

**Ink amendments (editorials) approved by SC November 2014 (SC report, Appendix 15, CPM informed). These ink amendments were incorporated into French, but not presented in translation below because they were considered straightforward.**

**Table 1: Editorial changes**

These changes include cross-references to other ISPMs which can be adjusted "easily" (but the cross-reference remains). For example: removal of quotes without other text change; changes for the sake of consistency with the text agreed by CPM; removal of section numbers (straightforward cases); removal of references to ISPMs in the Reference section (references to other sources remain), etc...

Other editorial changes, such as those related to the cover page and publication history of standards are not listed in the table below.

In the column "reasons", the standards cross-referred in the paragraph and that have been revised since, or are under revision, are indicated. This is to indicate clearly which cross-references need to be changed to allow replacement of old versions, which ones will come up soon, and others.

APPENDIX 15 – TABLE 1						
ISPM	No.	Location of reference	Ref. ISPM	Current text	Proposed revision	Reasons
<b>ALL ISPMs</b>						
A L L	1.	References	ISPMs	[example of ISPM 1] <b>IPPC</b> . 1997. <i>International Plant Protection Convention</i> . Rome, IPPC, FAO. <b>ISPM 5</b> . <i>Glossary of phytosanitary terms</i> . Rome, IPPC, FAO. — All International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures. <b>WTO</b> . 1994. <i>Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures</i> . Geneva, World Trade Organization.	[example of ISPM 1] <b>IPPC</b> . 1997. <i>International Plant Protection Convention</i> . Rome, IPPC, FAO. <del><b>ISPM 5</b>. <i>Glossary of phytosanitary terms</i>. Rome, IPPC, FAO.</del> <del>— All International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures.</del> <b>WTO</b> . 1994. <i>Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures</i> . Geneva, World Trade Organization.  <u>The present standard also refers to other International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPMs). ISPMs are available on the IPP at <a href="https://www.ippc.int/core-activities/standards-setting/ispm5">https://www.ippc.int/core-activities/standards-setting/ispm5</a>.</u>	All ISPMs are now referred to collectively, as proposed in 2.1 of the main text on replacement of old versions. <u>References other than to ISPMs would remain.</u>  The example of ISPM 1 is given here, but it would apply to other ISPMs (not detailed in the table below), including Supplement 1 & 2 and Appendix 1 of ISPM 5, as well as ISPMs presented for adoption at CPM-9 (2014) . In ISPM 5 itself, the change needs to be different (and is in Annex 2).
<b>ISPM 1 <i>Phytosanitary principles for the protection of plants and the application of phytosanitary measures in international trade</i></b>						
1	2.	Adoption	1	This standard was first adopted by the Twenty-seventh Session of the FAO Conference in November 1993 as <i>Principles of plant quarantine as related to international trade</i> . The first revision was adopted by the First Session of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures in April 2006 as the present standard, ISPM 1:2006.	This standard was first adopted by the Twenty-seventh Session of the FAO Conference in November 1993 as <i>Principles of plant quarantine as related to international trade</i> . The first revision was adopted by the First Session of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures in April 2006 as the present standard, <del>ISPM 1:2006</del> .	ISPM mention is unnecessary, and its deletion also removes the year.
1	3.	2.14 Avoidance of undue delays, 3rd parag.	24	<i>Relevant ISPM: ISPM 24 (section 2.7 and Annex 1, step 7).</i>	<i>Relevant ISPM: ISPM 24 (<del>section 2.7 and Annex 1, step 7</del>).</i>	General cross-reference. Section 2.7 is "timeliness" (and easy to find). Annex 1 does

APPENDIX 15 – TABLE 1																								
ISPM	No.	Location of reference	Ref. ISPM	Current text			Proposed revision			Reasons														
										not refer to timeliness or undue delays (but to the need for a timetable). Note: undue delay is also a major topic in ISPM 2 (3.6) and 29 (2.4) (both adopted after the current version of ISPM 1), but these are not mentioned here														
<b>ISPM 2 Framework for pest risk analysis</b>																								
2	4.	Adoption	2 (previous and current)	This standard was first adopted by the Twenty-eighth Session of the FAO Conference in November 1995 as <i>Guidelines for pest risk analysis</i> . This first revision was adopted by the Second Session of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures in March 2007 as the present standard, ISPM 2:2007 ( <i>Framework for pest risk analysis</i> ).			This standard was first adopted by the Twenty-eighth Session of the FAO Conference in November 1995 as <i>Guidelines for pest risk analysis</i> . This first revision was adopted by the Second Session of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures in March 2007 as the present standard, <del>ISPM 2:2007 (<i>Framework for pest risk analysis</i>)</del> .			ISPM mention is unnecessary, and its deletion also removes the year.														
2	5.	1. PRA Stage 1: Initiation, 5th paragraph, <b>footnote</b>	5	Further information on this aspect is provided in Supplement 2 (Guidelines on the interpretation and application of potential economic importance and related terms including reference to environmental considerations) to ISPM 5.			Further information on this aspect is provided in Supplement 2 (Guidelines on the <u>understanding interpretation and application</u> of potential economic importance and related terms including reference to environmental considerations) to ISPM 5.			Specific cross-reference. Title kept when the Supplement is first mentioned in the ISPM. The title of the Supplement changed.														
2	6.	2.1 Linked standards	3, 11, 21	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>ISPM</th> <th>Title</th> <th>Coverage of PRA</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>ISPM 1 1:2004</td> <td>Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests including analysis of environmental risks and living modified organisms</td> <td>Specific guidance on PRA of quarantine pests including: - Stage 1: Initiation<sup>1</sup> - Stage 2: Pest risk assessment including environmental risks and LMO assessment - Stage 3: Pest risk management</td> </tr> <tr> <td>ISPM 2 1:2004</td> <td>Pest risk analysis for regulated non-quarantine pests</td> <td>[text not extracted here, no change needed - Includes reference to note 1 below]</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	ISPM	Title	Coverage of PRA	ISPM 1 1:2004	Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests including analysis of environmental risks and living modified organisms	Specific guidance on PRA of quarantine pests including: - Stage 1: Initiation <sup>1</sup> - Stage 2: Pest risk assessment including environmental risks and LMO assessment - Stage 3: Pest risk management	ISPM 2 1:2004	Pest risk analysis for regulated non-quarantine pests	[text not extracted here, no change needed - Includes reference to note 1 below]	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>ISPM</th> <th>Title</th> <th>Coverage of PRA</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>ISPM 11: 2004</td> <td><u>Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests including analysis of environmental risks and living modified organisms</u></td> <td>Specific guidance on PRA of quarantine pests including: - Stage 1: Initiation<sup>1</sup> - Stage 2: Pest risk assessment including environmental risks and LMO assessment - Stage 3: Pest risk management</td> </tr> <tr> <td>ISPM 21: 2004</td> <td><u>Pest risk analysis for regulated non-quarantine pests</u></td> <td>Specific guidance on PRA of regulated non-quarantine pests including: - Stage 1: Initiation<sup>1</sup></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	ISPM	Title	Coverage of PRA	ISPM 11: 2004	<u>Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests including analysis of environmental risks and living modified organisms</u>	Specific guidance on PRA of quarantine pests including: - Stage 1: Initiation <sup>1</sup> - Stage 2: Pest risk assessment including environmental risks and LMO assessment - Stage 3: Pest risk management	ISPM 21: 2004	<u>Pest risk analysis for regulated non-quarantine pests</u>	Specific guidance on PRA of regulated non-quarantine pests including: - Stage 1: Initiation <sup>1</sup>	<p>[ISPMs revised since: 11]</p> <p>The "coverage of PRA" for the 3 standards is described in broad terms and is not likely to change (except in case of substantial combination/reorganization, which is not planned at the moment). A reference to the coverage without ISPM date or title is sufficient. (also because the title of ISPM 11 has changed in 2013).</p> <p>The description of Stage 2 in ISPM 11 is still valid, even if elements on plants as quarantine pests were added in 2013 (but covered under the general wording "quarantine pests"). It is not proposed that Stage 2 be made less specific, as information would be lost on the difference in 11 and 21.</p>
ISPM	Title	Coverage of PRA																						
ISPM 1 1:2004	Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests including analysis of environmental risks and living modified organisms	Specific guidance on PRA of quarantine pests including: - Stage 1: Initiation <sup>1</sup> - Stage 2: Pest risk assessment including environmental risks and LMO assessment - Stage 3: Pest risk management																						
ISPM 2 1:2004	Pest risk analysis for regulated non-quarantine pests	[text not extracted here, no change needed - Includes reference to note 1 below]																						
ISPM	Title	Coverage of PRA																						
ISPM 11: 2004	<u>Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests including analysis of environmental risks and living modified organisms</u>	Specific guidance on PRA of quarantine pests including: - Stage 1: Initiation <sup>1</sup> - Stage 2: Pest risk assessment including environmental risks and LMO assessment - Stage 3: Pest risk management																						
ISPM 21: 2004	<u>Pest risk analysis for regulated non-quarantine pests</u>	Specific guidance on PRA of regulated non-quarantine pests including: - Stage 1: Initiation <sup>1</sup>																						

APPENDIX 15 – TABLE 1								
ISPM	No.	Location of reference	Ref. ISPM	Current text	Proposed revision			Reasons
				ISPM 3: 2005 Guidelines for the export, shipment, import and release of biological control agents and other beneficial organisms [text not extracted here, no change needed - Includes reference to note 2 below]			- Stage 2: Pest risk assessment especially of plants for planting as the main source of infestation and economic impact on their intended use - Stage 3: Pest risk management	
					ISPM 3:2005	Guidelines for the export, shipment, import and release of biological control agents and other beneficial organisms	Specific guidance on pest risk management for biological control agents and beneficial organisms <sup>2</sup>	
2	7.	2.1 Linked standards	3, 11, 21	1 The present ISPM 11:2004 and ISPM 21:2004, adopted before this revision of ISPM 2, include some guidance on PRA Stage 1 for quarantine pests and RNQPs, respectively. 2 ISPM 3:2005 provides more detailed guidance appropriate to PRA Stage 1, for example with respect to the provision of necessary information, documentation and communication to relevant parties.	1 <del>The present ISPM 11:2004 and ISPM 21:2004, adopted before this revision of ISPM 2,</del> include some guidance on PRA Stage 1 for quarantine pests and RNQPs, respectively. 2 ISPM 3:2005 provides more detailed guidance appropriate to PRA Stage 1, for example with respect to the provision of necessary information, documentation and communication to relevant parties.		[ISPMs revised since: 11] Specific cross-references. A revised ISPM 11 was adopted in 2013. It is not clear why the original version specified "adopted before this revision of ISPM2", but this seems superfluous and is now wrong for the revised ISPM 11.	
2	8.	3.6 Avoidance of undue delay	1	Where other contracting parties are directly affected, the NPPO should, on request, supply information about the completion of individual analyses, and if possible the anticipated time frame, taking into account avoidance of undue delay (section 2.14 of ISPM 1:2006).	Where other contracting parties are directly affected, the NPPO should, on request, supply information about the completion of individual analyses, and if possible the anticipated time frame, taking into account avoidance of undue delay ( <del>section 2.14 of ISPM 1:2006</del> ).		Principle is easy to find in ISPM 1 (title of a section). General reference to ISPM 1 is already used in some other ISPMs when mentioning specific principles. Avoid specific reference and date.	
<b>ISPM 3 Guidelines for the export, shipment, import and release of biological control agents and other beneficial organisms</b>								
3	9.	Adoption	3 (previous and current)	This standard was first adopted by the Twenty-eighth Session of the FAO Conference in November 1995 as <i>Code of conduct for the import and release of exotic biological control agents</i> . The first revision was adopted by the Seventh Session of the Interim Commission on	This standard was first adopted by the Twenty-eighth Session of the FAO Conference in November 1995 as <i>Code of conduct for the import and release of exotic biological control agents</i> . The first revision was adopted by the Seventh Session of the Interim Commission on		ISPM mention is unnecessary, and its deletion also removes the year.	

