

Ink amendments noted by CPM-10 in 2015 (CPM 2015/05, Attachment 1), translated into Spanish by the IPPC Secretariat in 2015 and reviewed by the LRG for Spanish (deletions are not translated). Incorporated into the concerned standards, published in January 2016.

At the beginning of the column “reasons”, between square brackets, are indicated the ISPMs cross-referred in the paragraph that have been revised, or are under revision, to mark clearly which cross-references need to be changed to allow replacement of old versions, which ones will come up soon, and others.

ISPM	No.	Location reference	of Ref.ISPM	Current text	Proposed revision	Reasons
ISPM 5 Glossary of Phytosanitary Terms						
5	1.	References		<p>CBD. 2000. <i>Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety to the Convention on Biological Diversity</i>. Montreal, CBD.</p> <p>CEPM. 1996. <i>Report of the Third Meeting of the FAO Committee of Experts on Phytosanitary Measures, Rome, 13–17 May 1996</i>. Rome, IPPC, FAO.</p> <p>— 1999. <i>Report of the Sixth Meeting of the Committee of Experts on Phytosanitary Measures, Rome, Italy: 17–21 May 1999</i>. Rome, IPPC, FAO.</p> <p>CPM. 2007. <i>Report of the Second Session of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures, Rome, 26–30 March 2007</i>. Rome, IPPC, FAO.</p> <p>— 2008. <i>Report of the Third Session of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures, Rome, 7–11 April 2008</i>. Rome, IPPC, FAO.</p> <p>— 2009. <i>Report of the Fourth Session of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures, Rome, 30 March–3 April 2009</i>. Rome, IPPC, FAO.</p> <p>— 2010. <i>Report of the Fifth Session of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures, Rome, 22–26 March 2010</i>. Rome, IPPC, FAO.</p>	<p><u>The references below correspond to the approval of terms and definitions, as indicated in the definitions. For ISPMs, they do NOT indicate the most recent version (which is available on the IPP at https://www.ippc.int/core-activities/standards-setting/ispm5)</u></p> <p>CBD. 2000. <i>Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety to the Convention on Biological Diversity</i>. Montreal, CBD.</p> <p>CEPM. 1996. <i>Report of the Third Meeting of the FAO Committee of Experts on Phytosanitary Measures, Rome, 13–17 May 1996</i>. Rome, IPPC, FAO.</p> <p>— <u>1997. <i>Report of the Fourth Meeting of the FAO Committee of Experts on Phytosanitary Measures, Rome, 6-10 October 1997</i>. Rome, IPPC, FAO.</u></p> <p>— 1999. <i>Report of the Sixth Meeting of the Committee of Experts on Phytosanitary Measures, Rome, Italy: 17–21 May 1999</i>. Rome, IPPC, FAO.</p> <p>CPM. 2007. <i>Report of the Second Session of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures, Rome, 26–30 March 2007</i>. Rome, IPPC, FAO.</p>	<p>The reference section of ISPM 5 lists only sources of approval of terms and definitions (those indicated between [] at the end of the definitions). Standards referred to in supplements and annex 1 are referenced in those.</p> <p>It is proposed that all sources are maintained here, and that this does not prevent replacement of old versions that have been revised (e.g. ISPMs 11 and 15). However, some adjustments are proposed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a paragraph to clarify the nature of the references - this section was not consistently updated when terms were deleted. Several references to CPM, ICPM or ISPMs are not anymore in ISPM 5 and were deleted. - the mention that a standard was revised is not relevant as this list is only about sources of adoption. Such mentions were deleted - A few references were missing and were added. <p>Note: It would not make sense to refer to ISPMs collectively in this case. An</p>

ISP M	No.	Location reference	of	Ref.ISP M	Current text	Proposed revision	Reasons
					<p>— 2012. <i>Report of the Seventh Session of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures, Rome, 19–23 March 2012.</i> Rome, IPPC, FAO.</p> <p>FAO. 1990. <i>FAO Glossary of phytosanitary terms. FAO Plant Protection Bulletin</i>, 38(1): 5–23. [current equivalent: ISPM 5]</p> <p>FAO. 1995. <i>See ISPM 5:1995.</i></p> <p>ICPM. 1998. <i>Report of the Interim Commission on Phytosanitary Measures, Rome, 3–6 November 1998.</i> Rome, IPPC, FAO.</p> <p>— 2001. <i>Report of the Third Interim Commission on Phytosanitary Measures, Rome, 2–6 April 2001.</i> Rome, IPPC, FAO.</p> <p>— 2002. <i>Report of the Fourth Interim Commission on Phytosanitary Measures, Rome, 11–15 March 2002.</i> Rome, IPPC, FAO.</p> <p>— 2003. <i>Report of the Fifth Interim Commission on Phytosanitary Measures, Rome, 07–11 April 2003.</i> Rome, IPPC, FAO.</p> <p>— 2004. <i>Report of the Sixth Interim Commission on Phytosanitary Measures, Rome, 29 March–02 April 2004.</i> Rome, IPPC, FAO.</p> <p>— 2005. <i>Report of the Seventh Interim Commission on Phytosanitary Measures, Rome, 4–7 April 2005.</i> Rome, IPPC, FAO.</p> <p>IPPC. 1997. <i>International Plant Protection Convention.</i> Rome, IPPC, FAO.</p> <p>ISO/IEC. 1991. <i>ISO/IEC Guide 2:1991, General terms and their definitions concerning standardization and related activities.</i> Geneva, International</p>	<p>— 2008. <i>Report of the Third Session of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures, Rome, 7–11 April 2008.</i> Rome, IPPC, FAO.</p> <p>— 2009. <i>Report of the Fourth Session of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures, Rome, 30 March–3 April 2009.</i> Rome, IPPC, FAO.</p> <p>— 2010. <i>Report of the Fifth Session of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures, Rome, 22–26 March 2010.</i> Rome, IPPC, FAO.</p> <p>— 2012. <i>Report of the Seventh Session of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures, Rome, 19–23 March 2012.</i> Rome, IPPC, FAO.</p> <p>FAO. 1990. <i>FAO Glossary of phytosanitary terms. FAO Plant Protection Bulletin</i>, 38(1): 5–23. [current equivalent: ISPM 5]</p> <p>FAO. 1995. <i>See ISPM 5:1995.</i></p> <p>ICPM. 1998. <i>Report of the Interim Commission on Phytosanitary Measures, Rome, 3–6 November 1998.</i> Rome, IPPC, FAO.</p> <p>— 2001. <i>Report of the Third Interim Commission on Phytosanitary Measures, Rome, 2–6 April 2001.</i> Rome, IPPC, FAO.</p> <p>— 2002. <i>Report of the Fourth Interim Commission on Phytosanitary Measures, Rome, 11–15 March 2002.</i> Rome, IPPC, FAO.</p> <p>— 2003. <i>Report of the Fifth Interim Commission on Phytosanitary Measures, Rome, 07–11 April 2003.</i> Rome, IPPC, FAO.</p> <p>— 2004. <i>Report of the Sixth Interim Commission on Phytosanitary Measures,</i></p>	<p>alternative would have been to delete the references and decide what to do with the sources indicated between square brackets in each definition. However, these are believed to be useful and this alternative has not been retained.</p>

