



**Regional workshop for the review of draft International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures
NEAR EAST
Cairo, Egypt
5–8 July, 2010**

Report

1. Opening of the session

The meeting was opened by Mr. Taher el Azzabi, FAO Senior Plant Protection Officer for the Near East and Lottie Erikson, IPPC Secretariat representative.

The IPPC Secretariat representative remarked that the IPPC wants to encourage the full participation of all 173 member countries in the development of ISPMs and that participation in regional workshops is an important venue for discussing and preparing comments on ISPMs. It was emphasized that member countries may adopt regional workshop comments, but each country must submit comments to the Secretariat through the national contact point.

The FAO representative discussed the purpose of and the format for the meeting. The meeting was attended by 13 experts from 12 countries and was facilitated by the FAO and the IPPC Secretariat. See Appendix 1.

2. Purpose of the workshop

The FAO representative Taher el Azzabi 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:

- *Systems approaches for pest risk management of fruit flies*
- *Submission of new treatments for inclusion in ISPM No.15*
- *Integrated measures approach for managing pest risks associated with international trade of plants for planting*
- *Irradiation treatment for *Ceratitis Capitata* (Annex to ISPM 28)*
- *Diagnostic protocol for Plum pox virus*

3. Overview of the IPPC

The IPPC representative Lottie Erikson 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 2010.

The presentation focused on the standard setting process, the member consultation process, and opportunities for members to participate in developing standards. It was emphasized that standards are developed by members, adopted by members and implemented by members and that members can participate in the standard development process to help ensure that standards are relevant to their concerns by proposing topics for the work program (importance of this step was emphasized), drafting standards (by participating in EWGs and TPs), commenting on standards (during the MC process), and attending CPM and actively participating in evening sessions.

During the discussion following the IPPC Secretariat presentation questions were asked about why it takes so long to develop standards, why only five standards are presented to CPM each year, what the status of NEPPO is, and whether the IPPC dispute settlement system is binding.

With regard to the length of time for developing standards, it was explained that multiple levels of review and revision are required to ensure that standards are technically accurate, clearly written, and globally acceptable and that development time also depends on the priority accorded a standard by CPM. In recent years a maximum of five standards have been approved for member consultation to rationalize the standard setting process and in recognition of IPPC Secretariat resource shortages.

There was considerable discussion regarding the first meeting of NEPPO. Questions were raised about cancellation of a NEPPO meeting planned by the Moroccan MOA for July 2010, and concerns were expressed that the meeting had been rescheduled for September 2010 during Ramadan which would significantly limit attendance from the region.

It was explained the IPPC dispute settlement process is not binding, but can provide an accessible and lower cost venue for countries to have phytosanitary disputes considered and recommendations made by international subject matter experts from the FAO regions.

4. Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was discussed and adopted as presented (Appendix 2).

5. Review of documents and discussion on draft ISPMs

The five draft standards listed above were reviewed. The FAO and IPPC representatives presented the powerpoint summaries developed by stewards and contacted stewards for elaboration when necessary. Comments were recorded in templates provided by the IPPC Secretariat. Draft ISPMs were discussed in plenary, and discussion sessions were chaired by different meeting participants. Time was allocated for participants to review ISPMs prior to discussion. It was emphasized that in situations where there was not agreement, countries should submit their comments individually through their national contact points.

Participants were reminded to follow the *Instructions for the Use of the Template* (see Appendix 3)

The following sections capture the main discussion points for each of the draft ISPMs reviewed.

5.1 DRAFT ISPM: Systems approaches for pest risk management of fruit flies.

This session was chaired by K. Musa from Sudan. L. Erikson from the IPPC Secretariat took notes. T. ElAzzabi gave the power point presentation of the draft ISPM.

Participants questioned whether FFF-POP and FFF-PS (43) should be listed as components of an FF-SA because these measures are adequate to achieve appropriate level of protection (ALP) without additional measures. Participants were referred to 61 which indicates that FFF-POP and FFF-PS should be used in conjunction with other independent measures. The glossary definition of SA was considered. It was decided to include a substantive comment to delete these terms because it was felt they are adequate by themselves to achieve ALP.

Section 2.1.1.2 regarding FF-POP and FFF-PS was deleted in its entirety to be consistent with changes made in 43. There was discussion indicating that these measures may stand alone or may be used as elements of an FFSA, but the group decided to make a substantive change and delete the entire section to be consistent with previous changes made in 43.

There was discussion of whether it would be reasonable to expect farmers to harvest at a less susceptible stage, because they need to sell their product and don't have access to cold storage facilities.

5.2 DRAFT ISPM: Submission of new treatments for inclusion in ISPM No.15

This session was chaired by I. Nahhal from Lebanon. L. Erikson from the IPPC Secretariat took notes. L. Erikson gave the power point presentation of the draft ISPM.

The technical and statistical complexity of this ISPM and its overall relevance to the region was discussed. There was discussion on the difficulty of finding alternatives to methyl bromide that can achieve Probit 9 efficacy for all species and the possibility that it might not be feasible for some countries in the region to implement new, expensive, sophisticated treatments. A general comment was added suggesting that systems approaches for wood packaging materials be considered as alternatives to methyl bromide because they might be more feasible for some countries in the region to implement.

Some participants found the standard (particularly the description of the stages) difficult to understand and suggested it be revised for clarity and ease of understanding. Several questions were posed about the selection of species for testing and the use of substitute species.

