.3 Steiner Trap (use)	[130]					
3.3 Steiner Trap (use)	[131]					
3.3 Steiner Trap (use)	[132]					
3.3 Trapping devices: Tephri Trap	[133]					
3.3 Tephri Trap (general description)	[134]					
3.3 Tephri Trap (general description)	[135]					
3.3 Tephri Trap (use)	[136]					
3.3 Tephri Trap (use)	[137]		Substantive.	strips placed inside the trap to kill the fruit flies. DM is applied in a polyethylene strip,	The Standard is for fruit flies as such be indicated accordingly.	
3.3 Tephri Trap (use)	[138]					
3.3 Tephri Trap (use)	[139]					
3.3 Tephri Trap (use)	[140]					
3.3 Trapping devices: Yellow Panel/Rebell Trap	[141]					
3.3 Yellow Panel/Rebell Trap (general description)	[142]					
3.3 Yellow Panel/Rebell Trap (general description)	[143]					
3.3 Yellow Panel/Rebell Trap (use)	[144]					
3.3 Yellow Panel/Rebell Trap (use)	[145]					
3.3 Yellow Panel/Rebell	[146]		Editorial	To be used for the following species: (YP or	Improvement for clarity.	

1. Section	2. Paragraph number	3. Sentence/row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
Trap (use)				Rebell traps) <i>Ceratitidis</i> spp. and <i>Rhagoletis</i> spp.; only YP traps for <i>Bactrocera oleae</i> (Table 2).		
3.3 Yellow Panel/Rebell Trap (use)	[147]					
3.3 Yellow Panel/Rebell Trap (use)	[148]					
3.4 Trapping procedures	[149]					
3.4.1 Layout of trapping network	[150]					
3.4.1 Layout of trapping network	[151]		Substantive	In suppression and eradication programmes, an extensive trapping network should be deployed over the entire area subject to survey and control actions	Paragraph 151 should become 154, and 152, 153 and 154 become 151, 152 and 153 for improving sequence and order for clarity.	
3.4.1 Layout of trapping network	[152]					
3.4.1 Layout of trapping network	[153]					
3.4.1 Layout of trapping network	[154]					
3.4.2 Trap deployment (placement)	[155]					
3.4.2 Trap deployment (placement)	[156]					
3.4.2 Trap deployment (placement)	[157]	sentence three	Substantive	Other suitable trap sites are resting and feeding areas in plants that provide shelter and protect fruit flies from strong winds and predators.	The Standard deals with fruit flies hence should be indicated accordingly	
3.4.2 Trap deployment (placement)	[158]					
3.4.2 Trap deployment	[159]					

1. Section	2. Paragraph number	3. Sentence/row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
(placement)						
3.4.2 Trap deployment (placement)	[160]					
3.4.2 Trap deployment (placement)	[161]					
3.4.3 Trap mapping	[162]					
3.4.3 Trap mapping	[163]					
3.4.3 Trap mapping	[164]					
3.4.3 Trap mapping	[165]		substantive	If GPS equipment is not available, the references of the trap location should include visible landmarks,	For improved understanding as GPS is a system and appropriate GPS equipment is needed to apply the GPS	
3.4.3 Trap mapping	[166]			location of each trap and other valuable information such as exact location of fruit fly finds (incursions or outbreaks), historical profiles of the geographical distribution patterns of the pest, and relative size of the populations in given areas. This information is extremely useful in planning control activities, ensuring that bait sprays and sterile fruit fly releases are accurately placed and cost-effective in their application	The Standard deals with fruit flies hence need to indicate accordingly.	
3.4.4 Trap servicing and inspection	[167]					
3.4.4 Trap servicing and inspection	[168]					
3.4.4 Trap servicing and inspection	[169]					
3.4.4 Trap servicing and inspection	[170]					
3.4.4 Trap servicing and inspection	[171]		sustantive	Attractant spillage or trap contamination would reduce the chances of fruit flies entering the trap. For traps that use a sticky insert to capture fruit flies	The Standard deals with fruit flies hence should be indicated accordingly.	