ISPM	No.	Location reference	of	Ref.ISPM	Current text	Proposed revision	Reasons
					<p>Organization for Standardization, International Electrotechnical Commission.</p> <p>ISPM 2. 1995. <i>Guidelines for pest risk analysis</i>. Rome, IPPC, FAO. [published 1996] [revised; now ISPM 2: 2007]</p> <p>ISPM 2. 2007. <i>Framework for pest risk analysis</i>. Rome, IPPC, FAO.</p> <p>ISPM 3. 1995. <i>Code of conduct for the import and release of exotic biological control agents</i>. Rome, IPPC, FAO. [published 1996] [revised; now ISPM 3: 2005]</p> <p>ISPM 3. 2005. <i>Guidelines for the export, shipment, import and release of biological control agents and other beneficial organisms</i>. Rome, IPPC, FAO.</p> <p>ISPM 4. 1995. <i>Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas</i>. Rome, IPPC, FAO. [published 1996]</p> <p>ISPM 5. 1995. <i>Glossary of phytosanitary terms</i>. Rome, IPPC, FAO. [published 1996]</p> <p>ISPM 6. 1997. <i>Guidelines for surveillance</i>. Rome, IPPC, FAO.</p> <p>ISPM 7. 1997. <i>Export certification system</i>. Rome, IPPC, FAO.</p> <p>ISPM 8. 1998. <i>Determination of pest status in an area</i>. Rome, IPPC, FAO.</p> <p>ISPM 9. 1998. <i>Guidelines for pest eradication programmes</i>. Rome, IPPC, FAO.</p> <p>ISPM 10. 1999. <i>Requirements for the establishment of pest free places of production and pest free production sites</i>. Rome, IPPC, FAO.</p>	<p>Rome, 29 March–02 April 2004. Rome, IPPC, FAO.</p> <p>— 2005. <i>Report of the Seventh Interim Commission on Phytosanitary Measures, Rome, 4–7 April 2005</i>. Rome, IPPC, FAO.</p> <p>IPPC. 1997. <i>International Plant Protection Convention</i>. Rome, IPPC, FAO.</p> <p>ISO/IEC. 1991. <i>ISO/IEC Guide 2:1991, General terms and their definitions concerning standardization and related activities</i>. Geneva, International Organization for Standardization, International Electrotechnical Commission.</p> <p>ISPM 2. 1995. <i>Guidelines for pest risk analysis</i>. Rome, IPPC, FAO. [published 1996] [revised; now ISPM 2: 2007]</p> <p>ISPM 2. 2007. <i>Framework for pest risk analysis</i>. Rome, IPPC, FAO.</p> <p>ISPM 3. 1995. <i>Code of conduct for the import and release of exotic biological control agents</i>. Rome, IPPC, FAO. [published 1996] [revised; now ISPM 3: 2005]</p> <p>ISPM 3. 2005. <i>Guidelines for the export, shipment, import and release of biological control agents and other beneficial organisms</i>. Rome, IPPC, FAO.</p> <p>ISPM 4. 1995. <i>Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas</i>. Rome, IPPC, FAO. [published 1996]</p> <p>ISPM 5. 1995. <i>Glossary of phytosanitary terms</i>. Rome, IPPC, FAO. [published 1996]</p> <p>ISPM 6. 1997. <i>Guidelines for surveillance</i>. Rome, IPPC, FAO.</p> <p>ISPM 7. 1997. <i>Export certification system</i>. Rome, IPPC, FAO.</p> <p>ISPM 8. 1998. <i>Determination of pest status in an area</i>. Rome, IPPC, FAO.</p>	

ISPM	No.	Location reference	of	Ref.ISPM	Current text	Proposed revision	Reasons
					<p>ISPM 11. 2001. <i>Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests.</i> Rome, IPPC, FAO. [revised; now ISPM 11:2004]</p> <p>ISPM 11. 2004. <i>Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests including analysis of environmental risks and living modified organisms.</i> Rome, IPPC, FAO.</p> <p>ISPM 12. 2001. <i>Guidelines for phytosanitary certificates.</i> Rome, IPPC, FAO.</p> <p>ISPM 13. 2001. <i>Guidelines for the notification of non-compliance and emergency action.</i> Rome, IPPC, FAO.</p> <p>ISPM 14. 2002. <i>The use of integrated measures in a systems approach for pest risk management.</i> Rome, IPPC, FAO.</p> <p>ISPM 15. 2002. <i>Guidelines for regulating wood packaging material in international trade.</i> Rome, IPPC, FAO. [revised; now ISPM 15:2009]</p> <p>ISPM 16. 2002. <i>Regulated non-quarantine pests: concept and application.</i> Rome, IPPC, FAO.</p> <p>ISPM 18. 2003. <i>Guidelines for the use of irradiation as a phytosanitary measure.</i> Rome, IPPC, FAO.</p> <p>ISPM 20. 2004. <i>Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system.</i> Rome, IPPC, FAO.</p> <p>ISPM 22. 2005. <i>Requirements for the establishment of areas of low pest prevalence.</i> Rome, IPPC, FAO.</p> <p>ISPM 23. 2005. <i>Guidelines for inspection.</i> Rome, IPPC, FAO.</p> <p>ISPM 24. 2005. <i>Guidelines for the determination and recognition of</i></p>	<p>ISPM 9. 1998. <i>Guidelines for pest eradication programmes.</i> Rome, IPPC, FAO.</p> <p>ISPM 10. 1999. <i>Requirements for the establishment of pest free places of production and pest free production sites.</i> Rome, IPPC, FAO.</p> <p>ISPM 11. 2001. <i>Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests.</i> Rome, IPPC, FAO. [revised; now ISPM 11:2004]</p> <p>ISPM 11. 2004. <i>Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests including analysis of environmental risks and living modified organisms.</i> Rome, IPPC, FAO.</p> <p>ISPM 12. 2001. <i>Guidelines for phytosanitary certificates.</i> Rome, IPPC, FAO.</p> <p>ISPM 13. 2001. <i>Guidelines for the notification of non-compliance and emergency action.</i> Rome, IPPC, FAO.</p> <p>ISPM 14. 2002. <i>The use of integrated measures in a systems approach for pest risk management.</i> Rome, IPPC, FAO.</p> <p>ISPM 15. 2002. <i>Guidelines for regulating wood packaging material in international trade.</i> Rome, IPPC, FAO. [revised; now ISPM 15:2009]</p> <p>ISPM 15. 2002. <i>Guidelines for regulating wood packaging material in international trade.</i> Rome, IPPC, FAO. [revised; now ISPM 15:2009]</p> <p>ISPM 16. 2002. <i>Regulated non-quarantine pests: concept and application.</i> Rome, IPPC, FAO.</p> <p>ISPM 17. 2002. <i>Pest reporting.</i> Rome, IPPC, FAO.</p> <p>ISPM 18. 2003. <i>Guidelines for the use of irradiation as a phytosanitary measure.</i> Rome, IPPC, FAO.</p> <p>ISPM 20. 2004. <i>Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system.</i> Rome, IPPC, FAO.</p>	