APPENDIX 15 – TABLE 1						
ISPM	No.	Location of reference	Ref. ISPM	Current text	Proposed revision	Reasons
				Phytosanitary Measures in April 2005 as the present standard, ISPM 3:2005.	Phytosanitary Measures in April 2005 as the present standard, <a href="#">ISPM 3:2005</a> .	
3	10.	3.1.9	19	Consider, through pest risk analysis (consistent with the principles of necessity and minimal impact), if, after a first import or release, further imports of the same biological control agent or other beneficial organism may be exempted from some or all of the requirements for import. The publication of lists of approved and prohibited biological control agents and other beneficial organisms may also be considered. If appropriate, biological control agents that are prohibited should be included in lists of regulated pests (established and updated by contracting parties in accordance with the IPPC and ISPM 19:2003).	Consider, through pest risk analysis (consistent with the principles of necessity and minimal impact), if, after a first import or release, further imports of the same biological control agent or other beneficial organism may be exempted from some or all of the requirements for import. The publication of lists of approved and prohibited biological control agents and other beneficial organisms may also be considered. If appropriate, biological control agents that are prohibited should be included in lists of regulated pests (established and updated by contracting parties in accordance with the IPPC and ISPM 19: <del>2003</del> ).	General cross-reference to the concept covered by ISPM 19. Date not needed. Close parenthesis missing in the current ISPM, and added (editorial)
<b>ISPM 5 Glossary of phytosanitary terms</b>						
5	11.				Throughout the table, change the way the dates of ISPMs are mentioned to number, date (e.g. for absorbed dose: "[ISPM 18, 2003, revised CPM, 2012]" (instead of "[ISPM 18:2003, revised CPM, 2012]" )	To use a usual reference format instead of the recent format for dates of standards
<b>ISPM 7 Phytosanitary certification system</b>						
7	12.	Adoption	7	This standard was adopted by the Twenty-ninth Session of the FAO Conference in November 1997 as <i>Export certification system</i> . The first revision of the standard was adopted by the Sixth Session of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures in March 2011 as the present standard, ISPM 7:2011.	This standard was adopted by the Twenty-ninth Session of the FAO Conference in November 1997 as <i>Export certification system</i> . The first revision of the standard was adopted by the Sixth Session of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures in March 2011 as the present standard, <a href="#">ISPM 7:2011</a> .	ISPM mention is unnecessary, and its deletion also removes the year.
<b>ISPM 11 Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests</b>						
11	13.	2. Stage 2: Pest Risk Assessment, 2nd parag.	1 (previous)	In most cases, these steps will be applied sequentially in a PRA but it is not essential to follow a particular sequence. Pest risk assessment needs to be only as complex as is technically justified by the circumstances. This standard allows a specific PRA to be judged against the principles of necessity, minimal impact, transparency, equivalence, risk analysis, managed risk and non-discrimination set out in ISPM 1:1993.	In most cases, these steps will be applied sequentially in a PRA but it is not essential to follow a particular sequence. Pest risk assessment needs to be only as complex as is technically justified by the circumstances. This standard allows a specific PRA to be judged against the principles of necessity, minimal impact, transparency, equivalence, <a href="#">pest</a> risk analysis, managed risk and non-discrimination set out in ISPM 1: <del>1993</del> .	<b>[ISPMs revised since: 1]</b> Specific cross-reference. The revised ISPM 1 includes the principles mentioned. Risk analysis is now pest risk analysis (which also corresponds to the term used throughout standards)
11	14.	2.3.2.4 Non-commercial and environmental consequences, last parag.	5 Suppl. 2	S1 Economic impact is described in ISPM 5 Supplement 2 ( <i>Guidelines on the understanding of potential economic importance and related terms including reference to environmental considerations</i> ).	S1 Economic impact is described in ISPM 5 Supplement 2 ( <del><i>Guidelines on the understanding of potential economic importance and related terms including reference to environmental considerations</i></del> ).	Specific cross-reference to one element of the Supplement 2. Title not needed
11	15.	3.1 Level of risk	1	The principle of "managed risk" (ISPM 1:1993, <i>Principles of plant quarantine as related to international trade</i> ) states	<del>The principle of "managed risk" (ISPM 1:1993, <i>Principles of plant quarantine as related to international trade</i>) states</del>	<b>[ISPMs revised since: 1]</b>

APPENDIX 15 – TABLE 1						
ISPM	No.	Location of reference	Ref. ISPM	Current text	Proposed revision	Reasons
				that: "Because some risk of introduction of a quarantine pest always exists, countries shall agree to a policy of risk management when formulating phytosanitary measures." In implementing this principle, countries should decide what level of risk is acceptable to them.	<del>that: "Because some risk of introduction of a quarantine pest always exists, countries shall agree to a policy of risk management when formulating phytosanitary measures."</del> In implementing <del>this</del> principle <del>of managed risk (ISPM 1)</del> , countries should decide what level of risk is acceptable to them.	Specific cross-reference. Managed risk is one of the basic principles, also in the revised version of ISPM 1, but wording has changed. It is proposed to not quote the principle, but refer to it. No additional change needed and considered as editorial. In any case, a change is needed to be able to replace the old version of ISPM 1
11	16.	3.6.1 Monitoring and review of phytosanitary measures, 1st parag.	1 (previous)	The principle of "modification" states: "As conditions change, and as new facts become available, phytosanitary measures shall be modified promptly, either by inclusion of prohibitions, restrictions or requirements necessary for their success, or by removal of those found to be unnecessary" (ISPM 1:1993, <i>Principles of plant quarantine as related to international trade</i> ).  Thus, the implementation of particular phytosanitary measures should not be considered to be permanent. After application, the success of the measures in achieving their aim should be determined by monitoring during use. This is often achieved by inspection of the commodity on arrival, noting any interceptions or any entries of the pest to the PRA area. The information supporting the pest risk analysis should be periodically reviewed to ensure that any new information that becomes available does not invalidate the decision taken.	<del>In accordance with the principle of "modification" states: "As conditions change, and as new facts become available, phytosanitary measures shall be modified promptly, either by inclusion of prohibitions, restrictions or requirements necessary for their success, or by removal of those found to be unnecessary" (ISPM 1 (Phytosanitary principles for the protection of plants and the application of phytosanitary measures in international trade)):1993, Principles of plant quarantine as related to international trade).</del> Thus, the implementation of particular phytosanitary measures should not be considered to be permanent. After application, the success of the measures in achieving their aim should be determined by monitoring during use. This is often achieved by inspection of the commodity on arrival, noting any interceptions or any entries of the pest to the PRA area. The information supporting the pest risk analysis should be periodically reviewed to ensure that any new information that becomes available does not invalidate the decision taken.	[ISPMs revised since: 1] The wording of this principle has changed in the revised ISPM 1. The rewording proposed avoids a direct quote, and still refer to the relevant principle of ISPM 1 (easy to find). Principles are normally not mentioned between "" and these were deleted. The same text appears in ISPM 21 and was changed in the same manner.  No additional change needed and considered as editorial.  In any case, a change is needed to be able to replace the old version of ISPM 1
11	17.	4.1 Documentation requirements	1 (previous)	The IPPC and the principle of "transparency" (ISPM 1:1993) require that countries should, on request, make available the rationale for phytosanitary requirements. The whole process from initiation to pest risk management should be sufficiently documented so that when a review or a dispute arises, the sources of information and rationale used in reaching the management decision can be clearly demonstrated.	The IPPC and the principle of "transparency" (ISPM 1: <del>1993</del> ) require that countries should, on request, make available the rationale for phytosanitary requirements. The whole process from initiation to pest risk management should be sufficiently documented so that when a review or a dispute arises, the sources of information and rationale used in reaching the management decision can be clearly demonstrated.	[ISPMs revised since: 1] General reference to the principle of transparency, which is one of the basic principles. Principles are normally not mentioned between "" and these were deleted.
<b>ISPM 12 Phytosanitary certificates</b>						
12	18.	Adoption	12	This standard was first adopted by the Third Session of the Interim Commission on Phytosanitary Measures in April 2001 as <i>Guidelines for phytosanitary certificates</i> . The first revision of the standard was adopted by the Sixth Session	This standard was first adopted by the Third Session of the Interim Commission on Phytosanitary Measures in April 2001 as <i>Guidelines for phytosanitary certificates</i> . The first revision of the standard was adopted by the Sixth	ISPM mention is unnecessary, and its deletion also removes the year.