A question was raised about the meaning of the term "moribund" in 33 and an editorial change was suggested that it be replaced by the more easy to understand phrase "appear dead"

5.3 DRAFT ISPM: Integrated measures approach for managing pest risks associated with international trade of plants for planting

This session was chaired by I. Nahhal from Lebanon. T. ElAzzabi from the FAO regional office gave the power point presentation of the draft ISPM. L. Erikson from the IPPC Secretariat took notes.

It was suggested that the title was not descriptive of the standard and should possibly be changed. This suggestion was not accepted by the group.

It was suggested to clarify the first indent of 22 by adding the phrase at the end **and at certain life stages**. In addition an editorial change was made so that subject and verb agree in number.

There was discussion of whether morphology of the plant (34) would affect risk and discussion of whether rhizomes and tubers should be added to the list. There was a discussion about whether tubers should be considered seed and whether they would come under the scope of this standard.

There was discussion regarding the difference between critical and non-critical non-compliance incidents (84-88) and it was suggested that examples would help to clarify the difference between the two concepts.

It was discovered that in Table 1 of Appendix 1, group 10 is missing. It was later clarified that during the SC meeting group 10 became group 9. This means that Table 2 of Appendix one will need to be revised to remove any references to group 10, since it no longer exists in Table 1.

5.4 DRAFT ISPM: Irradiation treatment for *Ceratitidis Capitata* (Annex to ISPM 28)

This session was chaired by B. Khalil from Iraq. L. Erikson of the IPPC Secretariat gave the power point presentation of the draft ISPM and took notes.

Two participants raised concerns about the effects of irradiation on animals, humans, and the environment, and one recommended that tests should be done on health and environmental effects before irradiation treatments are adopted. There was not agreement on this point and it was emphasized that countries may submit comments individually through their contact points. There was a suggestion that all commodities should be tested prior to adoption of irradiation standards; but it was suggested that this might be impracticable given the number of commodities and cultivars and their differential responses to irradiation treatment. There was clarification that modified atmospheres refers to modified constituents (carbon dioxide, nitrogen, hydrogen) of the atmosphere in which commodities are stored.

5.5 DRAFT ISPM: Diagnostic protocol for Plum pox virus

This session was chaired by B. Khalil from Iraq. L. Erikson of the IPPC Secretariat gave the power point presentation of the draft ISPM and took notes.

Mode of transmission of plum pox virus was discussed. Questions were raised about whether the virus could be transmitted by the seeds of the fruit or infected imported fruit, but it was asserted that aphids and grafting are the primary means for transmitting the virus and there is no scientific evidence to support transmission via seed or fruit.

There was a suggestion to add photographs to the diagnostic protocol. It was noted that this could aid understanding, and that the Secretariat is trying to develop a process for adding graphics to diagnostic protocols which will keep the files of a manageable size so they can be uploaded and downloaded easily by everyone.

A general question was raised about the purpose of diagnostic protocols and it was indicated their purpose is to establish commonly accepted methods to identifying pests and pathogens.

Technical and editorial comments made on the draft ISPMs are attached to the report (see Appendix 4). 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 2010. Guidelines for the submission of comments on draft international standards for phytosanitary measures (ISPMs) are provided (see Appendix 5).

7. Any other business

7.1 Presentation of online comment system for draft ISPMs

The IPPC Secretariat presented a brief presentation about the development of the online system and requested volunteers to participate in testing in summer 2010.

7.2 Participant survey (Appendix 6)

A link to the online participant survey for the workshop was provided and the IPPC representative demonstrated how to complete the survey online.

7.3 Guide for Foresters

The IPPC Secretariat presented information on the Guide to IPPC standards for foresters. Participants were interested to learn that the guide will be published in Arabic.

7.4 Arabic language translation issues

The formation of language review groups was discussed and participants indicated that they would like more information on the formation of an Arabic language review group.

The FAO representative presented information on requesting translations of diagnostic protocols in English before member consultation. Some members who attended CPM-5 had not received requested information on standards and diagnostic protocols. The IPPC representative agreed to follow-up on this issue.

7.5 New IPPC website

Issues regarding navigating the new website were discussed and it was agreed to spend some time becoming familiar with the new website. The Secretariat representative demonstrated how to find “member consultation” and “regional workshop” pages on the website, and how to choose publications and dates in English. Using the search function in Arabic was not successful because the search function in Arabic does not appear to be fully functional.

8. Date and location of the next meeting (between July – September 15, 2011)

The date, venue, and organizer for next year’s meeting were not decided.

9. Close

Closing remarks were given by T. ElAzzabi and L. Erikson. Participants were thanked for their valuable contributions and encouraged to coordinate the submission of national country comments to the Secretariat. The FAO regional plant protection officer and Standards Committee representative were also thanked for their special contribution.