ISPM	No.	Location reference	of	Ref.ISPM	Current text	Proposed revision	Reasons
					<p><i>equivalence of phytosanitary measures.</i> Rome, IPPC, FAO.</p> <p>ISPM 25. 2006. <i>Consignments in transit.</i> Rome, IPPC, FAO.</p> <p>ISPM 27. 2006. <i>Diagnostic protocols for regulated pests.</i> Rome, IPPC, FAO.</p> <p>ISPM 28. 2007. <i>Phytosanitary treatments for regulated pests.</i> Rome, IPPC, FAO.</p> <p>WTO. 1994. <i>Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures.</i> Geneva, World Trade Organization.</p>	<p>ISPM 22. 2005. <i>Requirements for the establishment of areas of low pest prevalence.</i> Rome, IPPC, FAO.</p> <p>ISPM 23. 2005. <i>Guidelines for inspection.</i> Rome, IPPC, FAO.</p> <p>ISPM 24. 2005. <i>Guidelines for the determination and recognition of equivalence of phytosanitary measures.</i> Rome, IPPC, FAO.</p> <p>ISPM 25. 2006. <i>Consignments in transit.</i> Rome, IPPC, FAO.</p> <p>ISPM 27. 2006. <i>Diagnostic protocols for regulated pests.</i> Rome, IPPC, FAO.</p> <p>ISPM 28. 2007. <i>Phytosanitary treatments for regulated pests.</i> Rome, IPPC, FAO.</p> <p>WTO. 1994. <i>Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures.</i> Geneva, World Trade Organization.</p>	
	2.						For translation, refer to ISPM 5 sent for LRG review, 2015/16.
ISPM 7 Phytosanitary certification system							
7	3.	3.2 Information on phytosanitary import requirements		20	Phytosanitary certification should be based on official information from the importing country. The NPPO of the exporting country should, to the extent possible, have available current official information concerning the phytosanitary import requirements of relevant importing countries. Such information should be made available in accordance with Article VII.2(b), VII.2(d) and VII.2(i) of the IPPC and ISPM 20:2004, section 5.1.9.2.	Phytosanitary certification should be based on official information from the importing country. The NPPO of the exporting country should, to the extent possible, have available current official information concerning the phytosanitary import requirements of relevant importing countries. Such information should be made available in accordance with Article VII.2(b), VII.2(d) and VII.2(i) of the IPPC and ISPM 20 (elements on dissemination of established regulations):2004, section 5.1.9.2.	Specific cross-reference. Proposal refers to the content of the section, which is likely to still be in the standard even if ISPM 20 is revised, rather to the section number.
	4.					La certificación fitosanitaria debería basarse en la información oficial del país importador. La ONPF del país exportador debería, en la medida de lo posible, contar con información oficial actualizada sobre los requisitos fitosanitarios de importación de los países importadores	

ISPM	No.	Location reference	of	Ref.ISPM	Current text	Proposed revision	Reasons
						pertinentes. Dicha información debería ponerse a disposición en conformidad con los párrafos 2(b), 2(d) y 2(i) del Artículo VII de la CIPF y la NIMF 20 (elementos sobre la difusión de los <u>las</u> reglamentaciones <u>establecidas</u>).	
ISPM 8 Determination of pest status in an area							
8	5.	Appendix 1, Useful references, under "Nomenclature, Terminology and General Taxonomy"		5	ISPM 5. <i>Glossary of phytosanitary terms.</i> Rome, IPPC, FAO. (Arabic/Chinese/English/French/Spanish)	ISPM 5. <i>Glossary of phytosanitary terms.</i> Rome, IPPC, FAO. (Arabic/Chinese/English/French/Spanish/ <u>Russian</u>)	In this specific case, the reference is useful and Russian should be added
	6.					NIMF 5. <i>Glosario de términos fitosanitarios</i> 1997. NIMF n.º 5, FAO, Roma. CIPF. FAO Italia (árabe/chino/francés/español/inglés/ruso).	
ISPM 11 Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests							
11	7.	2.1.1.3 Regulatory status, 2nd parag.		5 Suppl 1 (previous)	S1 Official control of pests presenting an environmental risk may involve agencies other than the NPPO. However, it is recognized that ISPM 5 Supplement 1 (<i>Guidelines on the interpretation and application of the concept of official control for regulated pests</i>), in particular section 5.7, applies.	S1 Official control of pests presenting an environmental risk may involve agencies other than the NPPO. However, it is recognized that ISPM 5 Supplement 1 (<i>Guidelines on the interpretation and application of the concepts of "official control" and "not widely distributed"</i>), in particular section 5.7, <u>applies, in particular its provisions regarding NPPO authority and involvement in official control.</u>	[ISPMs revised since: Suppl. 1] Supplement 1 to ISPM 5 was revised in 2012. The title and the structure changed. Section 5.7 became section 2.7, but kept the same content and title. It is proposed to refer to the title (reflecting the content) rather than section numbers.
	8.					El control oficial de las plagas que presentan un riesgo ambiental, pueden intervenir organismos <u>agencias distintas</u> de las ONPF. Sin embargo, hay que se reconocer <u>que es aplicable</u> el Suplemento 1 de la NIMF 5 (<i>Directrices sobre la interpretación y aplicación de los conceptos de "control oficial" y "no ampliamente distribuida"</i>), que trata sobre el control oficial, en particular las disposiciones relativas a la autoridad de la ONPF sección 5.7 y la participación en el control oficial.	
ISPM 15 Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade							