APPENDIX 15 – TABLE 1						
ISPM	No.	Location of reference	Ref. ISPM	Current text	Proposed revision	Reasons
				of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures in March 2011 as the present standard, ISPM 12:2011.	Session of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures in March 2011 as the present standard, <del>ISPM 12:2011</del> .	
<b>ISPM 15 Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade</b>						
15	19.	Adoption	15	This standard was first adopted by the Fourth Session of the Interim Commission on Phytosanitary Measures in March 2002 as Guidelines for regulating wood packaging material in international trade. Modifications to Annex 1 were adopted by the First Session of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures in April 2006. The first revision was adopted by the Fourth Session of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures in March–April 2009 as the present standard, ISPM 15:2009.  Revision to Annex 1 together with associated change in Annex 2, was adopted by the Eighth Session of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures in April 2013.	This standard was first adopted by the Fourth Session of the Interim Commission on Phytosanitary Measures in March 2002 as Guidelines for regulating wood packaging material in international trade. Modifications to Annex 1 were adopted by the First Session of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures in April 2006. The first revision was adopted by the Fourth Session of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures in March–April 2009 as the present standard, <del>ISPM 15:2009</del> .  Revision to Annex 1 together with associated change in Annex 2, was adopted by the Eighth Session of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures in April 2013.	ISPM mention is unnecessary, and its deletion also removes the year.
<b>ISPM 21 Pest risk analysis for regulated non-quarantine pests</b>						
21	20.	Background, last parag.	16	Requirements for official control are set out in ISPM 5 Supplement 1 ( <i>Guidelines on the interpretation and application of the concept of official control for regulated pests</i> ), and the defining criteria of RNQPs are set out in ISPM 16:2002; these standards should be taken into account in PRA.	Requirements for official control are set out in ISPM 5 Supplement 1 ( <i>Guidelines on the interpretation and application of the concepts of "official control" <del>for regulated pests</del> and "not widely distributed"</i> ), and the defining criteria of RNQPs are set out in ISPM 16: <del>2002</del> ; these standards should be taken into account in PRA.	[ISPMs revised since: Suppl. 1] General cross-reference to Supplement 1. Revision applies. Title of Supplement 1 changed (Title kept when Supplement 1 is first mentioned in the ISPM). General cross reference to ISPM 16, which is on RNQPs
21	21.	1.2 Official control, 1st parag.	16	"Regulated" in the definition of an RNQP refers to official control. RNQPs are subject to official control in the form of phytosanitary measures for their suppression in the specified plants for planting (see section 3.1.4 of ISPM 16:2002).	"Regulated" in the definition of an RNQP refers to official control. RNQPs are subject to official control in the form of phytosanitary measures for their suppression in the specified plants for planting (see <del>section 3.1.4 of ISPM 16:2002</del> ).	Specific cross-reference to one section of ISPM 16. Official control is the title of 3.1.4 and easy to find
21	22.	1.2 Official control, last parag.	5 Suppl.1	An official control programme for RNQPs can be applied on a national, sub-national or local area basis (see ISPM 5 Supplement 1).	An official control programme for RNQPs can be applied on a national, sub-national or local area basis (see ISPM 5 Supplement 1).	[ISPMs revised since: Suppl. 1] General cross-reference to Supplement 1. Revision applies.
21	23.	3.1.1.4 Indication of economic impact(s) of the pest on the intended use of the plants for planting, 1st parag.	5 Suppl. 2	There should be clear indications that the pest causes an economic impact on the intended use of the plants for planting (see ISPM 5 Supplement 2 <i>Guidelines on the understanding of potential economic importance and related terms</i> ).	There should be clear indications that the pest causes an economic impact on the intended use of the plants for planting (see ISPM 5 Supplement 2 <i>Guidelines on the understanding of potential economic importance and related terms including reference to environmental considerations</i> ).	General cross-reference to Supplement 2. Title of Supplement 2 changed (Title kept when Supplement 2 is first mentioned in the ISPM).
21	24.	3.3.3.1 Analytical techniques	11 (previous)	There are analytical techniques that can be used in consultation with experts in economics to make a more	There are analytical techniques that can be used in consultation with experts in economics to make a more	[ISPMs revised since: 11]

APPENDIX 15 – TABLE 1						
ISPM	No.	Location of reference	Ref. ISPM	Current text	Proposed revision	Reasons
				detailed analysis of the economic effects of an RNQP. These should incorporate all of the effects that have been identified. These techniques (see section 2.3.2.3 of ISPM 11:2004) may include:	detailed analysis of the economic effects of an RNQP. These should incorporate all of the effects that have been identified. These techniques (see <del>section 2.3.2.3 of ISPM 11:2004</del> ) may include:	Specific cross-reference. Still applies in 2013 version of ISPM 11, easy to find, section number not needed.
21	25.	4. Stage 3: Pest Risk Management	16	The most commonly used option for pest risk management for an RNQP is the establishment of measures to achieve an appropriate pest tolerance level. The same tolerance level should be applied for domestic production and import requirements (see section 6.3 of ISPM 16:2002).	The most commonly used option for pest risk management for an RNQP is the establishment of measures to achieve an appropriate pest tolerance level. The same tolerance level should be applied for domestic production and import requirements (see <del>section 6.3 of ISPM 16:2002</del> ).	Specific cross-reference. Section 6.3 is called tolerances, easy to find not needed
21	26.	4.3.1 Non-discrimination	5 Suppl. 1	There should be consistency between import and domestic requirements for a defined pest (see ISPM 5 Supplement 1):	There should be consistency between <u>domestic requirements and phytosanitary import requirements</u> <del>import and domestic requirements</del> for a defined pest (see ISPM 5 Supplement 1):	[ISPMs revised since: Suppl. 1] Specific cross-reference. The original Supplement 1 used "consistency between import and domestic requirements", while the revised version uses "consistency between domestic requirements and phytosanitary import requirements". The change was made here for consistency with Supplement 1, and because "phytosanitary import requirements" is the term defined in ISPM 5.
21	27.	4.5 Options to achieve the required tolerance levels, 1st parag.	16	There are a number of options that may achieve the required tolerance. Certification schemes are often useful for attaining the required tolerance and may include elements that may be relevant for all of the management options. Mutual recognition of certification schemes may facilitate trade of healthy plant material. However some aspects of certification schemes (e.g. varietal purity) are not relevant (see section 6.2 of ISPM 16:2002).	There are a number of options that may achieve the required tolerance. Certification schemes are often useful for attaining the required tolerance and may include elements that may be relevant for all of the management options. Mutual recognition of certification schemes may facilitate trade of healthy plant material. However some aspects of certification schemes (e.g. varietal purity) are not relevant (see <del>section 6.2 of ISPM 16:2002</del> ).	Specific cross-reference. The reference to certification schemes and varietal purity in ISPM 16 is easy to locate.
21	28.	4.5 Options to achieve the required tolerance levels, 4th parag.	11 (previous)	Section 3.4 of ISPM 11:2004 also provides information on the identification and selection of risk management options.	<del>Section 3.4 of ISPM 11:2004</del> also provides information on the identification and selection of risk management options.	[ISPMs revised since: 11] Specific cross-reference. The title of section 3.4 is identification and selection of appropriate risk management options, also in ISPM 11 revised in 2013. Easy to locate
21	29.	5. Monitoring and Review of Phytosanitary Measures, 1st parag.	1 (previous)	The principle of "modification" states: "As conditions change, and as new facts become available, phytosanitary measures shall be modified promptly, either by inclusion of prohibitions, restrictions or requirements necessary for their success, or by removal of those found to be unnecessary" (ISPM 1:1993).	<u>In accordance with the principle of "modification" states:</u> <del>"As conditions change, and as new facts become available, phytosanitary measures shall be modified promptly, either by inclusion of prohibitions, restrictions or requirements necessary for their success, or by removal of those found to be unnecessary" (ISPM 1:1993).</del> Thus, the implementation of particular phytosanitary measures should not be considered to be permanent. After	[ISPMs revised since: 1] The wording of this principle has changed in the revised version of ISPM 1. The wording proposed avoids an exact quote, and still refer to the relevant principle (easy to find in ISPM 1). Principles are generally not mentioned between "" and these were deleted. The same

APPENDIX 15 – TABLE 1						
ISPM	No.	Location of reference	Ref. ISPM	Current text	Proposed revision	Reasons
				Thus, the implementation of particular phytosanitary measures should not be considered to be permanent. After application, the success of the measures in achieving their aim should be determined by monitoring. This may be achieved by monitoring the plants for planting at appropriate times and places and/or damage levels (economic impact). The information supporting the pest risk analysis should be periodically reviewed to ensure that any new information that becomes available does not invalidate the decision taken.	application, the success of the measures in achieving their aim should be determined by monitoring. This may be achieved by monitoring the plants for planting at appropriate times and places and/or damage levels (economic impact). The information supporting the pest risk analysis should be periodically reviewed to ensure that any new information that becomes available does not invalidate the decision taken.	text appears in ISPM 11 and was changed in the same manner.  No other change needed and considered as editorial.  In any case, a change is needed, so that the old version of ISPM 1 can be replaced.
21	30.	6. Documentation of Pest Risk Analysis	1 (previous)	The IPPC (Article VII.2(c)) and the principle of "transparency" (ISPM 1:1993) require that contracting parties should, on request, make available the rationale for phytosanitary requirements. The whole process from initiation to pest risk management should be sufficiently documented so that when a request for the rationale for measures is received, or a dispute arises, or when measures are reviewed, the sources of information and rationale used in reaching the management decision can be clearly demonstrated.	The IPPC (Article VII.2(c)) and the principle of "transparency" (ISPM 1:1993) require that contracting parties should, on request, make available the rationale for phytosanitary requirements. The whole process from initiation to pest risk management should be sufficiently documented so that when a request for the rationale for measures is received, or a dispute arises, or when measures are reviewed, the sources of information and rationale used in reaching the management decision can be clearly demonstrated.	[ISPMs revised since: 1] Specific cross-reference to a basic principle. Principles are generally not between "" and these were deleted
<b>ISPM 24 Guidelines for the determination and recognition of equivalence of phytosanitary measures</b>						
24	31.	Outline of Requirements	1 (previous)	Equivalence is one of the IPPC general principles (ISPM 1:1993).	Equivalence is one of the IPPC <del>basic</del> general principles (ISPM 1: <del>1993</del> ).	[ISPMs revised since: 1] Specific cross-reference. General principles became basic principles at revision of ISPM 1. Consistency with ISPM 1.
24	32.	1. General Considerations	1 (previous)	Equivalence is described as general principle no. 7 in ISPM 1:1993: "Equivalence: Countries shall recognize as being equivalent those phytosanitary measures that are not identical but which have the same effect." Furthermore, the concept of equivalence and the obligation of contracting parties to observe the principle of equivalence is an integral element in other existing ISPMs. In addition, equivalence is described in Article 4 of the WTO-SPS Agreement.	Equivalence is described <del>as general principle no. 7 in ISPM 1:1993: "Equivalence: Countries shall recognize as being equivalent those phytosanitary measures that are not identical but which have the same effect."</del> Furthermore, the concept of equivalence and the obligation of contracting parties to observe the principle of equivalence is an integral element in other existing ISPMs. In addition, equivalence is described in Article 4 of the WTO-SPS Agreement.	[ISPMs revised since: 11] Specific cross-reference. - Mention of a principle number is the only one of its kind in ISPMs, and not necessary. - it is not a general principle anymore in the 2006 version (general principles became basic principles). - The proposal avoids a direct quote (the WTO-SPS is also not quoted). - The principle of equivalence in ISPM 1 refers to ISPM 24, which introduces circular quotings. - The wording in ISPM 1 is "equivalence of phytosanitary measures", but it is not ambiguous to only keep equivalence here.