Appendices:

Appendix 1: Agenda

Appendix 2: List of participants

Appendix 3: Completed templates with workshop comments on each ISPM

Appendix 1: Agenda



**Regional workshop for the review of draft
International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPMs)
5 – 8 July 2010
Cairo – Egypt**

Agenda

<u>Monday 5 July 2010</u>	
9.00 – 11.00	
Opening session	
Purpose of the Workshop	Mr. T. ElAzzabi
Election of Sessions Chairs	Plenary
Election of sessions rapporteur	Plenary
IPPC Overview	Ms. L. Erikson
Adoption of Agenda	Mr. T. ElAzzabi
11.00 – 11.20 Coffee break	
Session 1	
11.20 – 13.00	
Session chair	Mr. K. Musa
Review and discussion of the ISPMs	
• System approach for pest risk management of fruit flies	
Presentation of the draft standard	Mr. T. ElAzzabi
Draft standard discussion	
Lunch break 13.00 – 14.00	
Session 2	
Session chair	Mr. K. Musa
14.00 – 17.30	
• Continue System approach for pest risk management of fruit flies	

<u>Tuesday 6 July 2010</u>	
9.00 – 17.00	
Session 3	
Session chair	Mr. I. Nahal
Session Rapporteur	
Submission of new treatments for inclusion in ISPMs No. 15	
Presentation of the draft standard	Ms. L Erikson
Draft standard discussion	
<u>Wednesday 7 July 2010</u>	
Session 3	
9.00 – 11.00	
Session chair	Mr. I. Nahal
Session Rapporteur	
Integrated measures approach for plants and planting in International Trade	
Draft standard presentation	Mr. T. ElAzzabi
Draft standard discussion	
Coffee break 11.00 – 11.20	
Session 4	
Continue discussion of Integrated measures approach for plants and planting in International Trade	
Lunch break 13.00 – 14.00	
Session 5	
14.00 – 17.00	
Session chair	Mr. B. Khalil
Session Rapporteur	
Irradiation treatment for <i>Ceratitis Capitata</i>(Annex No. 28)	
Draft standard presentation	Ms. L. Erikson
Draft standard discussion	

Thursday 8 July 2010

Session 6

9.00 – 11.00

Session Chair

Mr. B. Khalil

Session Rapporteur

- **Continue discussion Irradiation treatment for *Ceratitis Capitata* (Annex No. 28)**

Coffee break 11.00 – 11.20

**Draft Annex to ISPM 27: 2010 (Diagnostic protocols for regulated pests)
Plum pox Virus**

Lunch break 13.00 – 14.00

Session 7

14.00 – 17.30

Session Chair

Mr. B. Khalil

- **Continue discussion Draft Annex to ISPM 27: 2010 (Diagnostic protocols for regulated pests) Plum pox Virus**

Any other business:

- Mechanism for the requests for diagnostic protocol translation into FAO languages before the 100 –day consultation period. Mr. T. ElAzzabi
- Online System for Compiling Member Comments Ms. L. Erikson
- IPPC Website demonstration Ms. L. Erikson
- Guide to IPPC standards for foresters Ms. L. Erikson
- Adoption of the report
- Close

Appendix 2: Participant List



Regional workshop for the review of draft International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPMs)

5-8 July, 2010
Cairo, Egypt

Participants List

Participants	
<u>BAHRAIN</u> Mr. Ahmed Saeed Eid Senior Plant Protection Specialist Plant Protection & Quarantine Section Ministry of Municipalities & Agriculture Affairs Manama, Bahrain Tel: 00-973-177-966-98 Email: ahmedeid72@hotmail.com	<u>LEBANON</u> Mr. Imad Nahhal Head of Plant Protection Department Ministry of Agriculture Beirut, Lebanon Phone: 00-961-1-849-639 E-mail: imadn@terra.net.lb inahal@agriculture.gov.lb inahhal@agriculture.gov.lb
<u>EGYPT</u> Mr. Ali Shaaban Balah SPS Specialist Egyptian Plant Quarantine CAPQ Cairo, Egypt Tel: 00-202-376-085-75 Fax: 00-202-276-085-74 E.mail: ali_balah95@yahoo.com	<u>LIBYA</u> Mr. Bashir Geshera Dept. Of Biological Control and Plant Protection Tripoli, Libya Tel: 00-218-213-404-515 E.mail: dr.bashirgeshera@yahoo.com
<u>IRAQ</u> Mr. Basim Mustafa Khalil Director of Plant Quarantine State Board of Plant Protection Ministry of Agriculture Abo-Gharib, Baghdad, Iraq Tel: 00-964-790-372-1480 E.mail: crop-prot@moag.org bmustafa52@yahoo.com	<u>OMAN</u> Mr. Suliman Mahfoodh Ahmed Al-Toubi Director of Plant Quarantine Department Ministry of Agriculture Muscat, Oman Tel: 00-968-993-431-90 E.mail: altoubi68@hotmail.com

Participants	
<p><u>JORDAN</u> Ms. Abeer Mohammed Tayyem Member in the Phytosanitary Directorate Ministry of Agriculture Amman, Jordan Tel: 00-962-656-861-51 Email: bushrajo@yahoo.com</p>	<p><u>QATAR</u> Mr. Mohamed Gasem Al Mohanady Chief, Plant Protection Division Agricultural Division Ministry of Environment Doha, Qatar Tel: 00-974-555-1529 Email: almehri73@hotmail.com</p>