ISPM	No.	Location of reference	Ref.ISPM	Current text	Proposed revision	Reasons
15	9.	4.6 Phytosanitary measures for non-compliance at point of entry, 1st parag.	13, 20	- Relevant information on non-compliance and emergency action is provided in sections 5.1.6.1 to 5.1.6.3 of ISPM 20:2004, and in ISPM 13:2001. Taking into account the frequent re-use of wood packaging material, NPPOs should consider that the non-compliance identified may have arisen in the country of production, repair or remanufacture, rather than in the country of export or transit.	- Relevant information on non-compliance and emergency action is provided in sections 5.1.6.1 to 5.1.6.3 of ISPM 20:2004 , and in ISPM 13:2001. Taking into account the frequent re-use of wood packaging material, NPPOs should consider that the non-compliance identified may have arisen in the country of production, repair or remanufacture, rather than in the country of export or transit.	General cross-reference to ISPM 13, on notification of non-compliance and emergency action. However, in ISPM 20, “non-compliance and emergency actions” is the title of section 5.1.6. Sections 5.1.6.1 to 5.1.6.3 deal with actions in case of non-compliance, emergency action, reporting of non-compliance and emergency action. Apparently ISPM 15 did not mean to refer to section 5.1.6.4 of ISPM 20 (Withdrawal or modification of phytosanitary regulation). Deletion of the section numbers is proposed, as the information referred to is easy to find in ISPM 20.
ISPM 19 Guidelines on lists of regulated pests						
19	10.	1. Basis for Lists of Regulated Pests, 4th parag.	12 (previous)	The availability of lists of regulated pests assists exporting contracting parties to issue phytosanitary certificates correctly. In instances where a list of regulated pests is not supplied by the importing contracting party, the exporting contracting party can only certify for pests it believes to be of regulatory concern (see ISPM 12:2001, section 2.1).	The availability of lists of regulated pests assists exporting contracting parties to issue phytosanitary certificates correctly. In instances where a list of regulated pests is not supplied by the importing contracting party, the exporting contracting party can only certify for pests it believes to be of phytosanitary regulatory concern (see ISPM 12 in relation to certifying statements:2001, section 2.4).	[ISPMs revised since: 12] Specific cross-reference. “Regulatory concern” was changed to “phytosanitary concern” when ISPM 12 was revised, and is adjusted here for consistency. A specific reference would be helpful as it relates to one item in ISPM 12. However, the section number (previously 2.1, now 5) is not helpful, as it is a long section, and a reference to the certifying statement was added
	11.				La disponibilidad de las listas de plagas reglamentadas ayuda a las partes contratantes exportadoras a expedir correctamente los Certificados Fitosanitarios. Cuando la parte contratante importadora no suministre una lista de plagas reglamentadas, la parte contratante exportadora sólo puede expedir un certificado certificar para las plagas que considere que tienen interés desde el punto de	Additional translation adjustment to align with English version.

ISPM	No.	Location reference	of	Ref.ISPM	Current text	Proposed revision	Reasons
						vista reglamentario fitosanitario (véase la NIMF n.º 12: Directrices para los certificados fitosanitarios, sección 2.1 en relación con las declaraciones de certificación).	
ISPM 22 Requirements for the establishment of areas of low pest prevalence							
22	12.	3.1.4.3 Reducing the risk of entry of specified pest(s), 1st parag.		20	In cases where an ALPP is established for a regulated pest, phytosanitary measures may be required to reduce the risk of entry of the specified pests into the ALPP (ISPM 20:2004). These may include:	In cases where an ALPP is established for a regulated pest, phytosanitary measures may be required to reduce the risk of entry of the specified pests into the ALPP (ISPM 20:2004). These may include:	The reference seems superfluous as it is not clear which aspect of ISPM 20 it refers to (ISPM 20 does not deal with this directly, and it is ISPM 22 which is making requirements for ALPPs).
22	13.	3.3 Change in the status of an area of low pest prevalence, last parag.		17	If the ALPP is being used for export purposes, the importing country may require that such situations and associated activities are reported to it. Additional guidance is provided by ISPM 17:2002. Furthermore, a corrective action plan may be agreed to between the importing and exporting countries.	If the ALPP is being used for export purposes, the importing country may require that such situations and associated activities are reported to it. Additional guidance is provided by ISPM 17: 2002 <u>in the section on other pest reports</u> . Furthermore, a corrective action plan may be agreed to between the importing and exporting countries.	It is unclear what this refers to, or what guidance is provided by ISPM 17. The only section that seem to relate to this aspect is about "other pest reports", which comes after all the other aspects of "obligatory" pest reporting. If this is the case, then lack of specific cross-reference makes it difficult to understand what is meant.
	14.					Si el ABPP se utiliza para fines <u>propósitos</u> de exportación, el país importador podrá exigir <u>requerir</u> que se les reporten tales situaciones y actividades relacionadas <u>asociadas</u> . En la NIMF n.º 17 (Notificación de plagas), <u>en la sección sobre otras notificaciones de plagas</u> , se ofrece orientación adicional. Además, el país importador y el país exportador podrán convenir <u>acordar</u> un plan de acción <u>correctiva</u> .	Additional translation adjustment to align with English version.
ISPM 26 Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)							
26	15.	4th parag.		8	In areas where the fruit flies concerned are not capable of establishment because of climatic, geographical or other reasons, absence should be recognized according to the first paragraph of section 3.1.2 of ISPM 8:1998. If, however, the fruit flies are detected and can cause economic damage during a season (Article	In areas where the fruit flies concerned are not capable of establishment because of climatic, geographical or other reasons, <u>there should be no records of presence and it may be reasonable to conclude that the pest is absent</u> it should be recognized according to the first paragraph of section 3.1.2 of (ISPM 8):1998 . If, however, the	[ISPMs under revision: 8] Specific cross-reference, not clear as such, nor how it relates to the second paragraph of the section mentioned. To avoid the specific reference, some rewording is proposed, adapted from the first paragraph of section 3.1.2 of

ISPM	No.	Location reference	of	Ref.ISPM	Current text	Proposed revision	Reasons
					VII.3 of the IPPC), corrective actions should be applied in order to allow the maintenance of a FF-PFA.	fruit flies are detected and can cause economic damage during a season (Article VII.3 of the IPPC), corrective actions should be applied in order to allow the maintenance of a FF-PFA.	ISPM 8. The section is likely to change in the revised ISPM 8, but the general concept will probably remain (i.e. reasonable to conclude that the pest is absent when there are no records of presence in general surveillance data) – if not, this standard will need to be changed.
	16.					En las áreas en donde las moscas de la fruta de interés no son capaces de establecerse debido a razones climáticas, geográficas u otras, <u>no debería haber registros de presencia y puede resultar razonable concluir que la plaga está ausente</u> debería reconocerse la ausencia conforme al primer párrafo del apartado 3.1.2 de la NIMF n.º 8 (Determinación del estatus de una plaga en un área). Sin embargo, si se detectan moscas de la fruta y pueden causar <u>daños económicos</u> durante una temporada (Artículo VII.3 de la CIPF), deberían aplicarse acciones correctivas con el fin de mantener el ALP-MF.	Additional translation adjustment to align with English version.
26	17.	5th parag.		8	In areas where the fruit flies are capable of establishment and known to be absent, general surveillance in accordance with section 3.1.2 of ISPM 8:1998 is normally sufficient for the purpose of delimiting and establishing a pest free area. Where appropriate, import requirements and/or domestic movement restrictions against the introduction of the relevant fruit fly species into the area may be required to maintain the area free from the pest.	In areas where the fruit flies are capable of establishment and known to be absent, general surveillance in accordance with section 3.1.2 of ISPM 8:1998 is normally sufficient for the purpose of delimiting and establishing a pest free area. Where appropriate, import requirements and/or domestic movement restrictions against the introduction of the relevant fruit fly species into the area may be required to maintain the area free from the pest.	[ISPMs under revision: 8] Specific cross-reference to absence/general surveillance in ISPM 8. The section that mentions general surveillance in ISPM 8 is easy to find, and therefore does not need to be mentioned.
		ISPM 27 Diagnostic protocols for regulated pests					
27	18.	APPENDIX 2					It is proposed that this appendix be deleted (see main text)
		ISPM 28 Phytosanitary treatments for regulated pests					