1. Section	2. Paragraph number	3. Sentence/row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
3.4.4 Trap servicing and inspection	[172]					
3.4.5 Trapping records	[173]					
3.4.5 Trapping records	[174]	Sentence 1	Editorial	<p>The following information must be included in order to keep proper trapping records:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - trap location, plant where the trap is placed - trap and attractant type - servicing and inspection dates - target fly capture <p>Any other information</p>	Proposed new format for sentence one and sentence 2 to start new paragraph, to facilitate easier reading/ understanding	
3.4.6 Flies per trap per day	[175]					
3.4.6 Flies per trap per day	[176]					
3.4.6 Flies per trap per day	[177]					
3.4.6 Flies per trap per day	[178]					
3.4.6 Flies per trap per day	[179]					
3.4.6 Flies per trap per day	[180]		Substantive	In areas where sterile fruit flies are being released it is used to measure the relative abundance of the sterile and wild fruit flies.	The Standard deals with fruit flies as such should be indicated accordingly.	
3.4.6 Flies per trap per day	[181]		Substantive.	FTD is obtained by dividing the total number of captured fruit flies by the product obtained from multiplying the total number of inspected traps by the average number of days the traps were exposed.	<p>The Standard deals with fruit flies as such should be indicated accordingly.</p> <p>The FDT should be used throughout consistently.</p>	
4. Trap Densities	[182]			and trapping densities for that pest should be higher in the production field and decrease toward points of entry	Remove fig. 19 as it was highlighted previously.	
4. Trap Densities	[183]					
4. Trap Densities	[184]		Editorial	For example, in a pest free area, a higher	It is understood that the whole paragraph	

1. Section	2. Paragraph number	3. Sentence/row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
				density of traps is required at points of entry and a lower density in commercial orchards (Figure 19).	refers to Figure 19 (referenced at the end of the paragraph) and it is therefore not needed to repeat reference in sentence 2	
4. Trap Densities: Figure 19	[185]					
4. Trap Densities	[186]					
4. Trap Densities	[187]					
4. Trap Densities: Table 5a	[188]					
4. Trap Densities: Table 5b	[189]					
4. Trap Densities: Table 5c	[190]					
4. Trap Densities: Table 5d	[191]					
4. Trap Densities: Table 5e	[192]					
4. Trap Densities: Table 5f	[193]					
5. Delimiting Surveys	[194]					
5. Delimiting Surveys	[195]					
5. Delimiting Surveys	[196]			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A delimiting survey must be implemented as soon as possible after the initial detection of a targeted fruit fly 2. However, one or two generations may be used for particular situations or fruit fly species 	The Standard deals with fruit flies and it should be indicated accordingly.	
5. Delimiting Surveys: Figure 20	[197]	Figure 20 on page 22	Editorial		For consistency the heading of Figure 20 should be moved to appear at the bottom of the figure on pp 22.	
5. Delimiting Surveys: Figure 21	[198]					
6. Supervision Activities	[199]					
6. Supervision Activities	[200]					
6. Supervision Activities	[201]					
6. Supervision Activities	[202]					

1. Section	2. Paragraph number	3. Sentence/row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
6. Supervision Activities	[203]					
6. Supervision Activities	[204]					
6. Supervision Activities	[205]					
6. Supervision Activities	[206]					
6. Supervision Activities	[207]		substantive	<p>Evaluation of identification capability can occur via target flies that have been marked in some manner in order to distinguish them from wild trapped flies. These marked flies are placed in traps in order to evaluate the trapper's diligence in servicing the traps, competence in recognizing the targeted species, and knowledge of the proper reporting procedures once a fruit flies is found. Commonly used marking systems are fluorescent dyes and/or wing clipping. In some programmes that survey for eradication or exclusion, the flies may also be marked by using sterile irradiated flies in order to further reduce the chances of the marked fly being falsely identified as a wild fruit flies and resulting in unnecessary actions by the programme. A slightly different method is necessary under a sterile fruit flies release programme in order to evaluate the screeners on their ability to accurately distinguish target wild flies from the released sterile fruit flies. The marked flies used are sterile and lack the fluorescent dye, but are marked physically by wing clipping or some other method. These fruit flies are placed into the trap samples after they have been collected in the field but before they are inspected by the screeners.</p>	<p>The Standard deal with fruit flies, therefore for consistency it should be indicated accordingly.</p>	
6. Supervision Activities	[208]					