APPENDIX 15 – TABLE 1						
ISPM	No.	Location of reference	Ref. ISPM	Current text	Proposed revision	Reasons
<b>ISPM 25 Consignments in transit</b>						
25	33.	1.2 Pest risk assessment, 2nd parag.	11 (previous)	Guidance for the assessment of the probability of introduction and spread of a pest is provided in ISPM 11:2004, in particular section 2.2. For consignments in transit, the following information may also be relevant:	Guidance for the assessment of the probability of introduction and spread of a pest is provided in ISPM 11: <del>2004</del> , in particular <del>section 2.2</del> . For consignments in transit, the following information may also be relevant:	[ISPMs revised since: 11] Specific cross-reference. The section is easy to find and is worded in the same way. Also applies to the revised version
<b>ISPM 29 Recognition of pest free areas and areas of low pest prevalence</b>						
29	34.	2.6 Other relevant principles of the IPPC and its ISPMs, last indent	1	equivalence (section 1.10 of ISPM 1:2006).	equivalence ( <del>section 1.10 of ISPM 1:2006</del> ).	[ISPMs revised since: 1] Specific cross-reference. The principle of equivalence is a separate section of ISPM 1 and easy to locate
29	35.	4.7 Duration of recognition, 2nd indent	13	there are significant instances of non-compliance (as described in section 4.1 of ISPM 13:2001) related to the areas in question or related to the bilateral arrangement noted by the importing contracting party.	there are significant instances of non-compliance ( <del>as described in section 4.1 of ISPM 13:2001</del> ) related to the areas in question or related to the bilateral arrangement noted by the importing contracting party.	Specific cross-reference. Significant instances of non-compliance is the title of a section in ISPM 13
<b>ISPM 30 Establishment of areas of low pest prevalence for fruit flies (Tephritidae)</b>						
30	36.	1. General Requirements, 1st parag.	22	The concepts and provisions of ISPM 22:2005 ( <i>Requirements for the establishment of areas of low pest prevalence</i> ) apply to the establishment and maintenance of ALPPs for a specified pest, or a group of pests including fruit flies, and therefore ISPM 22 should be referred to in conjunction with this standard.	The concepts and provisions of ISPM 22: <del>2005</del> ( <del><i>Requirements for the establishment of areas of low pest prevalence</i></del> ) apply to the establishment and maintenance of ALPPs for a specified pest, or a group of pests including fruit flies, and therefore ISPM 22 should be referred to in conjunction with this standard.	General cross-reference. ISPM 22 is about ALPPs
30	37.	1. General Requirements, last parag.	26	FF-ALPPs should include public awareness programmes of a similar nature as outlined in section 1.1 of ISPM 26:2006.	FF-ALPPs should include public awareness programmes of a similar nature as outlined in <del>section 1.1 of ISPM 26:2006</del> .	Specific cross-reference. Public awareness is a specific section in ISPM 26 and easy to find
30	38.	2.1 Establishment of the FF-ALPP	26	Elements for consideration when establishing an FF-PFA are described in sections 2.1 and 2.2 of ISPM 26:2006 and may also be applied to an FF-ALPP as defined in following subsections.	Elements for consideration when establishing an FF-PFA are described in <del>sections 2.1 and 2.2 of ISPM 26:2006</del> and may also be applied to an FF-ALPP as defined in following subsections.	Section 2.1 of ISPM 26 is on characterization, and 2.2. on establishment. It is probably sufficient to refer to ISPM 26 generally, as the subsections in ISPM 30 indicate which elements are considered
30	39.	2.2.1 Surveillance activities, 1st parag.	6, 26	Surveillance systems based on trapping are similar in any type of ALPP. The surveillance used in an FF-ALPP may include those processes described in ISPM 6:1997, section 2.2.2.1 on trapping procedures of ISPM 26:2006 and any other relevant scientific information.	Surveillance systems based on trapping are similar in any type of ALPP. The surveillance used in an FF-ALPP may include those processes described in ISPM 6: <del>1997</del> , <del>section 2.2.2.1</del> on trapping procedures of ISPM 26: <del>2006</del> and any other relevant scientific information.	[ISPMs under revision: 6] General cross-reference to ISPM 6. Specific cross-reference to trapping procedures in ISPM 26. The section is easy to find (and there is now an annex too)
30	40.	2.2.1 Surveillance activities, 3rd parag.	26	The NPPO may complement trapping for adults with fruit sampling for larvae. Fruit sampling may be especially useful for surveillance for fruit flies when no traps are available. If larvae are detected in fruit sampling, it may be necessary to rear the larvae to adults in order to identify them. This is the case particularly if multiple species of fruit flies may be present. However, fruit sampling alone will	The NPPO may complement trapping for adults with fruit sampling for larvae. Fruit sampling may be especially useful for surveillance for fruit flies when no traps are available. If larvae are detected in fruit sampling, it may be necessary to rear the larvae to adults in order to identify them. This is the case particularly if multiple species of fruit flies may be present. However, fruit sampling alone will	Specific cross-reference to fruit sampling procedures in ISPM 26. The section is easy to find (and there is now an annex too)

APPENDIX 15 – TABLE 1						
ISPM	No.	Location of reference	Ref. ISPM	Current text	Proposed revision	Reasons
				provide sufficient accuracy for describing the size of the population and should not be solely relied on to validate or verify the FF-ALPP status. Surveillance procedures may include those described in section 2.2.2.2 on fruit sampling procedures of ISPM 26:2006.	not provide sufficient accuracy for describing the size of the population and should not be solely relied on to validate or verify the FF-ALPP status. Surveillance procedures may include those described <del>in section 2.2.2.2</del> <a href="#">en</a> for fruit sampling procedures <del>of</del> in ISPM 26:2006.	
<b>ISPM 31 Methodologies for sampling of consignments</b>						
31	41.	3.1.1.6 Tolerance level, 2nd parag.	21	Tolerance levels may be established for regulated non-quarantine pests (as described in ISPM 21:2004, section 4.4) and may also be established for conditions related to other phytosanitary import requirements (for example, bark on wood or soil on plant roots).	Tolerance levels may be established for regulated non-quarantine pests (as described in ISPM 21:2004, <del>section 4.4</del> ) and may also be established for conditions related to other phytosanitary import requirements (for example, bark on wood or soil on plant roots).	Specific cross-reference. This is the section called tolerances, easy to find.
31	42.	3.1.1.6 Tolerance level, 3rd parag.	11 (previous)	Most NPPOs have a zero tolerance level for all quarantine pests, taking into account probabilities of pest presence in the non-sampled units as described in section 3.1.1.1. However, an NPPO may determine to establish a tolerance level for a quarantine pest based on pest risk analysis (as described in ISPM 11:2004, section 3.4.1) and then determine sampling rates from this. For example, NPPOs may determine a tolerance level that is greater than zero because small numbers of the quarantine pest may be acceptable if the establishment potential of the pest is considered low or if the intended end use of the product (for example, fresh fruit and vegetables imported for processing) limits the potential of entry of the pest into endangered areas.	Most NPPOs have a zero tolerance level for all quarantine pests, taking into account probabilities of pest presence in the non-sampled units as described in section 3.1.1.1. However, an NPPO may determine to establish a tolerance level for a quarantine pest based on pest risk analysis (as described in ISPM 11:2004, <del>section 3.4.1</del> ) and then determine sampling rates from this. For example, NPPOs may determine a tolerance level that is greater than zero because small numbers of the quarantine pest may be acceptable if the establishment potential of the pest is considered low or if the intended end use of the product (for example, fresh fruit and vegetables imported for processing) limits the potential of entry of the pest into endangered areas.	[ISPMs revised since: 11] Internal cross-reference  Specific cross-reference to a section of ISPM 11. Revised version applies.  Note: does ISPM 11 "describe" this? (it says "inspection or testing for freedom from a pest or to a specified pest tolerance – sample size should be adequate to give an acceptable probability of detecting the pest")
<b>PT 12</b>						
PT 12	43.	<b>Scope of the treatment</b>	18	This treatment applies to the irradiation of fruits and vegetables at 165 Gy minimum absorbed dose to prevent the development of F1 adults of <i>Cylas formicarius elegantulus</i> at the stated efficacy. This treatment should be applied in accordance with the requirements outlined in ISPM 18:2003 ( <i>Guidelines for the use of irradiation as a phytosanitary measure</i> )	This treatment applies to the irradiation of fruits and vegetables at 165 Gy minimum absorbed dose to prevent the development of F1 adults of <i>Cylas formicarius elegantulus</i> at the stated efficacy. This treatment should be applied in accordance with the requirements outlined in ISPM 18:2003 ( <del><i>Guidelines for the use of irradiation as a phytosanitary measure</i></del> )	General cross-reference. ISPM 18 is about irradiation
PT 12	44.		18	Treatment should be applied in accordance with the requirements of ISPM 18:2003 ( <i>Guidelines for the use of irradiation as a phytosanitary measure</i> ).	Treatment should be applied in accordance with the requirements of ISPM 18:2003 ( <del><i>Guidelines for the use of irradiation as a phytosanitary measure</i></del> ).	General cross-reference. ISPM 18 is about irradiation
<b>PT 13</b>						

APPENDIX 15 – TABLE 1						
ISPM	No.	Location of reference	Ref. ISPM	Current text	Proposed revision	Reasons
PT 13	45.	Scope of the treatment	18	This treatment applies to the irradiation of fruits and vegetables at 150 Gy minimum absorbed dose to prevent the development of F1 adults of <i>Euscepes postfasciatus</i> at the stated efficacy. This treatment should be applied in accordance with the requirements outlined in ISPM 18:2003 ( <i>Guidelines for the use of irradiation as a phytosanitary measure</i> )	This treatment applies to the irradiation of fruits and vegetables at 150 Gy minimum absorbed dose to prevent the development of F1 adults of <i>Euscepes postfasciatus</i> at the stated efficacy. This treatment should be applied in accordance with the requirements outlined in ISPM 18: <del>2003</del> ( <i>Guidelines for the use of irradiation as a phytosanitary measure</i> )	General cross-reference. ISPM 18 is about irradiation
PT 13	46.		18	Treatment should be applied in accordance with the requirements of ISPM 18:2003 ( <i>Guidelines for the use of irradiation as a phytosanitary measure</i> ).	Treatment should be applied in accordance with the requirements of ISPM 18: <del>2003</del> ( <i>Guidelines for the use of irradiation as a phytosanitary measure</i> ).	General cross-reference. ISPM 18 is about irradiation
DP 1						
DP 1	47.	5. Records, 1 <sup>st</sup> parag.	27	Records and evidence should be retained as described in section 2.5 of ISPM 27:2006.	Records and evidence should be retained as described in <del>section 2.5 of</del> ISPM 27: <del>2006</del> .	Specific cross-reference. Section 2.5 in ISPM 27 is called "Records" and is easy to find.
DP 2						
DP 2	48.	5. Records, 1 <sup>st</sup> parag.	27	The records required to be kept are listed in section 2.5 of ISPM 27:2006.	The records required to be kept are listed in <del>section 2.5 of</del> ISPM 27: <del>2006</del> .	Specific cross-reference. Section 2.5 in ISPM 27 is called "Records" and is easy to find.
DP 3						
DP 3	49.	5. Records, 1 <sup>st</sup> parag.	27	Records and evidence should be retained as described in section 2.5 of ISPM 27.	Records and evidence should be retained as described in <del>section 2.5 of</del> ISPM 27.	Specific cross-reference. Section 2.5 in ISPM 27 is called "Records" and is easy to find. The year was already omitted in the adopted version.
DP 4						
DP 4	50.	5. Records, 1 <sup>st</sup> parag.	27	Refer to section 2.5 in ISPM 27:2006 for the list of information that needs to be recorded and retained.	Refer to <del>section 2.5 in</del> ISPM 27: <del>2006</del> for the list of information that needs to be recorded and retained.	Specific cross-reference. Section 2.5 in ISPM 27 is called "Records" and is easy to find.
DP 5						
DP 5	51.	5. Records, 1 <sup>st</sup> parag.	27	The records and evidence detailed in section 2.5 of ISPM 27:2006 should be kept.	The records and evidence detailed in <del>section 2.5 of</del> ISPM 27: <del>2006</del> should be kept.	Specific cross-reference. Section 2.5 in ISPM 27 is called "Records" and is easy to find.
DP 6						
DP 6	52.	5. Records, 1 <sup>st</sup> parag.	27	Records and evidence should be retained as described in section 2.5 of ISPM 27:2006.	Records and evidence should be retained as described in <del>section 2.5 of</del> ISPM 27: <del>2006</del> .	Specific cross-reference. Section 2.5 in ISPM 27 is called "Records" and is easy to find.