ISPM	No.	Location reference of	Ref.ISPM	Current text	Proposed revision	Reasons
28	19.	APPENDIX 1				It is proposed that this appendix be deleted (to be maintained by the Secretariat on the IPP – see main text)
ISPM 29 Recognition of pest free areas and areas of low pest prevalence						
29	20.	1. General Considerations, parag. 2 to 7	1, 4, 8, 10, 22, 26	<p>ISPM 1:2006 includes operational principles on recognition of PFAs and ALPPs (sections 2.3 and 2.14).</p> <p>ISPM 4:1995 points out that, since certain PFAs are likely to involve an agreement between trading partners, their implementation would need to be reviewed and evaluated by the national plant protection organization (NPPO) of the importing country (section 2.3.4).</p> <p>ISPM 8:1998 provides guidance on the use of the phrase “pest free area declared” in pest records (section 3.1.2).</p> <p>ISPM 10:1999 describes the requirements for the establishment and use of pest free places of production and pest free production sites as risk management options for meeting phytosanitary requirements for the import of plants, plant products and other regulated articles.</p> <p>ISPM 22:2005 describes the requirements and procedures for the establishment of ALPPs for regulated pests in an area and, to facilitate export, for pests regulated by an importing country only. This includes the identification, verification, maintenance and use of those ALPPs.</p> <p>ISPM 26:2006 describes the requirements for the establishment and maintenance of PFAs for the economically important species in the family Tephritidae.</p>	<p>ISPM 1:2006 includes operational principles on recognition of PFAs and ALPPs (<u>and avoidance of undue delays</u>) (sections 2.3 and 2.14).</p> <p>ISPM 4:1995 points out that, since certain PFAs are likely to involve an agreement between trading partners, their implementation would need to be reviewed and evaluated by the national plant protection organization (NPPO) of the importing country (section 2.3.4).</p> <p>ISPM 8:1998 provides guidance on the use of the phrase “pest free area declared” in pest records (section 3.1.2).</p> <p>ISPM 10:1999 describes the requirements for the establishment and use of pest free places of production and pest free production sites as risk management options for meeting phytosanitary requirements for the import of plants, plant products and other regulated articles.</p> <p>ISPM 22:2005 describes the requirements and procedures for the establishment of ALPPs for regulated pests in an area and, to facilitate export, for pests regulated by an importing country only. This includes the identification, verification, maintenance and use of those ALPPs.</p> <p>ISPM 26:2006 describes the requirements for the establishment and maintenance of PFAs for the economically important species in the family Tephritidae.</p>	<p>[ISPMs under revision: 4, 8] Specific cross-references, but likely to remain valid even if ISPM 1 is revised (except for section number). Section 2.14 is about avoidance of undue delay, and it would be clearer to indicate this. Principles are easy to locate in the standard</p> <p>Specific cross-reference to ISPM 4, but quite general</p> <p>Specific cross-reference to one status in ISPM 8. Needed here (but may need to be changed when ISPM 8 is revised). Section number is not needed</p> <p>General cross-references to ISPM 10, 22 and ISPM 26</p>
	21.				La NIMF nº 1 (Principios fitosanitarios para la protección de las plantas y la aplicación de medidas fitosanitarias en el comercio internacional) incluye principios operativos para	

ISPM	No.	Location reference of	Ref.ISPM	Current text	Proposed revision	Reasons
					el reconocimiento de ALP y ABPP (secciones 2.3 y 2.14) y prevención de evitar demoras indebidas).	
29	22.	2.1 Recognition of pest free areas and areas of low pest prevalence	1	ISPM 1:2006 states that “contracting parties should ensure that their phytosanitary measures concerning consignments moving into their territories take into account the status of areas, as designated by the NPPOs of the exporting countries. These may be areas where a regulated pest does not occur or occurs with low prevalence or they may be pest free production sites or pest free places of production”.	ISPM 1:2006 states that “c Contracting parties should ensure that their phytosanitary measures concerning consignments moving into their territories take into account the status of areas, as designated by the NPPOs of the exporting countries. These may be areas where a regulated pest does not occur or occurs with low prevalence or they may be pest free production sites or pest free places of production” ” (ISPM 1).	[ISPMs revised since: 1] Although there is a specific cross-reference, in this case it is proposed to leave some text in the standard but not as a quote.
29	23.	3. Requirements for the Recognition of Pest Free Areas and Areas of Low Pest Prevalence, 4th parag.	8	Where the pest is absent from an area and the PFA status can easily be determined (for example in areas where no records of the pest have been made and, in addition, long-term absence of the pest is known or absence is confirmed by surveillance), the process for recognition described in this standard (in section 4) may not be required or very little supporting information may be necessary. In such cases, absence of the pest should be recognized according to the first paragraph of section 3.1.2 of ISPM 8:1998 without the need for detailed information or elaborate procedures.	Where the pest is absent from an area and the PFA status can easily be determined (for example in areas where no records of the pest have been made and, in addition, long-term absence of the pest is known or absence is confirmed by surveillance), the process for recognition described in this standard (in section 4) may not be required or very little supporting information may be necessary. In such cases, absence of the pest should be recognized (according to the first paragraph of section 3.1.2 of ISPM 8:1998) without the need for detailed information or elaborate procedures.	[ISPMs under revision: 8] Specific cross-reference to an element of ISPM 8, but the sentence on its own with the reference to ISPM 8 seems sufficient. It is expected that such approach will be possible also according to the revised ISPM 8.
29	24.	5. Considerations on Pest Free Places of Production and Pest Free Production Sites, paragraphs 1 to 3	10	Usually pest free places of production and pest free production sites should not require recognition using the procedures described above (section 4). In this regard ISPM 10:1999 states, for such places and sites, “The issuance of a phytosanitary certificate for a consignment by the NPPO confirms that the requirements for a pest free place of production or a pest free production site have been fulfilled. The importing country may require an appropriate additional declaration on the phytosanitary	Usually pest free places of production and pest free production sites should not require recognition using the procedures described above (section 4). In this regard ISPM 10: 1999 <u>provides guidance states,</u> for such places and sites_“The issuance of a phytosanitary certificate for a consignment by the NPPO confirms that the requirements for a pest free place of production or a pest free production site have been fulfilled. The importing country may require an appropriate additional declaration on the	Specific cross-references to content of ISPM 10. The quotes provide a lot of information. Deleting them would remove some information, rephrasing may be paraphrasing. So it is suggested to take away the quotes and simply make stand alone statements.