Other participants	
<p><u>SAUDI ARABIA</u> Mr. Abdulhakim Yousef Agricultural Engineer Ministry of Agriculture Riyadh, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia Tel: 00-966-140-16666 E-mail: ksapq@yahoo.com</p>	<p><u>YEMEN</u> Mr. Gamil Abdul Rahman Sallam Director of Plant Quarantine Department General Directorate of Plant Protection Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation Shoup Street, P.O. Box 26 Sana'a, Yemen Tel: 00-967-777-776-143 00-967-56-33-28 Fax: 00-967-125-1711 E.mail: gameelsallam@yahoo.com</p>
<p><u>SUDAN</u> Mr. Khidir Gibril Musa Director General Plant Protection Directorate (PPD) & Member of the Standard Committee Plant Protection Directorate (PPD) Khartoum North, Sudan P.O. Box 14 Mobile: 00-249-912-138-939 E.mail: khidirgme@yahoo.com khidirgibrilmusa@yahoo.com</p> <p>Ms. Nagat Mubarak El Tayeb Director, Plant Quarantine Dept. Plant Protection General Directorate Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry Khartoum, Sudan Tel: 00-249-912-181-812 E.mail: neltayb@yahoo.com</p>	<p><u>FAO</u> Ms. Lottie Erikson IPPC Standard Settling Programme Staff International Plant Protection Convention Secretariat Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations AGPM, Room B-763, Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00153 Rome, Italy Tel.: 00-39-06-5705-5696 Fax: 00-39-06-5705-4819 E-mail: lottie.erikson@fao.org</p>

Other participants

<p><u>SYRIA</u> Mr. Mohammad Al Hariri Head of the Phytosanitary Division Plant Protection Directorate Ministry of Agriculture and Agrarian Reform Damascus, Syria Tel: 00-963-11-2349-8345 Fax: 00-963-11-2247-913 Mobile: 00-963-933-574-986 E.mail: haririmhd2006@gmail.com</p>	<p><u>FAO</u> Mr. Taher ElAzzabi Senior Plant Protection Officer Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations Regional Office for the Near East Cairo, Egypt, Tel: 00-202-33316000 Ext. 2809 E.mail: Taher.ElAzzabi@fao.org</p>
<p><u>FAO</u> Ms. Heba Tokali Programme Clerk Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations Regional Office for the Near East Cairo, Egypt Tel: 00-202-33316000 Ext. 2807 E.mail: Heba.Tokali@fao.org</p>	

Appendix 3: Completed templates with participant comments

Template for comments - Draft ISPMs for country consultation, 2010

DRAFT: SYSTEMS APPROACHES FOR PEST RISK MANAGEMENT OF FRUIT FLIES (TEPHRITIDAE)

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

1. Section	2. Para number	3. sentence/ row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment (Substantive, Editorial, Translation)	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
<i>GENERAL COMMENTS</i>						
TITLE						
Contents						
Introduction	[1]					
SCOPE	[2]					
SCOPE	[3]					
REFERENCES	[4]					
REFERENCES	[5]					
REFERENCES	[6]					
REFERENCES	[7]					
REFERENCES	[8]					
REFERENCES	[9]					
REFERENCES	[10]					

1. Section	2. Paragraph number	3. sentence/row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment (Substantive, Editorial, Translation)	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
REFERENCES	[11]					
REFERENCES	[12]					
REFERENCES	[13]					
DEFINITIONS	[14]					
DEFINITIONS	[15]					
OUTLINE OF REQUIREMENTS	[16]					
OUTLINE OF REQUIREMENTS	[17]					
OUTLINE OF REQUIREMENTS	[18]					
OUTLINE OF REQUIREMENTS	[19]					
OUTLINE OF REQUIREMENTS	[20]					
OUTLINE OF REQUIREMENTS	[21]					
BACKGROUND	[22]					
BACKGROUND	[23]					
BACKGROUND	[24]					
BACKGROUND	[25]					
BACKGROUND	[26]	with fruit fly free places of production (FFF-POP) and fruit fly free production				

1. Section	2. Paragraph	3. sentence/row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment (Substantive, Editorial, Translation)	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
		sites (FFF-PS) (ISPM 10:1999).				
BACKGROUND	[27]					
BACKGROUND	[28]					
BACKGROUND	[29]					
BACKGROUND	[30]					
BACKGROUND	[31]					
BACKGROUND	[32]					
REQUIREMENTS	[33]					
1. General Requirements	[34]					
1.1. Pest risk analysis	[35]					
1.1. Pest risk analysis	[36]					
1.1. Pest risk analysis	[37]					
1.1. Pest risk analysis	[38]					
1.1. Pest risk analysis	[39]					
1.1. Pest risk analysis	[40]					
1.1. Pest risk analysis	[41]					
1.1. Pest risk analysis	[42]					
1.1. Pest risk analysis	[43]	Some of the measures to be applied under an FF-SA may include FFF-	Substantive		FFF- POP, FFF-PS are adequate by themselves - no need to include them in system approach for fruit flies. Must be deleted throughout the standard	

1. Section	2. Paragraph number	3. sentence/row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment (Substantive, Editorial, Translation)	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
		POP, FFF-PS, FF-ALPP, host status and limited distribution in the endangered area.				
1.2 Documentation and record-keeping	[44]	Control points and stakeholders should be identified	Substantive	Control points and stakeholders should be identified and documented	Necessity of documenting of the control points and stakeholders	NE COUNTRIES
1.2 Documentation and record-keeping	[45]					
1.2 Documentation and record-keeping	[46]					
1.3 Supervision	[47]					
1.3 Supervision	[48]					
1.3 Supervision	[49]					
2. Specific Requirements	[50]					
2.1 Establishment of an FF-SA	[51]					
2.1 Establishment of an FF-SA	[52]					
2.1 Establishment of an FF-SA	[53]					