## Appendix 15 – Table 2: deletion of dates

These changes are related to the deletion of the year of adoption of an ISPM (only change). This includes cases whereby a very specific wording arising from another ISPM is needed (i.e. a specific pest status from ISPM 8) and needs to remain in the standard in order to be properly understood.

In the column “reasons”, the standards cross-referred in the paragraph and that have been revised since, or are under revision, are indicated. This is to indicate clearly which cross-references need to be changed to allow replacement of old versions, which ones will come up soon, and others.

APPENDIX 15 – TABLE 2						
ISPM		Location of reference	Ref.ISPM	Current text	Proposed revision	Reasons
		<b>ISPM 2 Framework for pest risk analysis</b>				
2	1.	Outline of requirements, 2nd parag.	3, 11 (previous), 21	This standard provides detailed guidance on PRA Stage 1, summarizes PRA Stages 2 and 3, and addresses issues generic to the entire PRA process. For Stages 2 and 3 it refers to ISPM 3:2005, ISPM 11:2004 and ISPM 21:2004 dealing with the PRA process.	This standard provides detailed guidance on PRA Stage 1, summarizes PRA Stages 2 and 3, and addresses issues generic to the entire PRA process. For Stages 2 and 3 it refers to ISPM 3: <del>2005</del> , ISPM 11: <del>2004</del> and ISPM 21: <del>2004</del> dealing with the PRA process.	[ISPMs revised since: 11] General cross-references. Still valid. Current version of ISPM 11 applies.
2	2.	Background 2nd parag., <b>footnote</b>	11 (previous)	The IPPC defines a pest as “any species, strain or biotype of plant, animal or pathogenic agent injurious to plants or plant products”. The understanding of the term “pests” includes organisms that are pests because they directly affect cultivated/managed or uncultivated/unmanaged plants, indirectly affect plants, or indirectly affect plants through effects on other organisms (c.f. Annex 1 of ISPM 11:2004).	The IPPC defines a pest as “any species, strain or biotype of plant, animal or pathogenic agent injurious to plants or plant products”. The understanding of the term “pests” includes organisms that are pests because they directly affect cultivated/managed or uncultivated/unmanaged plants, indirectly affect plants, or indirectly affect plants through effects on other organisms (c.f. Annex 1 of ISPM 11: <del>2004</del> ).	[ISPMs revised since: 11] Specific cross-reference. The annex has not changed in the revised ISPM 11. A specific cross reference is useful here, but the date can be deleted
2	3.	Background, revision of this standard	2, 3, 11 (previous), 21	This revision of ISPM 2 particularly addresses the issues of: ... - aligning the text with further conceptual developments of the PRA scope and procedures as appearing in ISPM 3:2005, ISPM 11:2004 and ISPM 21:2004	This revision of ISPM 2 particularly addresses the issues of: ... - aligning the text with further conceptual developments of the PRA scope and procedures as appearing in ISPM 3: <del>2005</del> , ISPM 11: <del>2004</del> and ISPM 21: <del>2004</del>	[ISPMs revised since: 11] General cross-references. Still valid. Current version of ISPM 11 applies. No date needed.
2	4.	1.2.1 Plants as pests, 2nd parag.	11	Plants as pests may affect other plants by competing for water, light, minerals etc. or through direct parasitism and thus suppressing or eliminating other plants. Imported plants may also affect, by hybridization, plant populations under cultivation or in the wild flora, and may become pests for that reason. Further information is provided in the supplementary text on environmental risks in ISPM 11:2004).	Plants as pests may affect other plants by competing for water, light, minerals etc. or through direct parasitism and thus suppressing or eliminating other plants. Imported plants may also affect, by hybridization, plant populations under cultivation or in the wild flora, and may become pests for that reason. Further information is provided in the supplementary text on environmental risks in ISPM 11: <del>2004</del> ).	[ISPMs revised since: 11] General cross-reference. The current version of ISPM 11 applies. Date deleted (close parenthesis was a mistake and is also deleted)
2	5.	1.2.2 Biological control agents and other beneficial organisms, 1st parag., <b>footnote</b>	3	ISPM 3:2005 recommends that NPPOs should conduct a PRA either before import or before release of biological control agents and other beneficial organisms.	ISPM 3: <del>2005</del> recommends that NPPOs should conduct a PRA either before import or before release of biological control agents and other beneficial organisms.	Specific cross-reference. Sentence may have to be substantially changed if this aspect of ISPM 3 is changed (but not foreseen)
2	6.	1.2.4 Living modified organisms, last parag.	11	Further potential risks of LMOs are outlined in Annex 3 to ISPM 11:2004. A PRA may be carried out to determine	Further potential risks of LMOs are outlined in Annex 3 to ISPM 11: <del>2004</del> . A PRA may be carried out to determine	[ISPMs revised since: 11] Specific cross-reference, and is needed. Annex has not changed with

APPENDIX 15 – TABLE 2						
ISPM		Location of reference	Ref.ISPM	Current text	Proposed revision	Reasons
				whether the LMO is a pest, and subsequently assess the pest risk.	whether the LMO is a pest, and subsequently assess the pest risk.	recent revision of ISPM 11, and is expected to remain.
2	7.	1.5 Conclusion of initiation, 4th parag.	11	Where the PRA is specifically aimed at determining if the pest should be regulated as a quarantine pest, the process may proceed immediately to the pest categorization step of pest risk assessment (PRA Stage 2) of ISPM 11:2004. That ISPM is relevant for organisms that appear to meet the following criteria:	Where the PRA is specifically aimed at determining if the pest should be regulated as a quarantine pest, the process may proceed immediately to the pest categorization step of pest risk assessment (PRA Stage 2) of ISPM 11: <del>2004</del> . That ISPM is relevant for organisms that appear to meet the following criteria:	<b>[ISPMs revised since: 11]</b> General cross-reference to a PRA stage. Current version of ISPM 11 applies.
2	8.	1.5 Conclusion of initiation, 4th parag.	21	Where the PRA is specifically aimed at determining if the pest should be regulated as an RNQP, the process may proceed immediately to the pest categorization step of pest risk assessment (PRA Stage 2) of ISPM 21:2004. That ISPM is relevant for organisms that appear to meet the following criteria:	Where the PRA is specifically aimed at determining if the pest should be regulated as an RNQP, the process may proceed immediately to the pest categorization step of pest risk assessment (PRA Stage 2) of ISPM 21: <del>2004</del> .	General cross-reference to a PRA stage.
2	9.	3.3.2 Documenting each specific PRA, <b>footnote</b> linked to 3rd parag.	3	ISPM 3:2005 lists additional documentation requirements in relation to such organisms.	ISPM 3: <del>2005</del> lists additional documentation requirements in relation to such organisms.	Specific cross-ref. Expected that some kind of documentation requirements would remain in ISPM 3 even if revised.
<b>ISPM 3 Guidelines for the export, shipment, import and release of biological control agents and other beneficial organisms</b>						
3	10.	Background, 3rd parag.	20	Section 4.1 of ISPM 20:2004 contains a reference to the regulation of biological control agents; it states: Imported commodities that may be regulated include articles that may be infested or contaminated with regulated pests. ... The following are examples of regulated articles: ... - pests and biological control agents.	Section 4.1 of ISPM 20: <del>2004</del> contains a reference to the regulation of biological control agents; it states: Imported commodities that may be regulated include articles that may be infested or contaminated with regulated pests. ... The following are examples of regulated articles: ... - pests and biological control agents.	<b>[no solution found]</b> Specific cross-reference, but also one to the IPPC in the paragraph just above. No easy rewording. It is proposed to leave the text as it is (only delete the date of adoption of ISPM 20) and adjust it if ISPM 20 is revised before ISPM 3.
3	11.	Background, 5th parag.	3, 2, 11	The structure of this revised standard broadly follows the same structure as the original ISPM 3:1995, and its content is based primarily on risk management relating to the use of biological control agents and other beneficial organisms. It is recognized that the existing standards on pest risk analysis (ISPM 2:2007 and ISPM 11:2004) provide the appropriate fundamental processes for carrying out pest risk assessments for biological control agents and other beneficial organisms. In particular, ISPM 11:2004 includes provisions for pest risk assessment in relation to environmental risks, and this aspect covers environmental concerns related to the use of biological control agents.	The structure of this revised standard broadly follows the same structure as the original ISPM 3: <del>1995</del> , and its content is based primarily on risk management relating to the use of biological control agents and other beneficial organisms. It is recognized that the existing standards on pest risk analysis (ISPM 2: <del>2007</del> and ISPM 11: <del>2004</del> ) provide the appropriate fundamental processes for carrying out pest risk assessments for biological control agents and other beneficial organisms. In particular, ISPM 11: <del>2004</del> includes provisions for pest risk assessment in relation to environmental risks, and this aspect covers environmental concerns related to the use of biological control agents.	<b>[ISPMs revised since: 3, 11]</b> General cross-reference to the previous ISPM 3, current version applies. General cross-reference to ISPMs 2 and 11.  Specific reference to ISPM 11, but the current version applies.
3	12.	Background, 7th parag.	20	Most of this standard is based on the premise that a biological control agent or other beneficial organism may be	Most of this standard is based on the premise that a biological control agent or other beneficial organism may be a potential	General cross-reference to ISPM 20.