ISP M	No.	Location reference	of	Ref.ISP M	Current text	Proposed revision	Reasons
					<p>certificate to this effect." (section 3.2 of ISPM 10) However, ISPM 10 (in section 3.3) also indicates: The NPPO of the exporting country should, on request, make available to the NPPO of the importing country the rationale for establishment and maintenance of pest free places of production or pest free production sites. Where bilateral arrangements or agreements so provide, the NPPO of the exporting country should expeditiously provide information concerning establishment or withdrawal of pest free places of production or pest free production sites to the NPPO of the importing country. As described in ISPM 10 (section 3.1): When complex measures are needed to establish and maintain a pest free place of production or pest free production site, because the pest concerned requires a high degree of phytosanitary security, an operational plan may be needed. Where appropriate, such a plan would be based on bilateral agreements or arrangements listing specific details required in the operation of the system including the role and responsibilities of the producer and trader(s) involved.</p>	<p>phytosanitary certificate to this effect." (section 3.2 of ISPM 10) However, ISPM 10 (in section 3.3) also indicates that t The NPPO of the exporting country should, on request, make available to the NPPO of the importing country the rationale for establishment and maintenance of pest free places of production or pest free production sites. Where bilateral arrangements or agreements so provide, the NPPO of the exporting country should expeditiously provide information concerning establishment or withdrawal of pest free places of production or pest free production sites to the NPPO of the importing country. As <u>also</u> described in ISPM 10 (section 3.1), <u>when</u> complex measures are needed to establish and maintain a pest free place of production or pest free production site, because the pest concerned requires a high degree of phytosanitary security, an operational plan may be needed. Where appropriate, such a plan would be based on bilateral agreements or arrangements listing specific details required in the operation of the system including the role and responsibilities of the producer and trader(s) involved.</p>	
	25.				<p>Habitualmente, no debería ser necesario utilizar el procedimiento arriba descrito (sección 4) para el reconocimiento de los lugares de producción libres de plagas y sitios de producción libres de plagas. A este respecto, la NIMF nº 10 (Requisitos para el establecimiento de lugares de producción libres de plagas y sitios de producción libres de plagas) estipula que proporciona orientación respecto de dichos</p>	<p>See En rationale. Additional translation adjustments to align with English version.</p>	

ISP M	No.	Location reference	of	Ref.ISP M	Current text	Proposed revision	Reasons
						<p>lugares y sitios. “La emisión expedición de un certificado fitosanitario para un envío por parte de la ONPF confirma que se han cumplido los requisitos establecidos para los lugares de producción libres de plagas o los sitios de producción libres de plagas. Con este fin el país importador podrá solicitar requerir que se incluya una declaración adicional apropiada en el certificado fitosanitario” (sección 3.2 de la NIMF nº 10).</p> <p>No obstante, la NIMF nº 10 (en la sección 3.3) también indica que: “La ONPF del país exportador debería, si alguien lo solicita, poner a la disposición de la ONPF del país importador las razones para el establecimiento y mantenimiento de lugares de producción libres de plagas o sitios de producción libres de plagas. Cuando lo estipulen los acuerdos o arreglos bilaterales, la ONPF del país exportador debería brindar rápidamente la información concerniente al establecimiento o retiro de los lugares de producción libres de plagas o sitios de producción libres de plagas a la ONPF del país importador.</p> <p>“Tal como también se estipula describe en la NIMF nº 10, “Cuando se necesiten medidas complejas para establecer y mantener un lugar de producción libre de plagas o sitio de producción libre de plagas debido a que la plaga en cuestión requiere un alto grado de seguridad fitosanitaria, se puede requerir un plan operativo. Cuando sea apropiado, dicho plan deberá basarse en acuerdos o arreglos bilaterales que listen los detalles específicos necesarios en la operación del sistema, incluyendo las funciones y responsabilidades del productor y comerciante(s) involucrado(s). En tales casos, el reconocimiento podrá basarse en el procedimiento que recomienda la sección 4 de la</p>	

ISPM	No.	Location reference	of	Ref.ISPM	Current text	Proposed revision	Reasons
						presente norma u otro procedimiento <u>acordado bilateralmente</u> acordado bilateralmente .	
ISPM 30 Establishment of areas of low pest prevalence for fruit flies (Tephritidae)							
30	26.	1.2 Determination of an FF-ALPP, 2nd parag.	8		In areas where prevalence of fruit flies is naturally at a low level because of climatic, geographical or other reasons (e.g. natural enemies, availability of suitable hosts, host seasonality), the target fruit fly population may already be below the specified level of low pest prevalence without applying any control measures. In such cases, surveillance should be undertaken over an appropriate length of time to validate the low prevalence status and this status may be recognized in accordance with the examples listed in section 3.1.1 of ISPM 8:1998. If, however, the fruit flies are detected above the specified level of low pest prevalence (e.g. because of extraordinary climatic conditions) corrective actions should be applied. Guidelines for corrective action plans are provided in Annex 2.	In areas where prevalence of fruit flies is naturally at a low level because of climatic, geographical or other reasons (e.g. natural enemies, availability of suitable hosts, host seasonality), the target fruit fly population may already be below the specified level of low pest prevalence without applying any control measures. In such cases, surveillance should be undertaken over an appropriate length of time to validate the low prevalence status and this status may be recognized in accordance with the examples of <u>pest statuses for presence in listed in section 3.1.1 of ISPM 8:1998</u> . If, however, the fruit flies are detected above the specified level of low pest prevalence (e.g. because of extraordinary climatic conditions) corrective actions should be applied. Guidelines for corrective action plans are provided in Annex 2.	[ISPMs under revision: 8] Specific cross-reference. While the section number will probably change in the revised ISPM 8, it is expected that examples (or recommendations) for pest status of presence will still be given, and it is also assumed that there will be one for low prevalence. This will have to be corrected if it is not the case in the revised version. The change proposed does not change the concept or application of the ISPM, but introduces new words
	27.					En las áreas donde el bajo nivel de prevalencia natural de moscas de la fruta se debe a razones climáticas, geográficas u otras (por ejemplo, enemigos naturales, disponibilidad de hospedantes adecuados, estacionalidad del hospedante), la población de moscas de la fruta objetivo podrá encontrarse ya debajo del nivel especificado de baja prevalencia de plagas, sin que se haya aplicado ninguna medida de control. En dichos casos, se debería utilizar la vigilancia durante un lapso de tiempo razonable para validar la condición de baja prevalencia, y esta condición podrá reconocerse por los ejemplos de <u>condiciones de plagas para la presencia en que enumera el apartado 3.1.1 de la NIMF n.º 8 (Determinación de la situación de una plaga en un área)</u> . Sin embargo, si se detectan moscas de la fruta por encima del nivel especificado de baja prevalencia de plagas (por ejemplo, debido a	

