**2009-005: Revision of ISPM 8:1998 Determination of pest status in an area 2012-12-14**

| **Comm. no.**  | **Para. no.**  | **Comment type**  | **Comment**  | **Explanation**  | **Language**  | **Country**  | **Steward's Response**  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1.  | *G*  | Editorial  | I support the document as it is and I have no comments   |    | English  | Jordan, Mexico, Ghana, China |    |
| 2.  | *G*  | Substantive  | Report of any new outbreak of pests in any country should be directed to the NPPO of the country for determination, verification, validation and accuracy before publication (IAPSC directives to member countries)   | To ensure accurate report   | English  | Nigeria  |    |
| 3.  | *G*  | Substantive  | Clear definitions and criteria for determining the status of pests are lacking in this ISPM.﻿   | Taking into consideration the ISPM 5 definition of a quarantine pest (A pest of potential economic importance to the area endangered thereby and not yet present there, or present but not widely distributed and being officially controlled) and the categorization of the status "present" in ISPM 8, it is barely feasible to  draw a clear line between  "not widely and widely distributed" pests.   | English  | Russian Federation  |    |
| 4.  | *G*  | Technical  | Uno de los principales obstaculos para poder aplicar esta norma de manera eficiente es la limitación al acceso de bases de datos canfialbles de caracter técnico y cientifico.    | Lo anterior genera problemas operacionales y técnicos.   | Español  | Colombia  |    |
| 5.  | *1*  | Editorial  |  **Revisión de la NIMF 8:1998 *Determinación de la condición la situación de una plaga en un área* (2009-005)**   | Se sugiere realizar este cambio con fin de generar armonia con la NIMF 5   | Español  | Colombia  |    |
| 6.  | *6*  | Substantive  | ISPM 8:1998 on *Determination of pest status in an area* was adopted by the Interim Commission on Phytosanitary Measures in November 1998. A revision is needed because this standard has not been reviewed since its original adoption and to take into account new guidance in several other standards, mainly on pest free areas, that have been adopted since ISPM 8:1998.   | Standards are due for revision periodically   | English  | United States of America  |    |
| 7.  | *9*  | Editorial  | This standard is not concerned with reporting obligations, but with the quality of the reported information. Accurate reports are an essential part of the international cooperation to facilitate trade.   | ISPM 17 includes the obligation of countries to report on the situation of the pest, which makes it unnecessary to include provisions in this regard   | English  | Costa Rica  |    |
| 8.  | *12*  | Substantive  | (1) review the consistency of ISPM 8:1998 with other relevant and subsequently adopted ISPMs, and with any relevant draft ISPMs under development   | If standards are under development the content may change; therefore it doesn’t make sense to adjust one standard to content that has not yet been agreed upon and which may change.   | English  | United States of America  |    |
| 9.  | *13*  | Editorial  | (2) reviewconsider the existing pest status categories in ISPM 8:1998 and propose new categories if appropriate   | more appropriate wording   | English  | United States of America  |    |
| 10.  | *13*  | Substantive  | (2) consider the existing pest status categories in ISPM 8:1998 and propose new categories if appropriate﻿(3) review the pest status "transient", in particular the category of "Transient: actionable, under eradication" and its relationship to quarantine pests that are present and under official control. Take into account seasonality if appropriate(4) consider the feasability of detailing the pest status categorization "transience" further, e.g. to describe circumstances that may lead to establishment of a pest﻿   | The IRSS questionnaire indicated seasonality was an issue. Paragraph (4) is a transfer from below.   | English  | EPPO, Netherlands, Russian Federation, Morocco, United Kingdom, Slovenia, Belarus  |    |
| 11.  | *13*  | Substantive  | (2) consider the existing pest status categories in ISPM 8:1998 and propose new categories if appropriate    | Need to also consider how official control applies to pest status   | English  | United States of America  |    |
| 12.  | *13*  | Substantive  | (2) consider the existing pest status categories in ISPM 8:1998 and propose new categories and/or sub categories, if appropriate   | After the revision of the existing categories, new sub categories could be added   | English  | Uruguay, COSAVE, Argentina, Brazil, Paraguay, Peru  |    |
| 13.  | *14*  | Editorial  | (35) consider to developping guidance for determining pest status for pests in relation to specific host commodities (the pest is present only on specific hosts)   | Improved english   | English  | EPPO, Netherlands, Russian Federation, Morocco, United Kingdom, Slovenia, Belarus  |    |
| 14.  | *15*  | Editorial  | (64) consider to adding guidance on how to combine the qualifications associated to pest status categories under “present”.   | Improved english   | English  | EPPO, Netherlands, Russian Federation, Morocco, United Kingdom, Slovenia, Belarus  |    |