1. Section	2. Paragraph	3. Sentence/row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
6. Supervision Activities	[209]					
7. Selected References	[210]					
7. Selected References	[211]					
7. Selected References	[212]					
7. Selected References	[213]					
7. Selected References	[214]					
7. Selected References	[215]					
7. Selected References	[216]					
7. Selected References	[217]					
7. Selected References	[218]					
7. Selected References	[219]					
7. Selected References	[220]					
7. Selected References	[221]					
7. Selected References	[222]					
7. Selected References	[223]					
7. Selected References	[224]					
7. Selected References	[225]					
7. Selected References	[226]					
7. Selected References	[227]					
7. Selected References	[228]					
7. Selected References	[229]					
7. Selected References	[230]					
7. Selected References	[231]					
7. Selected References	[232]					
7. Selected References	[233]					
7. Selected References	[234]					
7. Selected References	[235]					

1. Section	2. Para nber	3. Sentence/ row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
7. Selected References	[236]					
7. Selected References	[237]					

Template for comments - Draft ISPMs for country consultation, 2008

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

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>						
<i>SPECIFIC COMMENTS</i>						
TITLE	[1]					
Proposed definition: <i>incidence (of a pest)</i>	[2]					
Proposed definition: <i>tolerance level (of a pest)</i>	[3]					
Proposed definition: <i>phytosanitary security (of a consignment)</i>	[4]					
Proposed definition: <i>corrective action plan (in an area)</i>	[5]					
Proposed definition: <i>compliance procedure (for a consignment)</i>	[6]					
Proposed definition: <i>intended use</i>	[7]					
Proposed definition: <i>reference specimen</i>	[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**

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>						
<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]	Sentence 3	Substantive		Because “exotic” is the only mentioned term that is defined in ISPM 5. It is proposed that reference is made in ISPM 5 at the definition of “exotic” that it is indeed synonymous to the terms “non-native” and “non-indigenous” for clarity.	
3.1 Alien species: Note 4	[15]					

1. Section	2. Paragraph number	3. sentence/row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
3.2 Introduction	[16]					
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]					

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	[39]					
3.5 Intentional introduction	[40]					
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]					

BACKGROUND	[17]	Sentence 4	Editorial	Thus <u>Additionally</u> , while pursuing the	Clearer wording	COUNTRY NAME
1.4 Supervision activities	[26]	Sentence 3	Substantive	The FF-ALPP programme, including	The term regulatory control is unclear and	COUNTRY

				regulatory control - <u>domestic regulation</u>	text should use specific terms clarifying what is meant.	NAME
1.4 Supervision activities	[32]	New 2nd indent	Substantive	- operation of surveillance procedures - <u>fruit sampling</u> - surveillance capability	Fruit sampling is necessary as part of surveillance	COUNTRY NAME
1.6 Tolerance level	[44a]	After para 44	Substantive	add new paragraph after 44: <u>For quarantine pests the tolerance level generally equals zero. Setting the level of detection to zero implies that all units of the consignment must be included in the sample. Hence, for quarantine pests, a detection level that is as small as technically possible approaches the zero tolerance level.</u>	to explain the particular situation for quarantine pests	COUNTRY NAME
3. Phytosanitary Risk Categories and Measures	[61]	Whole para	Substantive	Move para 61 to after para 47	More appropriate location.	COUNTRY NAME

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. Para nber	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]	Sentence 1	Substantive	This standard describes general guidelines for the design and operation of post-entry quarantine (PEQ) facilities for holding consignments of plants regulated articles in containment.	Use of “plants” limits the application of this ISPM. It is proposed to broaden the scope to apply to all regulated articles as defined in ISPM 5 that may need to be contained.	
REFERENCES	[6]					
REFERENCES	[7]					
REFERENCES	[8]					
REFERENCES	[9]					
DEFINITIONS	[10]					
DEFINITIONS	[11]					
OUTLINE OF REQUIREMENTS	[12]	1. Sentence 1	1. Substantive	1. The pest risk associated with the importation of consignments of plants regulated articles into a country may be managed by the use of post-entry quarantine (PEQ) facilities that provide appropriate	1. Use of ”plants” limits the application of this ISPM. It is proposed to broaden the scope to apply to all regulated articles as defined in ISPM 5 that may need to be contained.	