ISPM	No.	Location reference	of	Ref.ISPM	Current text	Proposed revision	Reasons
						condiciones climáticas extraordinarias), se deberían aplicar acciones correctivas. En el Anexo 2 figuran las directrices sobre los planes de acciones <u>acciones correctivas</u> .	
ISPM 31 Methodologies for sampling of consignments							
	28.	1. Lot Identification, 1st parag.		23	A consignment may consist of one or more lots. Where a consignment comprises more than one lot, the inspection to determine compliance may have to consist of several separate visual examinations, and therefore the lots will have to be sampled separately. In such cases, the samples relating to each lot should be segregated and identified in order that the appropriate lot can be clearly identified if subsequent inspection or testing reveals non-compliance with phytosanitary requirements. Whether or not a lot will be inspected should be determined using factors stated in ISPM 23:2005 (section 1.5).	A consignment may consist of one or more lots. Where a consignment comprises more than one lot, the inspection to determine compliance may have to consist of several separate visual examinations, and therefore the lots will have to be sampled separately. In such cases, the samples relating to each lot should be segregated and identified in order that the appropriate lot can be clearly identified if subsequent inspection or testing reveals non-compliance with phytosanitary requirements. Whether or not a lot will be inspected should be determined using factors stated in ISPM 23: 2005 (section 1.5 <u>on other considerations for inspection</u>).	Specific cross-reference. The concept is expected to remain in ISPM 23 even if revised.
	29.					Un envío podrá constar de uno o más lotes. Cuando un envío comprenda más de un lote, la inspección para determinar el cumplimiento podrá tener que constar de varios exámenes visuales distintos y, por consiguiente, los lotes deberán muestrearse por separado. En tales casos, las muestras relacionadas con cada lote deberían segregarse e identificarse para que el lote apropiado pueda identificarse claramente, si la inspección o prueba de diagnóstico subsecuente revela el incumplimiento de los requisitos fitosanitarios. La decisión de inspeccionar debería tomarse basándose en los factores establecidos en el apartado 1.5 de la NIMF n.º 23 (sección sobre otras consideraciones para la inspección <u>Directrices para la inspección</u>).	
31	30.	7. Outcome of Sampling		23	The outcome of activities and techniques related to sampling may result in phytosanitary	The outcome of activities and techniques related to sampling may result in phytosanitary action	Specific cross-reference. The wording used before the parenthesis did not

ISM	No.	Location reference	of	Ref.ISM	Current text	Proposed revision	Reasons
					action being taken (further details can be found in ISPM 23:2005, section 2.5).	being taken (further details can be found in ISPM 23 <u>in relation to inspection outcome:2005, section 2.5</u>).	exactly relate to the section in ISPM 23, and some additional words would be useful. Inspection outcome is expected to remain in ISPM 23.
	31.					A raíz de los resultados de las actividades y las técnicas relacionadas con el muestreo, se podrán aplicar acciones fitosanitarias (<u>se podrán encontrar más detalles en la en el apartado 2.5 de la NIMF n.º 23 en relación con el resultado de la inspección, Directrices para la inspección se podrán encontrar más detalles</u>).	Additional translation adjustment to align with English version.
ISPM 32 Categorization of commodities according to their pest risk							
32	32.	Background, parag.	2nd	11	Some intended uses of commodities (e.g. planting) result in a much higher probability of introducing pests than others (e.g. processing) (further information is contained in ISPM 11:2004, section 2.2.1.5).	Some intended uses of commodities (e.g. planting) result in a much higher probability of introducing pests than others (e.g. processing) (further information is contained in ISPM 11:2004, <u>in relation to the probability of transfer to a suitable host</u> section 2.2.1.5).	[ISPMs revised since: 11] Specific reference. This is not a straightforward reference. Words added
	33.					Algunos usos previstos de los productos (por ejemplo, la siembra) resultan en una probabilidad mucho mayor que otros (como el procesamiento) de introducir plagas reglamentadas (hay más información al respecto en la NIMF n.º 11: <u>Análisis de riesgo de plagas para plagas cuarentonarias, incluido el análisis de riesgos ambientales y organismos vivos modificados, 2004, apartado 2.2.1.5</u>), en relación con la probabilidad de transferencia a un hospedante apropiado.	
32	34.	Background, from 5th parag. onwards		11 (previous), 12 (previous), 15 (previous), 16, 20, 21, 23	Article VI.1(b) of the IPPC states: “Contracting parties may require phytosanitary measures for quarantine pests and regulated non-quarantine pests, provided that such measures are ... limited to what is necessary to protect plant health and/or safeguard the intended use” This standard is based on the concepts of intended use of a commodity and the method	Article VI.1(b) of the IPPC states: “Contracting parties may require phytosanitary measures for quarantine pests and regulated non-quarantine pests, provided that such measures are ... limited to what is necessary to protect plant health and/or safeguard the intended use” This standard is based on the concepts of intended use of a commodity and the method and degree	[ISPMs revised since: 11, 12, 15] This is probably the most difficult case in this analysis. It is important to find a solution, as otherwise the old versions of ISPMs 11, 12 and 15 cannot be replaced. Removing quotes entails extensive rewording, but simply adjusting the

			<p>and degree of its processing, which are also addressed in other ISPMs as outlined below. Method and degree of processing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ISPM 12:2001, section 1.1, states: Importing countries should only require phytosanitary certificates for regulated articles. ... Phytosanitary certificates may also be used for certain plant products that have been processed where such products, by their nature or that of their processing, have a potential for introducing regulated pests (e.g. wood, cotton). ... Importing countries should not require phytosanitary certificates for plant products that have been processed in such a way that they have no potential for introducing regulated pests, or for other articles that do not require phytosanitary measures. - ISPM 15:2002, section 2, states: Wood packaging made wholly of wood-based products such as plywood, particle board, oriented strand board or veneer that have been created using glue, heat and pressure, or a combination thereof, should be considered sufficiently processed to have eliminated the risk associated with the raw wood. It is unlikely to be infested by raw wood pests during its use and therefore should not be regulated for these pests. - ISPM 23:2005, section 2.3.2, states: “Inspection can be used to verify the compliance with some phytosanitary requirements.” Examples include degree of processing. <p>Intended use:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ISPM 11:2004, sections 2.2.1.5 and 2.2.3. When analysing the probabilities of transfer of pests to a suitable host and of their spread after establishment, one of the factors 	<p>of its processing, which are also addressed in other ISPMs as outlined below. Method and degree of processing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ISPM 12. NPPOs of the importing countries should not require phytosanitary certificates for plant products that have been processed to the point where they have no potential for introducing regulated pests - ISPM 15. Low risk articles are exempted from the requirements in the standard due to the method and degree of processing. - ISPM 23. Inspection may be used to verify the degree of processing. <p>ISPM 12:2001, section 1.1, states: Importing countries should only require phytosanitary certificates for regulated articles. ... Phytosanitary certificates may also be used for certain plant products that have been processed where such products, by their nature or that of their processing, have a potential for introducing regulated pests (e.g. wood, cotton). ... Importing countries should not require phytosanitary certificates for plant products that have been processed in such a way that they have no potential for introducing regulated pests, or for other articles that do not require phytosanitary measures.</p> <p>ISPM 15:2002, section 2, states: Wood packaging made wholly of wood-based products such as plywood, particle board, oriented strand board or veneer that have been created using glue, heat and pressure, or a combination thereof, should be considered sufficiently processed to have eliminated the risk associated with the raw wood. It is unlikely to be infested by raw wood pests during its use and therefore should not be regulated for these pests.</p> <p>ISPM 23:2005, section 2.3.2, states: “Inspection can be used to verify the compliance with some phytosanitary requirements.” Examples include degree of processing.</p>	<p>text to quote the revised standards is not straightforward either. This proposed revision is more drastic than simply quoting the new revisions, but should avoid similar issues in the future.</p> <p>This revision does not take account of the fact that some ISPMs developed after ISPM 32 are also relevant (e.g. ISPM 36)</p>
--	--	--	---	--	--