1. Section	2. Paragraph number	3. sentence/row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment (Substantive, Editorial, Translation)	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
2.1 Establishment of an FF-SA	[54]					
2.1 Establishment of an FF-SA	[55]					
2.1.1 Pre-harvest and at harvest	[56]					
2.1.1 Pre-harvest and at harvest	[57]					
2.1.1.1 Low level of pest population	[58]					
2.1.1.1 Low level of pest population	[59]					
2.1.1.1 Low level of pest population	[60]	biological control such as natural enemies or sterile insect technique	Substantive	To be in a separate point		NE COUNTRIES
2.1.1.2 Fruit fly free places of production and fruit fly free production sites	[61]	2.1.1.2 Fruit fly free places of production and fruit fly free production sites	Substantive	To be deleted for consistency	NE COUNTRIES	
2.1.1.2 Fruit fly free places of production and fruit fly free production sites	[62]					
2.1.1.2 Fruit fly free places of production	[63]					

1. Section	2. Para nber	3. sentence/ row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment (Substantive, Editorial, Translation)	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
and fruit fly free production sites						
2.1.1.2 Fruit fly free places of production and fruit fly free production sites	[64]					
2.1.1.3 Status of the host	[65]					
2.1.1.3 Status of the host	[66]					
2.1.2 Post-harvest and shipping	[67]					
2.1.2 Post-harvest and shipping	[68]					
2.1.2.1 Post-harvest measures	[69]					
2.1.2.1 Post-harvest measures	[70]					
2.1.2.1 Post-harvest measures	[71]					
2.1.2.1 Post-harvest measures	[72]					
2.1.2.2 Post-harvest treatments	[73]					
2.1.2.2 Post-harvest treatments	[74]					
2.1.3 Entry and distribution	[75]					
2.1.3 Entry and distribution	[76]					

1. Section	2. Paragraph number	3. sentence/row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment (Substantive, Editorial, Translation)	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
2.2 Maintenance of a fruit fly systems approach	[77]					
2.2 Maintenance of a fruit fly systems approach	[78]	Such procedures may take the form of a written document	Substantive	Such procedures should take the form of a written document	For consistency as previous	RNE COUNTRIES
2.2 Maintenance of a fruit fly systems approach	[79]					
2.2 Maintenance of a fruit fly systems approach	[80]					
2.2 Maintenance of a fruit fly systems approach	[81]					
ANNEX 1	[82]					
ANNEX 1	[83]					
ANNEX 1	[84]					
ANNEX 1	[85]					
1. Non-compliance	[86]					
1. Non-compliance	[87]					
1.1 Non-compliance at the pre-harvest and harvest stage	[88]					

1. Section	2. Paragraph number	3. sentence/row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment (Substantive, Editorial, Translation)	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
1.1 Non-compliance at the pre-harvest and harvest stage	[89]					
1.2 Non-compliance at the post-harvest and shipping stage	[90]					
1.2 Non-compliance at the post-harvest and shipping stage	[91]					
1.3 Non-compliance at entry and distribution	[92]					
1.3 Non-compliance at entry and distribution	[93]					
2. Ongoing verification of the systems approach	[94]					
2. Ongoing verification of the systems approach	[95]					

Template for comments - Draft ISPMs for country consultation, 2010

DRAFT APPENDIX to ISPM 15:2009
SUBMISSION OF NEW TREATMENTS FOR INCLUSION IN ISPM 15

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 (Substantive,Editorial, Translation)	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
<i>GENERAL COMMENTS</i>				* Suggest adopting more than one treatment method. Implement system approach in wood treatment to be applicable and cost effective		
TITLE	[1]					
Introduction	[2]					
Introduction	[3]					
Introduction	[4]					
Introduction	[5]					
Introduction	[6]					
Introduction	[7]					
TABLE 1	[8]					
Introduction	[9]					
Introduction	[10]					
Step 1	[11]					
Step 1	[12]					
Step 1	[13]					
Step 1	[14]					

1. Section	2. Paragraph	3. sentence/row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment (Substantive,Editorial, Translation)	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
Step 1	[15]					
Step 2	[16]					
Step 2	[17]					
Step 2	[18]					
Step 2	[19]					
Step 2	[20]					
Step 2	[21]					
Step 2	[22]					
Step 2	[23]					
Step 3	[24]					
Step 3	[25]					
Step 4	[26]					
Step 4	[27]					
Step 4	[28]					
Step 4	[29]					
Step 5	[30]					
Step 5	[31]					
Assessment of treatment success	[32]					
Assessment of treatment success	[33]	those that may appear moribund may recover	Editorial	those that may appear dead may recover	For more clarity to avoid confusion	RNE COUNTRIES
Submission of treatment for approval	[34]					

1. Section	2. Para nber	3. sentence/ row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment (Substantive,Editorial, Translation)	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
Submission of treatment for approval	[35]					

Template for comments - Draft ISPMs for country consultation, 2010

DRAFT: INTEGRATED MEASURES APPROACH FOR PLANTS FOR PLANTING IN INTERNATIONAL TRADE

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

1. Section	2. Paragraph number	3. sentence/row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment (Substantive, Editorial, Translation)	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
<i>GENERAL COMMENTS</i>						
TITLE						
Contents						
Introduction	[1]					
SCOPE	[2]					
SCOPE	[3]					
REFERENCES	[4]					
REFERENCES	[5]					
REFERENCES	[6]					
REFERENCES	[7]					
REFERENCES	[8]					
REFERENCES	[9]					
REFERENCES	[10]					
REFERENCES	[11]					
REFERENCES	[12]					
REFERENCES	[13]					
Definitions	[14]					