| 15.  | *15*  | Editorial  | (4) consider to additional guidance on how to combine the qualifications associated withto pest status categories under “present”.   | Grammatical correction   | English  | United States of America  |    |
| 16.  | *16*  | Editorial  | (57) consider whether to provide additional guidance on how to determine pest absence when only very old pest records are available   | Improved english   | English  | EPPO, Netherlands, Russian Federation, Morocco, United Kingdom, Slovenia, Belarus  |    |
| 17.  | *16*  | Substantive  | (5) consider whether to pProvide guidance about time needed for updating pest records and additional guidance to determine pest absence when only very old pest records are available5a: describing how information can be evaluated and described according to quality and validity, including guidance on interpreting the table in ISPM 8, 5b: discuss how uncertainty relates to pest status and pest records including guidance on conflicting opinions, contradictory reports, weight of evidence (multiple corroborating reports vs. single reports)    | These points are related and can be handled under one task. More guidance is needed on these points – ie even if information is considered to come from a less reliable source it is still valid (albeit lower quality) and should not be discarded as evidence. What does need to happen in such cases is that uncertainty should be described. Further, there should be weight given to evidence when multiple independent sources report a pest vs. single unverified reports (regardless of source).   | English  | United States of America  |    |
| 18.  | *16*  | Substantive  | (5) consider whether to provide additional guidance to determine pest absence when only very old pest records are available   | "very old pest records are available". There is need to be explicity here. How old is very old? It would help if numerical years e.g. 5 years and above considered very old   | English  | Zambia  |    |
| 19.  | *17*  | Editorial  | (6) review the pest status “Transient” pest status, in particular the category of “Transient: actionable, under eradication” and its relationship to quarantine pests that are present and under official control.   | more appropriate wording   | English  | United States of America  |    |
| 20.  | *17*  | Substantive  | (6) review the pest status “Transient”, in particular the category of “Transient: actionable, under eradication” and its relationship to quarantine pests that are present and under official control.   | Clarity is required pertaining to the reason/s why the pest status “Transient: actionable, under eradication” is being reviewed.   | English  | South Africa  |    |
| 21.  | *17*  | Technical  | (6) review the pest status “Transient”, in particular the category of “Transient: actionable, under eradication” and its relationship to quarantine pests that are present and under official control.   | transfered to point above.   | English  | EPPO, Netherlands, Russian Federation, Morocco, United Kingdom, Slovenia, Belarus  |    |
| 22.  | *18*  | Technical  | (7) consider the feasibility of detailing the pest status categorization ”transience” further, e.g. to describe more precisely whether a particular pest outbreak may lead to establishment or not   | According to ISPM 5, transience is "presence of a pest that is not expected to lead to establishment". It is therefore not clear how transience can be further described for situations leading to establishment and not leading to establishment. This paragraph has been moved above.   | English  | EPPO, Russian Federation, Morocco, United Kingdom, Slovenia, Belarus, Netherlands  |    |
| 23.  | *19*  | Editorial  | (8) consider including text to explain how NPPOs may consider the pest status in the particular situation where a pest is presentcurated only in collections (e.g. botanical gardens)   | Deletion of the word “present” and insertion of the word “curated”. The reason being that the pest might not be present in the country but only in collection Centres.   | English  | South Africa  |    |
| 24.  | *19*  | Technical  | (8) consider including text to explain how NPPOs may consider the pest status in the particular situation where a pest is present only in living collections (e.g. botanical gardens)   | Avoid the word ‘collections’ being considered as all-encompassing to include museum and herbarium collections etc   | English  | EPPO, Netherlands, Russian Federation, Morocco, United Kingdom, Slovenia, Belarus  |    |
| 25.  | *20*  | Editorial  | (9) consider including text to explain how NPPO may consider the pest status for plants that are grown or kept under protected conditions only, and which the NPPO has determined cannot survive outdoors in the PRA area   | Addition of the word “which”; reason being that it provide clarity to the sentence.   | English  | South Africa  |    |
| 26.  | *20*  | Substantive  | (9) consider including text to explain how an NPPO may consider the pest status for plants that are grown or kept under protected conditions only, and which the NPPO has determined cannot survive outdoors in the relevant area(s) of their countryin the PRA area   | This seems to have been a cut and paste from ISPM 11, and it was not completely accurate.   | English  | EPPO, Netherlands, Russian Federation, Morocco, United Kingdom, Slovenia, Belarus  |    |