1. Section	2. Paragraph	3. sentence/row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
		2. Sentence 2	2. Substantive	containment for the risk that has been identified with the consignments being imported. 2. Pest risk assessment is required to determine the level of PEQ for a specified consignment of plants regulated articles	2. Pest risk assessment is required for all regulated articles, not only plants.	
		Sentence 5	substantive	The PEQ facility may consist of a field site, screen house, glasshouse, phytotron and/or laboratory.	Another specialised operation	
OUTLINE OF REQUIREMENTS	[13]					
OUTLINE OF REQUIREMENTS	[14]					
OUTLINE OF REQUIREMENTS	[15]					
BACKGROUND	[16]	Sentence 1	Substantive	Imported consignments of plants, plant products and other regulated articles can present a risk to plant health because they have the potential to introduce quarantine pests.	Add to adequately broaden scope of background to include plant products and other regulated articles that presents a plant health risk	
BACKGROUND	[17]					
BACKGROUND	[18]					
BACKGROUND	[19]	Sentence 1	Substantive	Post-entry quarantine (PEQ) may also be required for the following reasons.	Add “also” to clarify that the point of entry related situations does not exclude the principle of PRA	
BACKGROUND	[20]	Sentence 1 & 2	substantive	The purpose of PEQ is to contain both the plants, other regulated articles and any quarantine pest potentially associated with them so that neither can escape the facility before the required inspection, testing, treatment and verification activities have been	For clarity and consistency	

1. Section	2. Paragraph number	3. sentence/row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
				completed, and the consignment is released.		
GENERAL REQUIREMENTS	[21]					
1. PEQ Containment	[22]					
1. PEQ Containment	[23]	Sentence 1	Editorial	The containment levels of PEQ facilities are based on the principles of pest risk analysis as described in ISPM No. 11 (<i>Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests including analysis of environmental risks and living modified organisms</i>).	Use italics for consistency in reference format used	
1. PEQ Containment	[24]	Sentence 1 & 2	substantive	The NPPO should determine the containment level required for a specific consignment of plants and regulated articles 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	For consistency	
1. PEQ Containment	[25]	Sentence 3	Editorial	The requirements to determine containment level described below may need to be adjusted according to the specific pest risk management circumstances.	To clarify the reference to requirements mentioned in paragraph 26	
1. PEQ Containment	[26]	Indent 2	Substantive	- a modification of its structural or operating conditions <u>of an existing facility</u>	To clarify the statement that modifications may be made to “an existing facility”	
2. PEQ Facilities	[27]					
2. PEQ Facilities	[28]					
2. PEQ Facilities	[29]					
2.1 Location	[30]					
2.1 Location	[31]					
2.2 Physical requirements	[32]					
2.2 Physical requirements	[33]					
2.2 Physical requirements	[34]					

1. Section	2. Paragraph	3. sentence/row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
2.3 Operational requirements	[35]					
2.3 Operational requirements	[36]					
2.3 Operational requirements	[37]					
2.3 Operational requirements	[38]	Sentence 1	Substantive	Specific procedures are required in the operation of the facility to manage the particular risks relating to containment of the consignments of <u>regulated articles</u> in the <u>PEQ</u> facility	Use of "plants" limits the application of this ISPM. It is proposed to broaden the scope to apply to all regulated articles as defined in ISPM 5 that may need to be contained and for which the risk should be managed in the PEQ facility and consistency naming the facility..	Sentence 1
2.3 Operational requirements	[39]					
2.4 Release from containment	[40]					
2.4 Release from containment	[41]	Sentence 41	substantive	Consignments should be released from PEQ facilities on completion of the required inspection, testing, treatment and verification.	For clarity and consistency	
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	[46]					

1. Section	2. Paragraph number	3. sentence/row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
level 1						
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]	Sentence 3	substantive	PEQ1 sites should have appropriate signage	All levels should have appropriate signage	
3.1.3 Operational requirements, PEQ1	[51]					
3.1.3 Operational requirements, PEQ1	[52]					
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]					