1. Section	2. Paragraph	3. sentence/row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment (Substantive, Editorial, Translation)	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
Definitions	[15]					
Outline of requirements	[16]					
Outline of requirements	[17]					
Outline of requirements	[18]					
Outline of requirements	[19]					
BACKGROUND	[20]					
BACKGROUND	[21]					
BACKGROUND	[22]	Export inspections of consignments of plants for planting has limitations	Editorial	Export inspections of consignments of plants for planting have limitations	Grammatical correction	RNE COUNTRIES
		Some pests may be difficult to detect visually, particularly at low pest population densities.	Editorial	Some pests may be difficult to detect visually, particularly at low pest population densities and at certain life stages	More Clarification	RNE COUNTRIES
BACKGROUND	[23]					
BACKGROUND	[24]					

1. Section	2. Paragraph number	3. sentence/row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment (Substantive,Editorial, Translation)	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
BACKGROUND	[25]					
REQUIREMENTS	[26]					
1. Factors that Affect the Pest Risk of Plants for Planting	[27]					
1. Factors that Affect the Pest Risk of Plants for Planting	[28]					
1. Factors that Affect the Pest Risk of Plants for Planting	[29]					
1.1 Pest factors that affect risk	[30]					
1.1 Pest factors that affect risk	[31]	Pest factors that should be taken into consideration include: type of pest (arthropod, fungus, virus, bacteria etc.)	Substantive Substantive	To add : extent of damage type of pest (arthropod, fungus, virus, bacteria, nematodes, etc.)	More clarificaion	RNE COUNTRIES
1.1 Pest factors that affect risk	[32]					
1.2 Plant-related factors that affect risk	[33]					

1. Section	2. Para nber	3. sentence/ row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment (Substantive,Editorial, Translation)	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
1.2 Plant-related factors that affect risk	[34]	As part of the risk categorization, the initial plant risk factors to be considered are species and area of origin. Within any given species, there is a range of risk associated with the type of plant material moved, as broadly ranked below from lowest to highest risk:	Substantive	To update the list to include, but not limited to: Rhizoms, Offshoots, Corms, Stolones	More clarification	RNE COUNTRIES
1.2 Plant-related factors that affect risk	[35]					
1.2 Plant-related factors that affect risk	[36]					
1.3 Production factors that affect risk	[37]					

1. Section	2. Paragraph number	3. sentence/row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment (Substantive, Editorial, Translation)	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
1.3 Production factors that affect risk	[38]					
1.3 Production factors that affect risk	[39]					
1.3 Production factors that affect risk	[40]					
1.3 Production factors that affect risk	[41]					
1.3 Production factors that affect risk	[42]					
1.4 Intended uses that affect risk	[43]					
1.4 Intended uses that affect risk	[44]					
2. Application of Risk Mitigation Measures	[45]					
2. Application of Risk Mitigation Measures	[46]					
3. Integrated Measures Approach	[47]					
3. Integrated Measures Approach	[48]					
3.1 General integrated measures	[49]					
3.1 General integrated measures	[50]					
3.1.1 Authorization of places of production	[51]					
3.1.1 Authorization of places of production	[52]					

1. Section	2. Paragraph number	3. sentence/row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment (Substantive,Editorial, Translation)	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
3.1.2 Requirements for the place of production	[53]					
3.2 Integrated measures in high-risk situations	[54]					
3.2 Integrated measures in high-risk situations	[55]					
3.2.1 Requirements for the place of production in high-risk situations	[56]					
3.2.1 Requirements for the place of production in high-risk situations	[57]					
3.2.1 Requirements for the place of production in high-risk situations	[58]					
3.2.1.1 Place of production manual	[59]					
3.2.1.1 Place of production manual	[60]					
3.2.1.1 Place of production manual	[61]					
3.2.1.2 Pest management plan	[62]					
3.2.1.2 Pest management plan	[63]					
3.2.1.2 Pest management plan	[64]					

1. Section	2. Para nber	3. sentence/ row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment (Substantive,Editorial, Translation)	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
3.2.1.3 Crop protection specialist	[65]					
3.2.1.3 Crop protection specialist	[66]					
3.2.1.4 Training of employees	[67]					
3.2.1.4 Training of employees	[68]					
3.2.1.5 Examination of plant material	[69]					
3.2.1.5 Examination of plant material	[70]					
3.2.1.6 Packing and transportation	[71]					
3.2.1.6 Packing and transportation	[72]					
3.2.1.7 Internal audits	[73]					
3.2.1.7 Internal audits	[74]					
3.2.1.7 Internal audits	[75]					
3.2.1.7 Internal audits	[76]					
3.2.1.8 Records	[77]					

1. Section	2. Paragraph number	3. sentence/row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment (Substantive,Editorial, Translation)	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
3.2.1.8 Records	[78]					
3.2.2 Non-compliance with requirements for the place of production	[79]					
3.2.2 Non-compliance with requirements for the place of production	[80]					
3.2.2 Non-compliance with requirements for the place of production	[81]					
3.2.2 Non-compliance with requirements for the place of production	[82]					
3.2.2 Non-compliance with requirements for the place of production	[83]					
3.2.2.1 Critical non-compliance	[84]					
3.2.2.1 Critical non-compliance	[85]					
3.2.2.2 Non-critical	[86]					