| 27.  | *20*  | Substantive  | (9) consider iIncludeing text to explain how NPPO may consider the pest status for plants that are grown or kept under protected conditions only, and the NPPO has determined cannot survive outdoors in the PRA area   | “protected conditions” can mean different things --- may mean for instance under greenhouse production which is “protected conditions” or it may mean “under containment” where an organism is in a secure facility for research purposes. A country may have a quarantine pest present under containment for research purposes but this would not constitute “present” in that country. On the other hand, even if a pest is present under “protected conditions” and couldn’t survive outdoors it could still pose a risk to another country importing products from that country if such products were coming from places with “protected conditions”. Suggest that there is some more explanation provided as to what exactly is meant by this point.   | English  | United States of America  |    |
| 28.  | *21*  | Editorial  | (10) consider pProvideing recommendations as to the use and meaning of the terms ”finding of a pest” and ”pest is not known to occur”, as often used in pest reports   | more appropriate wording   | English  | United States of America  |    |
| 29.  | *21*  | Substantive  | (10) consider providing recommendations as to the use and meaning of the terms ”finding of a pest” and ”pest is not known not to occur”, as often used in pest reports   | The wording most often found has been indicated.   | English  | EPPO, Netherlands, Russian Federation, Morocco, United Kingdom, Slovenia, Belarus  |    |
| 30.  | *21*  | Substantive  | (10) consider providing recommendations as to the use and meaning of the terms ”finding of a pest”, and ”pest is not known to occur” and "world wide distribution", as often used in pest reports   | The term "world wide distribution" is often used on PRAs as a reference to support the presence of the pest in a country. A reference of this term should be included in this specification   | English  | Uruguay, COSAVE ,Argentina, Brazil, Paraguay, Peru |    |
| 31.  | *22*  | Substantive  | (11) consider adding guidance about the time needed for updating pest records or whether to recommend that NPPOs allow sufficient time to keep pest records up to date.   | This wording is suggested to avoid precising that updating pest records should be updated in less than an hour, for instance.   | English  | EPPO, Netherlands, Russian Federation, Morocco, United Kingdom, Slovenia, Belarus  |    |
| 32.  | *22*  | Substantive  | (11) consider adding guidance about time needed for updating pest records    | Related to comments in paragraph 13   | English  | United States of America  |    |
| 33.  | *22*  | Technical  | (11) consider adding guidance about time needed for updating pest records    | Unclarity, what is meant here as time needed to update a pest record? Time needed to write one or time after which a pest record should be updated?   | English  | Netherlands  |    |
| 34.  | *23*  | Substantive  | (12) consider adding more guidance on factors to determine validity of pest records to those already given in the current standard   | "factors to determine validity" are already covered under section 2 in ISPM 8. EWG should determine if more guidance is needed.    | English  | United States of America  |    |
| 35.  | *24*  | Editorial  | (13) include and update terms since adopted afterthe adoption of ISPM 8:1998   | more appropriate wording   | English  | United States of America  |    |
| 36.  | *26*  | Substantive  | (15) identify other relevant points to be updated﻿﻿Discuss the influence of an interception at import on the pest status of teh country of origin, especially when the pest status in the country of origin is absent.   | Additional point identified for the update.   | English  | Netherlands  |    |
| 37.  | *27*  | Substantive  | (16) consider implementation of the standard by contracting parties and identify potential operational and technical implementation issues. Provide information and possible recommendations on these issues to the SC   | As this standard has been in place for many years, there wouldn’t be “potential” operational issues – there would be issues that have already arisen.   | English  | United States of America  |    |
| 38.  | *35*  | Substantive  | Five to seven phytosanitary experts with collective expertise on phytosanitary systems, PRA, experience in interpreting evidence, the development and implementation of ISPMs and surveillance, monitoring or eradication programs for regulated pests.   | This is relevant experience that should be considered   | English  | United States of America  |    |
| 39.  | *35*  | Technical  | Five to seven phytosanitary experts with collective expertise on phytosanitary systems, the development and implementation of ISPMs and surveillance, monitoring or eradication programs for regulated pests, determining pest status, verifying or maintaining pest records..   | Clarification   | English  | EPPO, Netherlands, Russian Federation, Morocco, United Kingdom, Slovenia, Belarus  |    |