ISPM	No.	Location reference	of	Ref.ISPM	Current text	Proposed revision	Reasons
					<p>to be considered is the intended use of the commodity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ISPM 12:2001, section 2.1. Different phytosanitary requirements may apply to the different intended end uses as indicated on the phytosanitary certificate. - ISPM 16:2002, section 4.2. Risk of economically unacceptable impact varies with different pests, commodities and intended use. - ISPM 21:2004, which uses extensively the concept of intended use. <p>Method and degree of processing together with intended use:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ISPM 20:2004, section 5.1.4, indicates that PRA may be done on a specific pest or on all the pests associated with a particular pathway (e.g. a commodity). A commodity may be classified by its degree of processing and/or its intended use. - ISPM 23:2005, section 1.5. One of the factors to decide the use of inspection as a phytosanitary measure is the commodity type and intended use. 	<p>Intended use:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>ISPM 11. The intended use is considered when analysing the probabilities of transfer of pests to a suitable host and of their spread after establishment.</u> - <u>ISPM 16. Risk of economically unacceptable impact varies with different pests, commodities and intended use.</u> - <u>ISPM 21. Uses the concept of intended use extensively.</u> <p>ISPM 11:2004, sections 2.2.1.5 and 2.2.3. When analysing the probabilities of transfer of pests to a suitable host and of their spread after establishment, one of the factors to be considered is the intended use of the commodity.</p> <p>ISPM 12:2001, section 2.1. Different phytosanitary requirements may apply to the different intended end uses as indicated on the phytosanitary certificate.</p> <p>ISPM 16:2002, section 4.2. Risk of economically unacceptable impact varies with different pests, commodities and intended use.</p> <p>ISPM 21:2004, which uses extensively the concept of intended use.</p> <p>Method and degree of processing together with intended use:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>ISPM 12. Different phytosanitary requirements may apply to the different intended end uses or degree of processing as indicated on the phytosanitary certificate.</u> - <u>ISPM 20. A commodity may be classified by its degree of processing and/or its intended use.</u> - <u>ISPM 23. The commodity type and intended use are taken into account to decide the use of inspection as a phytosanitary measure.</u> <p>ISPM 20:2004, section 5.1.4, indicates that PRA may be done on a specific pest or on all</p>	

ISP M	No.	Location reference	of	Ref.ISP M	Current text	Proposed revision	Reasons
						<p>the pests associated with a particular pathway (e.g. a commodity). A commodity may be classified by its degree of processing and/or its intended use.</p> <p>- ISPM 23:2005, section 1.5. One of the factors to decide the use of inspection as a phytosanitary measure is the commodity type and intended use.</p>	
	35.					<p>Método y grado de procesamiento:</p> <p>La NIMF n.º 12 (<i>Directrices para los certificados fitosanitarios, 2001</i>), apartado 1.1, estipula que: “Las ONPF de los países importadores no deberían exigir requerir solamente certificados fitosanitarios para los productos vegetales que artículos reglamentados. ... También pueden utilizarse los certificados fitosanitarios para ciertos productos vegetales que se han elaborado procesado hasta el punto que no , cuando tales productos, por su naturaleza o la de su elaboración, tengan un potencial para la introducción de plagas reglamentadas (por ejemplo, madera, algodón)”. “Los países importadores no deberán exigir certificados fitosanitarios para los productos vegetales que se hayan elaborado de tal manera que no presenten la posibilidad de introducir plagas reglamentadas o para otros artículos que no requieran medidas fitosanitarias.”</p> <p>- La NIMF n.º 15 (<i>Directrices para reglamentar el embalaje de madera utilizado en el comercio internacional, 2002</i>) Los artículos de bajo riesgo están exentos de los requisitos en la norma debido al método y grado de elaboración</p>	

ISP M	No.	Location reference	of	Ref.ISP M	Current text	Proposed revision	Reasons
						<p>procesamiento., apartado 2, indica que: "El embalaje de madera fabricado en su totalidad de productos derivados de la madera tales como contrachapado, los tableros de partículas, los tableros de fibra orientada o las hojas de chapa que se han producido utilizando pegamento, calor y presión o una combinación de los mismos, deberá considerarse lo suficientemente procesado para haber eliminado el riesgo relacionado con la madera en bruto. Como es poco probable que esta madera se vea infestada por plagas de la madera en bruto durante su utilización, no deberá reglamentarse para estas plagas."</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - La NIMF n.º 23 (<i>Directrices para la inspección, 2005</i>). La inspección puede ser utilizada para verificar el grado de elaboración <u>procesamiento</u>, apartado 2.3.2, establece que: "la inspección puede utilizarse para verificar el cumplimiento de algunos requisitos fitosanitarios. Entre los ejemplos incluye el grado de procesamiento." - <u>Uso previsto:</u> - NIMF 11: El uso previsto del producto es considerado cuando se analizan las probabilidades de transferencia de plagas a un hospedante apropiado y de su dispersión luego del establecimiento - NIMF 16: El riesgo de repercusiones económicamente inaceptables varía de acuerdo con las diferentes plagas, productos y usos previstos. 	

ISP M	No.	Location reference	of	Ref.ISP M	Current text	Proposed revision	Reasons
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>NIMF 21: utiliza ampliamente el concepto de uso previsto.</u> - <u>Método y grado de procesamiento junto con uso previsto:</u> - <u>NIMF 12: Podrán aplicarse diferentes requisitos fitosanitarios a los diferentes usos finales previstos o grado de procesamiento, según indica el certificado fitosanitario.</u> - <u>NIMF 20: Se puede clasificar un producto por su grado de procesamiento y/o por su uso previsto.</u> - <u>NIMF 23: El tipo de producto y su uso previsto se toman en cuenta para decidir si se debe utilizar la inspección como una medida fitosanitaria.</u> 	