1. Section	2. Paragraph number	3. sentence/row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment (Substantive,Editorial, Translation)	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
non-compliance						
3.2.2.2 Non-critical non-compliance	[87]					
3.2.2.2 Non-critical non-compliance	[88]					
4. Responsibilities of the NPPO of the Exporting Country	[89]					
4. Responsibilities of the NPPO of the Exporting Country	[90]					
4.1 Establishing integrated measures approaches	[91]					
4.1 Establishing integrated measures approaches	[92]					
4.2 Authorization of places of production	[93]					
4.2 Authorization of places of production	[94]					
4.2 Authorization of places of production	[95]	the place of production complies with the protocols,		Delete phytosanitary		RNE COUNTRIES

1. Section	2. Paragraph number	3. sentence/row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment (Substantive,Editorial, Translation)	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
		procedures and standards specified in its phytosanitary manual				
4.2 Authorization of places of production	[96]					
4.3 Oversight of authorized places of production	[97]					
4.3 Oversight of authorized places of production	[98]					
4.4 Export inspections and issuance of phytosanitary certificates	[99]					
4.4 Export inspections and issuance of phytosanitary certificates	[100]					
4.5 Providing adequate information	[101]					
4.5 Providing adequate information	[102]					
5. Responsibilities of the NPPO of the Importing Country	[103]					
5. Responsibilities of the NPPO of the	[104]					

1. Section	2. Paragraph number	3. sentence/row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment (Substantive,Editorial, Translation)	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
Importing Country						
5. Responsibilities of the NPPO of the Importing Country	[105]	Plants produced under an integrated measures approach may not require intensive import inspection of every consignment	Substantive	Delete the statement	The same meaning is repeated in the following sentence	RNE COUNTRIES
5. Responsibilities of the NPPO of the Importing Country	[106]	The NPPO should notify the NPPO of the exporting country of any non-compliances (see ISPM 13:2001).	Substantive	The NPPO of the importing country should notify the NPPO of the exporting country of any non-compliances (see ISPM 13:2001).		RNE COUNTRIES
5.1 Traceability procedures	[107]					
5.1 Traceability procedures	[108]					

1. Section	2. Paragraph number	3. sentence/row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment (Substantive,Editorial, Translation)	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
5.2 Auditing by the importing NPPO	[109]					
5.2 Auditing by the importing NPPO	[110]					
Appendix 1: Examples of pest management measures to reduce the phytosanitary risk of plants for planting	[111]					
Appendix 1: Examples of pest management measures to reduce the phytosanitary risk of plants for planting	[112]					
Table 1	[113]					
Table 1	[114]					
Table 2	[115]			Point 10 is missing	Correction is needed	RNE COUNTRIES
Appendix 2: Examples of non-compliance	[116]					
Appendix 2: Examples of non-compliance	[117]					
Critical non-compliance	[118]					
Critical non-compliance	[119]					
Non-critical non-compliance	[120]					

1. Section	2. Para nber	3. sentence/ row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment (Substantive,Editorial, Translation)	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
Non-critical non-compliance	[121]					

Template for comments - Draft ISPMs for country consultation, 2010

**DRAFT ANNEX TO ISPM 28:2009
IRRADIATION TREATMENT FOR *CERATITIS CAPITATA***

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

1. Section	2. Paragraph number	3. sentence/row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment (Substantive, Editorial, Translation)	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
GENERAL COMMENTS		The scope of phytosanitary treatments does not include issues related to pesticide registration or other domestic requirements for approval of treatments. Treatments also do not provide information on specific effects on human health or food safety, which should be addressed using domestic procedures prior to approval of a treatment. In addition, potential effects of treatments on product quality are considered for			We recommend to execute a trial to get information about the specific effects on human health, environment and food safety before adopting the Annex	

1. Section	2. Para nber	3. sentence/ row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment (Substantive,Edit orial,Translation)	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
		some host commodities before their international adoption. However, evaluation of any effects of a treatment on the quality of commodities may require additional consideration. There is no obligation for a contracting party to approve, register or adopt the treatments for use in its territory.				
TITLE						
Adoption	[1]					
Adoption	[2]					
Scope of the treatment	[3]					
Scope of the treatment	[4]					
Treatment description	[5]					
Name of treatment	[6]					
Active ingredient	[7]					
Treatment type	[8]					
Target pest	[9]					
Target regulated articles	[10]					
Treatment schedule	[11]					

1. Section	2. Para nber	3. sentence/ row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment (Substantive,Edit orial,Translation)	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
Other relevant information	[12]					
References	[13]					
References	[14]					
References	[15]					
References	[16]					
References	[17]					
References	[18]					
References	[19]					
References	[20]					
References	[21]					
References	[22]					
References	[23]					
References	[24]					

Template for comments - Draft ISPMs for country consultation, 2010

DRAFT ANNEX TO ISPM 27:2010

Plum pox virus

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

1. Section	2. Paragraph number	3. sentence/row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment (Substantive, Editorial, Translation)	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
GENERAL COMMENTS						
TITLE						
Adoption						
Contents						
1. Pest Information	[1]					
1. Pest Information	[2]					
1. Pest Information	[3]					
1. Pest Information	[4]					
1. Pest Information	[5]					
1. Pest Information	[6]					
2. Taxonomic Information	[7]					
3. Detection and Identification	[8]					
3. Detection and Identification	[9]					
3. Detection and Identification	[10]					
3. Detection and Identification	[11]					