APPENDIX 15 – TABLE 2						
ISPM		Location of reference	Ref.ISPM	Current text	Proposed revision	Reasons
				a potential pest itself, and in this sense Article VII.1(c) of the IPPC applies because contracting parties may prohibit or restrict the movement of regulated pests into their territories. In some situations, biological control agents and other beneficial organisms may act as a carrier or pathway for plant pests, hyperparasitoids, hyperparasites and entomopathogens. In this sense, biological control agents and other beneficial organisms may be considered to be regulated articles as described in Article VII.1 of the IPPC and ISPM 20:2004.	pest itself, and in this sense Article VII.1(c) of the IPPC applies because contracting parties may prohibit or restrict the movement of regulated pests into their territories. In some situations, biological control agents and other beneficial organisms may act as a carrier or pathway for plant pests, hyperparasitoids, hyperparasites and entomopathogens. In this sense, biological control agents and other beneficial organisms may be considered to be regulated articles as described in Article VII.1 of the IPPC and ISPM 20: <del>2004</del> .	
3	13.	2. Pest Risk Analysis, 2nd parag.	2, 11	Pest risk assessment should be conducted in accordance with ISPM 2:2007 and/or Stage 2 of ISPM 11:2004 as appropriate, taking into account uncertainties, and potential environmental consequences, as provided for in those standards. In addition to conducting pest risk assessment, contracting parties should also consider possible impacts on the environment, such as impacts on non-target invertebrates.	Pest risk assessment should be conducted in accordance with ISPM 2: <del>2007</del> and/or Stage 2 of ISPM 11: <del>2004</del> as appropriate, taking into account uncertainties, and potential environmental consequences, as provided for in those standards. In addition to conducting pest risk assessment, contracting parties should also consider possible impacts on the environment, such as impacts on non-target invertebrates.	[ISPMs revised since: 11] Specific cross-references to a basic concept of ISPMs 2 and 11 (pest risk assessment). ISPM 11 was revised, and its revision still applies to the current wording.
3	14.	2. Pest Risk Analysis, 3rd parag.	20, 11	Most contracting parties require PRA to be completed prior to import and technical justification, as described in ISPM 20:2004, such as through PRA, is required to determine if pests should be regulated and the strength of phytosanitary measures to be taken against them. Where applicable, if pest risk assessment of the proposed organism has not been undertaken or completed prior to import, it should be completed prior to release (see section 7). However, it is recognized that biological control agents and other beneficial organisms may need to be imported for research and evaluation in secure facilities prior to release. ISPM 20 also states that contracting parties may make special provision for the import of biological control agents and other beneficial organisms for scientific research, and that such imports may be authorized subject to the provision of adequate safeguards. The NPPO should be prepared for such imports with the expectation that, where necessary, a full PRA in accordance with ISPM 11:2004 will be completed prior to release. When non-phytosanitary risks are identified, these may need to be referred to other appropriate authorities for possible action.	Most contracting parties require PRA to be completed prior to import and technical justification, as described in ISPM 20: <del>2004</del> , such as through PRA, is required to determine if pests should be regulated and the strength of phytosanitary measures to be taken against them. Where applicable, if pest risk assessment of the proposed organism has not been undertaken or completed prior to import, it should be completed prior to release (see section 7). However, it is recognized that biological control agents and other beneficial organisms may need to be imported for research and evaluation in secure facilities prior to release. ISPM 20 also states that contracting parties may make special provision for the import of biological control agents and other beneficial organisms for scientific research, and that such imports may be authorized subject to the provision of adequate safeguards. The NPPO should be prepared for such imports with the expectation that, where necessary, a full PRA in accordance with ISPM 11: <del>2004</del> will be completed prior to release. When non-phytosanitary risks are identified, these may need to be referred to other appropriate authorities for possible action.	[ISPMs revised since: 11] General cross-references to ISPMs 20 and 11. ISPM 11 was revised, and its revision still applies to the current wording.
3	15.	3.1.3, 2nd indent	12	phytosanitary certification, in accordance with ISPM 12:2001	phytosanitary certification, in accordance with ISPM 12: <del>2004</del>	[ISPMs revised since: 12]

APPENDIX 15 – TABLE 2						
ISPM	Location of reference	Ref.ISPM	Current text	Proposed revision	Reasons	
					General cross-reference to the concept covered by ISPM 12. The revised version applies.	
3	16.	3.2 Responsibilities of the NPPO of an exporting country, 1st parag.	12 (previous)	The NPPO of an exporting country should ensure that the phytosanitary import requirements of the importing country are satisfied and that phytosanitary certificates are issued in accordance with ISPM 12:2001 where required by the importing country for consignments of biological control agents or other beneficial organisms, if these are considered as potential pests or pathways for plant pests.	The NPPO of an exporting country should ensure that the phytosanitary import requirements of the importing country are satisfied and that phytosanitary certificates are issued in accordance with ISPM 12: <del>2001</del> where required by the importing country for consignments of biological control agents or other beneficial organisms, if these are considered as potential pests or pathways for plant pests.	[ISPMs revised since: 12] General cross-reference to the concept covered by ISPM 12. Revised version applies
3	17.	7. Responsibilities of the NPPO or Other Responsible Authority before, upon and following Release, 2nd paragraph	2, 11 (previous)	If pest risk analysis was not undertaken prior to import in accordance with ISPM 2:2007 and/or ISPM 11:2004, it should be undertaken prior to release, taking into account uncertainties, as provided for in those standards. In addition to conducting pest risk assessment, contracting parties should also consider possible impacts on the environment, such as impacts on non-target invertebrates.	If pest risk analysis was not undertaken prior to import in accordance with ISPM 2: <del>2007</del> and/or ISPM 11: <del>2004</del> , it should be undertaken prior to release, taking into account uncertainties, as provided for in those standards. In addition to conducting pest risk assessment, contracting parties should also consider possible impacts on the environment, such as impacts on non-target invertebrates.	[ISPMs revised since: 11] General cross-reference to the topic of ISPMs 2 and 11. Revised ISPM 11 applies
<b>ISPM 4 Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas</b>						
4	18.	1.2 Establishment and Maintenance of a PFA, last parag.	6, 2 (previous)	ISPM 6:1997 and ISPM 2:1995 provide further details on general surveillance and specific survey requirements.	ISPM 6: <del>1997</del> and ISPM 2: <del>1995</del> provide further details on general surveillance and specific survey requirements.	[ISPMs revised since: 2; under revision: 6] General cross-reference to survey and surveillance requirements, which is the main topic of ISPM 6. Surveillance or survey are briefly mentioned in the current version of ISPM 2, but not in the 1995 version, so the original cross-ref to ISPM 2 was not clear. However as such aspects are mentioned in the 2007 version, it applies. Date not needed
<b>ISPM 5 Glossary of phytosanitary terms</b>						
5	19.	Supplement 1, Background, last parag.	1, 8	“Not widely distributed” is not a term included in the description of pest status listed in ISPM 8:1998.	“Not widely distributed” is not a term included in the description of pest status listed in ISPM 8: <del>1998</del> .	[ISPMs under revision: 8] Specific cross-reference, true as of now. This is needed now. It is not possible to anticipate whether it might (or not) be mentioned in the revised ISPM 8
5	20.	Supplement 1, General Requirements	1, 1	Official control is subject to ISPM 1:2006, in particular the principles of non-discrimination, transparency, equivalence of phytosanitary measures and pest risk analysis.	Official control is subject to ISPM 1: <del>2006</del> , in particular the principles of non-discrimination, transparency, equivalence of phytosanitary measures and pest risk analysis.	This refers to the current ISPM 1. Basic IPPC principles, not expected to change

APPENDIX 15 – TABLE 2						
ISPM		Location of reference	Ref.ISPM	Current text	Proposed revision	Reasons
5	21.	Supplement 1, 2.1 Technical justification, 2nd parag.	2, 11 (previous)	Application of the definition of a quarantine pest requires knowledge of potential economic importance, potential distribution and official control programmes (ISPM 2:2007). The categorization of a pest as present and widely distributed or present but not widely distributed is determined in relation to its potential distribution. This potential distribution represents the areas where the pest could become established if given the opportunity, i.e. its hosts are present and environmental factors such as climate and soil are favourable. ISPM 11:2004 provides guidance on the factors to be considered in assessing the probability of establishment and spread when conducting a pest risk analysis. In the case of a pest that is present but not widely distributed, the assessment of potential economic importance should relate to the areas where the pest is not established.	Application of the definition of a quarantine pest requires knowledge of potential economic importance, potential distribution and official control programmes (ISPM 2: <del>2007</del> ). The categorization of a pest as present and widely distributed or present but not widely distributed is determined in relation to its potential distribution. This potential distribution represents the areas where the pest could become established if given the opportunity, i.e. its hosts are present and environmental factors such as climate and soil are favourable. ISPM 11: <del>2004</del> provides guidance on the factors to be considered in assessing the probability of establishment and spread when conducting a pest risk analysis. In the case of a pest that is present but not widely distributed, the assessment of potential economic importance should relate to the areas where the pest is not established.	[ISPMs revised since: 11] ISPM 2. Specific cross-reference to Basic elements of PRA, not expected to change  ISPM 11. specific cross-reference to basic elements of PRA. Sentence still applies to the revised version, and likely to remain relevant in the future
5	22.	Last parag.	6	Surveillance should be used to determine the distribution of a pest in an area as a basis for the further consideration of whether the pest is not widely distributed. ISPM 6:1997 provides guidance on surveillance, and includes provisions on transparency. Biological factors such as pest life cycle, means of dispersal and rate of reproduction may influence the design of surveillance programmes, the interpretation of survey data and the level of confidence in the categorization of a pest as not widely distributed. The distribution of a pest in an area is not a static condition. Changing conditions or new information may necessitate reconsideration of whether a pest is not widely distributed.	Surveillance should be used to determine the distribution of a pest in an area as a basis for the further consideration of whether the pest is not widely distributed. ISPM 6: <del>1997</del> provides guidance on surveillance, and includes provisions on transparency. Biological factors such as pest life cycle, means of dispersal and rate of reproduction may influence the design of surveillance programmes, the interpretation of survey data and the level of confidence in the categorization of a pest as not widely distributed. The distribution of a pest in an area is not a static condition. Changing conditions or new information may necessitate reconsideration of whether a pest is not widely distributed.	[ISPMs under revision: 6] General cross-reference. Not expected to change if ISPM 6 is revised (ISPM 6 is on surveillance and is expected to still mention transparency)
5	23.	Supplement 2, 3. Economic Terms and Environmental Scope of the IPPC and ISPMs, 3rd parag.	11 (previous) , 16	Terms related to evidence that supports the above judgements: - limit the economic impact (in the definition for phytosanitary regulation and the agreed interpretation of phytosanitary measure) - economic evidence (in the definition for pest risk analysis) - <i>cause economic damage</i> (in Article VII.3 of the IPPC, 1997) - direct and indirect <i>economic impacts</i> (in ISPM 11:2004 and ISPM 16:2002) - economic consequences and potential economic consequences (in ISPM 11:2004)	Terms related to evidence that supports the above judgements: - limit the economic impact (in the definition for phytosanitary regulation and the agreed interpretation of phytosanitary measure) - economic evidence (in the definition for pest risk analysis) - <i>cause economic damage</i> (in Article VII.3 of the IPPC, 1997) - direct and indirect <i>economic impacts</i> (in ISPM 11: <del>2004</del> and ISPM 16: <del>2002</del> ) - economic consequences and potential economic consequences (in ISPM 11: <del>2004</del> )	[ISPMs revised since: 11] General cross-references. For ISPM 11, revised version applies