1. Section	2. Paragraph number	3. sentence/row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
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]	1. Sentence 2	1. Substantive	They are suited for containment of consignments of plants where there is a moderate to high probability <u>risk</u> of escape and where the consequences of an escape would be serious <u>moderate to high</u> (e.g. aphid-transmitted viruses).	Use “risk” and “moderate to high” to ensure consistent use of terminology throughout this standard and also to make reference to the use terminology in Annex 1 clear.	
3.3.2 Physical requirements, PEQ3	[66]					
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	[75]					

1. Section	2. Paragraph number	3. sentence/row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
level 4						
3.4.1 Type of facility and use, PEQ4	[76]					
3.4.1 Type of facility and use, PEQ4	[77]	Sentence 2	substantive	These facilities are designed and operated specifically to contain consignments of plants and other regulated articles in quarantine (whether deliberately imported or associated pests) where both the risk of escape and the consequences of escape are high (e.g. airborne plant pathogenic fungi).	Add to adequately broaden scope of background to include plant products and other regulated articles that presents a plant health risk.	
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]					
3.4.2 Physical requirements, PEQ4	[83]					
3.4.3 Operational requirements, PEQ4	[84]					
3.4.3 Operational requirements, PEQ4	[85]	Sentence 1: Include as new sentence 1	Substantive	A shower should be required for staff members on leaving the facility. Operational processes required...	Add for consistency and clarity because for PEQ 3 a shower is required as optional. But according to Appendix 1 it is required as compulsory for PEQ4.	
3.4.3 Operational requirements, PEQ4	[86]	Sentence 1 and 2	Editorial and substantive	The facility should not be accessible to the unauthorised persons. A register of staff and visitors should be maintained providing a record of entries and exits of the laboratory.	Move sentence 1 to become new sentence 2 and move sentence 2 to become new sentence 1 to improve logical sequence that first exclude the general public from being	

1. Section	2. Paragraph number	3. sentence/row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
		Sentence 2	substantive	Disposable ... Disposable coverall suits or suitable alternatives should be worn in the facility.	visitors. Then reference to the register that must be kept for staff and possible visitors. Then address clothes to be worn by staff and visitors, that are allowed to enter the facility. . For applicability of the Standard as the are cost implications	
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]	Row 24, column 24	Editorial	Decontamination of equipment upon exit.		
			Column 1, row 25	decontamination of implements upon exit		

Template for comments - Draft ISPMs for country consultation, 2008

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

1. Section	2. Paragraph number	3. sentence/row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
DEFINITIONS	[16]	Definition	Editorial	Plants in vitro of tuber-forming <i>Solanum spp</i> (includes microtubers)	Bold “microtubers” to be consistent with manner in which defined terms are indicated in the Glossary	
DEFINITIONS	[18]	Definition	Substantive	A tuber produced in a soil-less growing medium in a protected controlled and environment from micropropagative material	Minituber definition should contain some specific reference to growing medium that should be soilless. due to the experience that minitubers imported from exporting countries where these were produced in protected environment but within soil resulted in contamination by regulated pests. Addition of and controlled to emphasise security and ease of control purposes.	
AND COUTLINE OF REQUIREMENTS	[21]	1. Whole Para 21 2. Sentence 1	1. Editorial 2. Substantive	2. Facilities used for the production of potato micropropagative material and minitubers should be officially authorized or operated directly by a National Plant Protection Organization (NPPO).	Justify text 2. Add “minitubers” to align with scope of this standard	
OUTLINE OF REQUIREMENTS	[22]	Whole Para 22	Editorial		Justify text	
OUTLINE OF REQUIREMENTS	[23]	1. Whole Para 23 2. Sentence 1	1. Editorial 2. Substantive	2. Facilities for the establishment of pest free	1. Justify text 2. Add minitubers to align with scope of	