1. Section	2. Para nber	3. sentence/ row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment (Substantive,Editor ial,Translation)	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
3.Detection and Identification	[12]					
Figure 1	[13]					
3.Detection and Identification	[14]					
3.Detection and Identification	[15]					
3.1Biological detection and identification	[16]					
3.1Biological detection and identification	[17]					
3.1Biological detection and identification	[18]					
3.2Serological detection and identification	[19]					
3.2Serological detection and identification	[20]					
3.2Serological detection and identification	[21]					
3.2Serological detection and identification	[22]					
3.2Serological detection and identification	[23]					
3.2Serological detection and identification	[24]					
3.2Serological detection and identification	[25]					
3.2Serological detection and identification	[26]					
3.2Serological detection and identification	[27]					

1. Section	2. Para nber	3. sentence/ row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment (Substantive,Editor ial,Translation)	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
3.2Serological detection and identification	[28]					
3.2Serological detection and identification	[29]					
3.3Molecular detection and identification	[30]					
3.3Molecular detection and identification	[31]					
3.3Molecular detection and identification	[32]					
3.3.1Reverse transcription- polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR)	[33]					
3.3.1Reverse transcription- polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR)	[34]					
3.3.1Reverse transcription- polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR)	[35]					
3.3.1Reverse transcription- polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR)	[36]					
1.3 Production factors that affect risk	[37]					
3.3.2 Immunocapture RT-PCR	[38]					
3.3.2 Immunocapture RT-PCR	[39]					

1. Section	2. Paragraph number	3. sentence/row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment (Substantive, Editorial, Translation)	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
3.3.2 Immunocapture RT-PCR	[40]					
3.3.3Co-operational RT-PCR	[41]					
3.3.3Co-operational RT-PCR	[42]					
3.3.3Co-operational RT-PCR	[43]					
3.3.3Co-operational RT-PCR	[44]					
3.3.3Co-operational RT-PCR	[45]					
3.3.4Real-time RT-PCR Mitigation Measures	[46]					
3.3.4Real-time RT-PCR Mitigation Measures	[47]					
3.3.4Real-time RT-PCR Mitigation Measures	[48]					
3.3.4Real-time RT-PCR Mitigation Measures	[49]					
3.3.4Real-time RT-PCR Mitigation Measures	[50]					
3.3.4Real-time RT-PCR Mitigation Measures	[51]					
3.3.4Real-time RT-PCR Mitigation Measures	[52]					

1. Section	2. Paragraph number	3. sentence/row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment (Substantive, Editorial, Translation)	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
3.3.4 Real-time RT-PCR Mitigation Measures	[53]					
3.3.4 Real-time RT-PCR Mitigation Measures	[54]					
3.3.4 Real-time RT-PCR Mitigation Measures	[55]					
3.3.4 Real-time RT-PCR Mitigation Measures	[56]					
4. Identification of Strains	[57]					
4. Identification of Strains	[58]					
4. Identification of Strains	[59]					
Figure 2	[60]					
4. Identification of Strains	[61]					
4.1 Serological identification of strains	[62]					
4.1 Serological identification of strains	[63]					
4.1 Serological identification of strains	[64]					
4.1 Serological identification of strains	[65]					
4.1 Serological identification of strains	[66]					
4.2 Molecular	[67]					

1. Section	2. Paragraph number	3. sentence/row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment (Substantive, Editorial, Translation)	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
identification of strains						
4.2.1 RT-PCR	[68]					
4.2.1 RT-PCR	[69]					
4.2.1 RT-PCR	[70]					
4.2.1 RT-PCR	[71]					
4.2.1 RT-PCR	[72]					
4.2.2 Immunocapture RT-PCR	[73]					
4.2.2 Immunocapture RT-PCR	[74]					
4.2.3 Co-operational RT-PCR	[75]					
4.2.3 Co-operational RT-PCR	[76]					
4.2.3 Co-operational RT-PCR	[77]					
4.2.4 Real-time RT-PCR	[78]					
4.2.4 Real-time RT-PCR	[79]					
4.2.4 Real-time RT-PCR	[80]					
4.2.4 Real-time RT-PCR	[81]					
4.2.4 Real-time RT-PCR	[82]					
4.2.4 Real-time RT-PCR	[83]					
4.2.4 Real-time RT-PCR	[84]					

1. Section	2. Paragraph number	3. sentence/row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment (Substantive, Editorial, Translation)	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
4.2.4 Real-time RT-PCR	[85]					
5. Records	[86]					
5. Records	[87]					
5. Records	[88]					
6.Contact Points for Further Information	[89]					
6.Contact Points for Further Information	[90]					
6.Contact Points for Further Information	[91]					
6.Contact Points for Further Information	[92]					
6.Contact Points for Further Information	[93]					
6.Contact Points for Further Information	[94]					
6.Contact Points for Further Information	[95]					
6.Contact Points for Further Information	[96]					
7.Acknowledgements	[97]					
7.Acknowledgements	[98]					
8. References	[99]				The disease was described as a viral disease in 1932 by Atanasoff.D. 1932 j.univ. of Sofia. Why this is not mentioned in the list of referentes.	
8. References	[100]					

1. Section	2. Paragraph number	3. sentence/row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment (Substantive,Editorial,Translation)	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
8. References	[101]					
8. References	[102]					
8. References	[103]					
8. References	[104]					
8. References	[105]					
8. References	[106]					
8. References	[107]					
8. References	[108]					
8. References	[109]					
8. References	[110]					
8. References	[111]					
8. References	[112]					
8. References	[113]					
8. References	[114]					
8. References	[115]					
8. References	[116]					
8. References	[117]					
8. References	[118]					
8. References	[119]					
8. References	[120]					
8. References	[121]					