APPENDIX 15 – TABLE 2					
ISPM	Location of reference	Ref.ISPM	Current text	Proposed revision	Reasons
			commercial consequences and non-commercial consequences (in ISPM 11:2004).	commercial consequences and non-commercial consequences (in ISPM 11: <del>2004</del> ).	
5	24. Supplement 2, 3. Economic Terms and Environmental Scope of the IPPC and ISPMs, 4th parag.	11 (previous)	ISPM 11:2004 notes in section 2.1.1.5 with respect to pest categorization, that there should be a clear indication that the pest is likely to have an unacceptable economic impact, including environmental impact, in the PRA area. Section 2.3 of the standard describes the procedure for assessing potential economic consequences of a pest introduction. Pest effects may be considered to be direct or indirect. Section 2.3.2.2 addresses analysis of commercial consequences. Section 2.3.2.4 provides guidance on the assessment of the non-commercial and environmental consequences of pest introduction. It acknowledges that certain types of effects may not apply to an existing market that can be easily identified, but it goes on to state that the impacts could be approximated with an appropriate non-market valuation method. This section notes that if a quantitative measurement is not feasible, then this part of the assessment should at least include a qualitative analysis and an explanation of how the information is used in the PRA. Environmental or other undesirable effects of control measures are covered in section 2.3.1.2 (Indirect pest effects) as part of the analysis of potential economic consequences. Where a pest risk is found to be unacceptable, section 3.4 provides guidance on the selection of pest risk management options, including measurements of cost-effectiveness, feasibility and least trade restrictiveness.	ISPM 11: <del>2004</del> notes in section 2.1.1.5 with respect to pest categorization, that there should be a clear indication that the pest is likely to have an unacceptable economic impact, including environmental impact, in the PRA area. Section 2.3 of the standard describes the procedure for assessing potential economic consequences of a pest introduction. Pest effects may be considered to be direct or indirect. Section 2.3.2.2 addresses analysis of commercial consequences. Section 2.3.2.4 provides guidance on the assessment of the non-commercial and environmental consequences of pest introduction. It acknowledges that certain types of effects may not apply to an existing market that can be easily identified, but it goes on to state that the impacts could be approximated with an appropriate non-market valuation method. This section notes that if a quantitative measurement is not feasible, then this part of the assessment should at least include a qualitative analysis and an explanation of how the information is used in the PRA. Environmental or other undesirable effects of control measures are covered in section 2.3.1.2 (Indirect pest effects) as part of the analysis of potential economic consequences. Where a pest risk is found to be unacceptable, section 3.4 provides guidance on the selection of pest risk management options, including measurements of cost-effectiveness, feasibility and least trade restrictiveness.	<p>[no solution found] [ISPMs revised since: 11]</p> <p>Although ISPM 11 was revised in 2013, the section numbers still apply (i.e. does not prevent replacement of old versions of ISPM 11).</p> <p>There may not be a solution in this case. This section needs to refer to different elements of ISPM 11. Deleting section numbers could be done by adding text, but would not be helpful for readers who need to find the details of each element.</p> <p>It is proposed to keep section numbers as they are (to delete only the date of ISPM 11)</p>
5	25. Supplement 2, 5. Application, last parag.	16, 21	In the case of regulated non-quarantine pests, because such pest populations are already established, introduction in an area of concern and environmental effects are not relevant criteria in the consideration of <i>economically unacceptable impacts</i> (see ISPM 16:2002 and ISPM 21:2004).	In the case of regulated non-quarantine pests, because such pest populations are already established, introduction in an area of concern and environmental effects are not relevant criteria in the consideration of <i>economically unacceptable impacts</i> (see ISPM 16: <del>2002</del> and ISPM 21: <del>2004</del> ).	General cross-references.
5	26. Appendix 1, note 9	11 (previous)	<sup>9</sup> The word “threaten” does not have an immediate equivalent in IPPC language. The IPPC definition of a <b>pest</b> uses the term “injurious”, while the definition of a <b>quarantine pest</b> refers to “economic importance”. ISPM 11:2004 makes it clear that <b>quarantine pests</b> may be “injurious” to <b>plants</b> directly, or indirectly (via other components of ecosystems), while Supplement 2 of the Glossary explains that “economic importance” depends on a harmful impact on crops, or on the	<sup>9</sup> The word “threaten” does not have an immediate equivalent in IPPC language. The IPPC definition of a <b>pest</b> uses the term “injurious”, while the definition of a <b>quarantine pest</b> refers to “economic importance”. ISPM 11: <del>2004</del> makes it clear that <b>quarantine pests</b> may be “injurious” to <b>plants</b> directly, or indirectly (via other components of ecosystems), while Supplement 2 of the Glossary explains that “economic importance” depends on a harmful impact on crops, or on the	<p>[ISPMs revised since: 11]</p> <p>General cross-reference. Still applies in ISPM 11 version of 2013</p> <p>The sentence about supplement 2 summarizes elements that are mentioned in the supplement</p>

APPENDIX 15 – TABLE 2					
ISPM	Location of reference	Ref.ISPM	Current text	Proposed revision	Reasons
			environment, or on some other specific value (recreation, tourism, aesthetics).	environment, or on some other specific value (recreation, tourism, aesthetics).	
5	27. Appendix 1, note 21	11 (previous), 5 Suppl. 2	<sup>21</sup> It is not clear at what stages in the process of <b>risk analysis (CBD)</b> socio-economic and cultural considerations are taken into account (during assessment, or during management, or both). No explanation can be offered in relation to ISPM 11:2004 or Supplement 2 of ISPM 5.	<sup>21</sup> It is not clear at what stages in the process of <b>risk analysis (CBD)</b> socio-economic and cultural considerations are taken into account (during assessment, or during management, or both). No explanation can be offered in relation to ISPM 11: <del>2004</del> or Supplement 2 of ISPM 5.	[ISPMs revised since: 11] General cross-references. For ISPM 11, still true for revised version
<b>ISPM 6 Guidelines for surveillance</b>					
6	28. Outline of Requirements	1 (previous), 4	Under the international standard ISPM 1:1993 countries are required to justify their phytosanitary measures on the basis of pest risk analysis. These principles also endorse the concept of “pest free areas”, a description of which is provided in ISPM 4:1995. These concepts are also referred to in the World Trade Organization’s Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (WTO, 1994). The collecting and recording of pest information is fundamental to all these concepts. The implication is that national plant protection organizations (NPPOs) should be in a position to validate declarations of the absence or limited distribution of quarantine pests.	Under the international standard ISPM 1: <del>1993</del> countries are required to justify their phytosanitary measures on the basis of pest risk analysis. These principles also endorse the concept of “pest free areas”, a description of which is provided in ISPM 4: <del>1995</del> . These concepts are also referred to in the World Trade Organization’s Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (WTO, 1994). The collecting and recording of pest information is fundamental to all these concepts. The implication is that national plant protection organizations (NPPOs) should be in a position to validate declarations of the absence or limited distribution of quarantine pests.	[ISPMs revised since: 1; under revision: 4] General cross-reference to basic principles, still apply to the revised version of ISPM 1 General cross-reference to ISPM 4. The revised ISPM 4 will still be about pest free areas.
<b>ISPM 7 Phytosanitary certification system</b>					
7	29. Scope	12	Requirements and guidelines for the preparation and issuance of phytosanitary certificates <sup>1</sup> (phytosanitary certificates for export and phytosanitary certificates for re-export) are described in ISPM 12:2011.	Requirements and guidelines for the preparation and issuance of phytosanitary certificates <sup>1</sup> (phytosanitary certificates for export and phytosanitary certificates for re-export) are described in ISPM 12: <del>2011</del> .	General cross-reference to a basic element of ISPM 12
7	30. 4.1 Phytosanitary certificates	12	The phytosanitary certificates are the documentary assurance that the phytosanitary certification process as described under the IPPC has been undertaken. The model phytosanitary certificates as described in the Annex to the IPPC should be used. Specific guidance is provided in ISPM 12:2011.	The phytosanitary certificates are the documentary assurance that the phytosanitary certification process as described under the IPPC has been undertaken. The model phytosanitary certificates as described in the Annex to the IPPC should be used. Specific guidance is provided in ISPM 12: <del>2011</del> .	General cross-reference to a basic element of ISPM 12
7	31. 4.2 Documentation of procedures, 1st parag.	12	The NPPO should maintain guidance documents and work instructions, as appropriate, covering all the procedures of the phytosanitary certification system, including: - specific activities relating to phytosanitary certificates, as described in ISPM 12:2011, including inspection, sampling, testing, treatment and verification of the identity and integrity of consignments	The NPPO should maintain guidance documents and work instructions, as appropriate, covering all the procedures of the phytosanitary certification system, including: - specific activities relating to phytosanitary certificates, as described in ISPM 12: <del>2011</del> , including inspection, sampling, testing, treatment and verification of the identity and integrity of consignments	General cross-reference to a basic element of ISPM 12

APPENDIX 15 – TABLE 2						
ISPM	Location of reference	Ref.ISPM	Current text	Proposed revision	Reasons	
7	32. 5.2 Communication between NPPOs, last parag.	13	If after phytosanitary certification the NPPO of the exporting country becomes aware that an exported consignment may not have complied with phytosanitary import requirements, the IPPC contact point or designated alternative point of contact in the importing country should be informed as soon as possible. In cases where non-compliance has been identified at import, ISPM 13:2001 applies.	If after phytosanitary certification the NPPO of the exporting country becomes aware that an exported consignment may not have complied with phytosanitary import requirements, the IPPC contact point or designated alternative point of contact in the importing country should be informed as soon as possible. In cases where non-compliance has been identified at import, ISPM 13: <del>2001</del> applies.	General cross-reference. The topic of ISPM 13 is notification of non-compliance and emergency action, and expected to remain so.	
<b>ISPM 8 Determination of pest status in an area</b>						
8	33. 1. Purposes of Pest Status Determination, 2nd parag.	1 (previous)	In general, the provision of reliable pest records and the determination of pest status are vital components of a number of activities covered under the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) and by the principles noted in ISPM 1:1993 and the international standards for phytosanitary measures that have been developed from them.	In general, the provision of reliable pest records and the determination of pest status are vital components of a number of activities covered under the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) and by the principles noted in ISPM 1: <del>1993</del> and the international standards for phytosanitary measures that have been developed from them.	[ISPMs revised since: 1] General cross-reference. Revised ISPM 1 is still about the principles	
8	34. 2.1 Pest record	6	The ISPM 6:1997 describes the elements of information from general surveillance and specific surveys that may be included in a pest record. The basic information needed in a pest record includes the following:	The ISPM 6: <del>1997</del> describes the elements of information from general surveillance and specific surveys that may be included in a pest record. The basic information needed in a pest record includes the following:	[ISPMs under revision: 6] General cross-reference. ISPM 6 is on surveillance, and even if revised is likely to refer to general surveillance and specific surveys	
8	35. 3.1.2 Absence, 2nd parag.	4, 6	It is also possible to conclude that a pest is absent even if there are pest records suggesting the contrary. These different situations are described below. Absence may also be confirmed by specific surveys (see ISPM 6:1997) and, in that case, the phrase “confirmed by survey” should then be added. Similarly, when a pest free area is established according to the appropriate ISPM (see ISPM 4:1995) the phrase “Pest free area declared” should be added.	It is also possible to conclude that a pest is absent even if there are pest records suggesting the contrary. These different situations are described below. Absence may also be confirmed by specific surveys (see ISPM 6: <del>1997</del> ) and, in that case, the phrase “confirmed by survey” should then be added. Similarly, when a pest free area is established according to the appropriate ISPM (see ISPM 4: <del>1995</del> ) the phrase “Pest free area declared” should be added.	[ISPMs under revision: 4, 6] Specific cross-reference. Still expected that absence may be confirmed by specific surveys, even in revised ISPM 6  General cross-reference to ISPM 4, on pest free areas	
8	36. 3.1.2 Absence, Absent: pest eradicated	9	Pest records indicate that the pest was present in the past. A documented pest eradication programme was conducted and was successful (see ISPM 9:1998). Surveillance confirms continued absence.	Pest records indicate that the pest was present in the past. A documented pest eradication programme was conducted and was successful (see ISPM 9: <del>1998</del> ). Surveillance confirms continued absence.	General cross-reference. Eradication is the topic of ISPM 9	
<b>ISPM 9 Guidelines for pest eradication programmes</b>						
9	37. Outline of requirements, 2nd parag.	2 (previous)	After a preliminary investigation that includes the consideration of data collected at the site(s) of detection or occurrence, the extent of the infestation, information on the biology and potential economic impact of the pest, current technology and available resources for eradication, a cost-benefit analysis of the pest eradication programme should be undertaken. Whenever possible, it is also useful to gather information concerning the geographical origin of the pest,	After a preliminary investigation that includes the consideration of data collected at the site(s) of detection or occurrence, the extent of the infestation, information on the biology and potential economic impact of the pest, current technology and available resources for eradication, a cost-benefit analysis of the pest eradication programme should be undertaken. Whenever possible, it is also useful to gather information concerning the geographical origin of the pest,	[ISPMs under revision: 2]  General cross-reference to ISPM 2. Revised version applies  Both ISPMs 2 and 11 would be relevant (but ISPM 9 was developed before ISPM 11 was first adopted)	