1. Section	2. Paragraph number	3. sentence/row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
				potato micropropagative material, minitubers and testing for pest freedom are subject to strict requirements to prevent cross-contamination or infection of material.	this standard	
OUTLINE OF REQUIREMENTS	[24]	1. Sentence 2 2. Sentence 2 3. Sentence 3	1. Substantive 2. Substantive 3. Substantive	1. In addition, potato micropropagation facilities should be officially examined to ensure that each lot of micropropagative material is free from the specified and regulated pests of the importing country and, if appropriate, complies with the requirements of the seed potato certification scheme of the exporting country. Pest free potato micropropagative material and minitubers moving in international trade may should be required to be accompanied by a phytosanitary certificate.	1. It is important to emphasise that the importing country determines the risk and specifies which pest will be regulated 2. The concept of “specified pests” is used in different contexts here and throughout the document. It is suggested for the purpose of consistency and clarity to define what is meant with “specified pests”. It is interpreted to indicate pests that are included in certification schemes of exporting countries and therefore important with regard to certification levels but not officially controlled. 3. The exporting country should always indicate by means of a phytosanitary certificate that phytosanitary procedures were followed according to the import requirements of the importing country.	
1. Responsibilities	[29]	1. Sentence 1	1. Substantive	1. Only facilities officially authorised or operated directly by a National Plant protection Organization (NPPO) should be recognized for the production of potato micropropagative material and minitubers as described in this standard	1. Add minitubers to align with scope of this standard. Also, based on the quantities of minitubers imported it is important that minitubers be certified as free from specified and regulated pests requested by the importing country. If this cannot be done the commodity can be considered as seed potatoes based on the phytosanitary risk	

1. Section	2. Paragraph number	3. sentence/row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
		2. Sentence 3	2. Substantive	2. The NPPO of the importing country is responsible for pest risk analysis (PRA) and should, on request, have access to documentation and facilities to enable it to verify that the level of phytosanitary risk management and security in the exporting country meets its requirements.	involved. 2. Add “risk management” to include the use of options (such as decontamination etc) that will reduce the risk . a definition of phytosanitary risk management and phytosanitary security in ISPM 5.	
2. Pest Risk Analysis	[30]	Sentence 2	Editorial	PRA should be carried out by the importing country in accordance with ISPM No 11 (<i>Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests including analysis of environmental risks and living modified organisms, 2004</i>)	Delete “2004” to be consistent in format of reference to relevant ISPMs.	
	33	substantive	<i>elines on lists of regulated pests).</i>	Addition of brackets for consistency		
		Sentence 2	substantive	testing individual candidate plants by the exporting country for the pests specified and regulated by the importing country		
		Sentence 39		production in pest free soil less growing medium under a protected and controlled environment operated as a pest free production site free from the pests (and their vectors) specified and regulated by the importing country.	To maintain consistence and clarity.	
		Sentence 48	substantive	A facility that maintains and propagates pest free micropropagative material should be operated as a pest free production site as described in ISPM No 10 (<i>Requirements for the establishment of pest free places of production and pest</i>	Clarity	

1. Section	2. Paragraph number	3. sentence/row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
				<i>free production sites</i>) for general requirements with respect to the pests of potato specified and regulated by the importing country for potato micropropagative material		
4. Production of Pest Free Minitubers	[56]	Sentence 2	substantive	A minituber production facility should be operated as a pest free production site as described in ISPM No. 10 (<i>Requirements for the establishment of pest free places of production and pest free production sites</i>) The pests commonly specified include those for micropropagative material (i.e. viruses, viroids, phytoplasmas and bacteria (listed in Appendix 1) as well as fungi, nematodes, arthropods etc (listed in Appendix 2).	clarity and consistency Clarity and consistency clarity	
		58	substantive	A systems approach as described in ISPM No. 14 (<i>The use of integrated measures in a systems approach for pest risk management</i>)	consistency	
4. Production of Pest Free Minitubers	[59]	Sentence 1	Substantive	However, if the facility includes adequate physical and operational safeguards against the introduction of the specified and regulated pests, these additional measures precautions may not be required.	Clarifies the reference to the previous paragraph [58] where the list is referred to as additional “precautions”. Also, the use of “measures” may lead to confusion with “phytosanitary measures”.	
	58	Sentence 2	substantive	The entry of authorised to the facility should be controlled and provision should be made for use of protective clothing, disinfection of footwear and hand washing on entry.	To cater for persons not categorized under staff, such as auditors.	
	63	Sentence 1	substantive	Additional requirements for minituber production facility are provided in Annex 3.	consistency	
	77	Sentence 1	substantive	Pest free potato micropropagative material and minitubers moving in international trade should be accompanied by a phytosanitary certificate	For clarity and consistency	