APPENDIX 15 – TABLE 2						
ISPM	Location of reference	Ref.ISPM	Current text	Proposed revision	Reasons	
			and pathways for its reintroduction. Pest risk analysis (PRA) provides a scientific basis for informed decision-making (see ISPM 2:1995). From these studies, one or more options should be made available to decision-makers. However, in an emergency situation, the benefits of speed of action in preventing spread may outweigh the benefits normally achieved through a more structured approach.	and pathways for its reintroduction. Pest risk analysis (PRA) provides a scientific basis for informed decision-making (see ISPM 2: <del>1995</del> ). From these studies, one or more options should be made available to decision-makers. However, in an emergency situation, the benefits of speed of action in preventing spread may outweigh the benefits normally achieved through a more structured approach.		
9	38. 1.3 Reporting requirements and information sharing	8	Verification of the occurrence of a new pest of immediate or potential danger initiates the process that leads to reporting requirements for the NPPO under the International Plant Protection Convention (see Article VII.2(j) and Article VIII.1(a) and VIII.1(c)) and is described in ISPM 8:1998.	Verification of the occurrence of a new pest of immediate or potential danger initiates the process that leads to reporting requirements for the NPPO under the International Plant Protection Convention (see Article VII.2(j) and Article VIII.1(a) and VIII.1(c)) and is described in ISPM 8: <del>1998</del> .	<b>[ISPMs under revision: 8]</b> General cross-reference. ISPM 8 is about determining pest status.	
9	39. 2.1 Initiation	6	The eradication programme may be initiated by detection of a pest new to an area arising from general surveillance or specific surveys (see ISPM 6:1997). In the case of established pests, the eradication programme will be initiated by policy considerations (e.g. a decision taken to establish a pest free area).	The eradication programme may be initiated by detection of a pest new to an area arising from general surveillance or specific surveys (see ISPM 6: <del>1997</del> ). In the case of established pests, the eradication programme will be initiated by policy considerations (e.g. a decision taken to establish a pest free area).	<b>[ISPMs under revision: 6]</b> General cross-reference ISPM 6 is on surveillance	
9	40. 2.4 Feasibility of undertaking an eradication programme	2, 11 (previous)	An estimate of the impact of the pest, the extent of the infested area, the potential for spread, and the anticipated rate of spread is necessary to judge the feasibility of an eradication programme. PRA provides a scientific basis for this estimate (see ISPM 2:2007 and ISPM 11:2004). Possible eradication options and cost-benefit factors should also be considered.	An estimate of the impact of the pest, the extent of the infested area, the potential for spread, and the anticipated rate of spread is necessary to judge the feasibility of an eradication programme. PRA provides a scientific basis for this estimate (see ISPM 2: <del>2007</del> and ISPM 11: <del>2004</del> ). Possible eradication options and cost-benefit factors should also be considered.	<b>[ISPMs revised since: 11]</b> General cross-reference. Estimating the impact of a pest is generally part of PRA, topic of ISPM 2 and ISPM 11	
9	41. 3.2.1 Surveillance	6	A delimiting survey should be completed either initially or to confirm earlier surveys. Monitoring surveys should then continue in accordance with the eradication plan to check the distribution of the pest and assess the effectiveness of the eradication programme (see ISPM 6:1997). Surveillance may include a pathway analysis to identify the source of the pest and its possible spread, the inspection of clonally or contact-linked material, inspection, trapping, and aerial observation. This may also include targeted inquiries to growers, those responsible for storage and handling facilities, and the public.	A delimiting survey should be completed either initially or to confirm earlier surveys. Monitoring surveys should then continue in accordance with the eradication plan to check the distribution of the pest and assess the effectiveness of the eradication programme (see ISPM 6: <del>1997</del> ). Surveillance may include a pathway analysis to identify the source of the pest and its possible spread, the inspection of clonally or contact-linked material, inspection, trapping, and aerial observation. This may also include targeted inquiries to growers, those responsible for storage and handling facilities, and the public.	<b>[ISPMs under revision: 6]</b> Specific reference to a concept in ISPM 6. Monitoring surveys are likely to remain in ISPM 6	
9	42. 3.5 Declaration of eradication	8	A declaration of eradication by the NPPO follows the completion of a successful eradication programme. The status of the pest in the area is then “absent: pest eradicated” (see ISPM 8: <del>1998</del> ). It involves communication	A declaration of eradication by the NPPO follows the completion of a successful eradication programme. The status of the pest in the area is then “absent: pest eradicated” (see ISPM 8: <del>1998</del> ). It involves communication	<b>[ISPMs under revision: 8]</b> Specific reference to one pest status in ISPM 8. If the pest status changes in the revised ISPM 8, the text here	

APPENDIX 15 – TABLE 2						
ISPM	Location of reference	Ref.ISPM	Current text	Proposed revision	Reasons	
			with affected and interested parties, as well as appropriate authorities concerning the fulfilment of programme objectives. Programme documentation and other relevant evidence supporting the declaration should be made available to other NPPOs upon request.	with affected and interested parties, as well as appropriate authorities concerning the fulfilment of programme objectives. Programme documentation and other relevant evidence supporting the declaration should be made available to other NPPOs upon request.	could easily be adjusted (as ISPM 8 will presumably contain a pest status for eradication)	
<b>ISPM 10 Requirements for the establishment of pest free places of production and pest free production sites</b>						
10	43. 1.2 Distinction between a Pest Free Place of Production or a Pest Free Production Site and a Pest Free Area	4	The concept of the pest free place of production is distinct from that of the pest free area (see ISPM 4:1995). The pest free area has the same objective as the pest free place of production but is implemented in a different way. Every distinction between a pest free place of production and a pest free area applies equally to a pest free production site.	The concept of the pest free place of production is distinct from that of the pest free area (see ISPM 4: <del>1995</del> ). The pest free area has the same objective as the pest free place of production but is implemented in a different way. Every distinction between a pest free place of production and a pest free area applies equally to a pest free production site.	[ISPMs under revision: 4] General cross-reference. ISPM 4 is on pest-free areas	
<b>ISPM 11 Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests</b>						
11	44. 1.1 Initiation points, 3rd parag.	3	pests modified to alter their pathogenic characteristic and thereby make them useful for biological control (see ISPM 3:2005)	pests modified to alter their pathogenic characteristic and thereby make them useful for biological control (see ISPM 3: <del>2005</del> )	General cross-reference to ISPM 3	
11	45. 2.2.2 Probability of establishment, 2nd parag.	8	In considering probability of establishment, it should be noted that a transient pest (see ISPM 8:1998) may not be able to establish in the PRA area (e.g. because of unsuitable climatic conditions) but could still have unacceptable economic consequences (see IPPC Article VII.3).	In considering probability of establishment, it should be noted that a transient pest (see ISPM 8: <del>1998</del> ) may not be able to establish in the PRA area (e.g. because of unsuitable climatic conditions) but could still have unacceptable economic consequences (see IPPC Article VII.3).	[ISPMs under revision: 8] Specific cross-reference. Transience expected to remain in ISPM 8	
11	46. 3.4 Identification and selection of appropriate risk management options, 1st parag	1 (previous)	Appropriate measures should be chosen based on their effectiveness in reducing the probability of introduction of the pest. The choice should be based on the following considerations, which include several of the phytosanitary principles of ISPM 1:1993:	Appropriate measures should be chosen based on their effectiveness in reducing the probability of introduction of the pest. The choice should be based on the following considerations, which include several of the phytosanitary principles of ISPM 1: <del>1993</del> :	[ISPMs revised since: 1] General cross-reference. The principles referred to are minimal impact, equivalence, and non-discrimination, which are basic principles and still in the 2006 version of ISPM 1.	
11	47. 3.4.3 Options ensuring that the area, place or site of production or crop is free from the pest	4, 10	Measures may include: - pest-free area – requirements for pest-free area status are described in ISPM 4:1995 - pest-free place of production or pest-free production site – requirements are described in ISPM 10:1999 - inspection of crop to confirm pest freedom.	Measures may include: - pest-free area – requirements for pest-free area status are described in ISPM 4: <del>1995</del> - pest-free place of production or pest-free production site – requirements are described in ISPM 10: <del>1999</del> - inspection of crop to confirm pest freedom.	[ISPMs under revision: 4] General cross-references to ISPMs 4 and 10	
11	48. 3.5 Phytosanitary certificates and other compliance measures, 1st parag.	7, 12 (previous)	Risk management includes the consideration of appropriate compliance procedures. The most important of these is export certification (see ISPM 7:1997). The issuance of phytosanitary certificates (see ISPM 12:2001) provides official assurance that a consignment is “considered to be free from the quarantine pests specified by the importing	Risk management includes the consideration of appropriate compliance procedures. The most important of these is export certification (see ISPM 7: <del>1997</del> ). The issuance of phytosanitary certificates (see ISPM 12: <del>2001</del> ) provides official assurance that a consignment is “considered to be free from the quarantine pests specified by the importing	General cross-references. Export certification is the topic of ISPM 7 and phytosanitary certificates of ISPM 12  Exact quote from ISPM 12:2001 is also included in ISPM 12:2011 (this is	

APPENDIX 15 – TABLE 2						
ISPM		Location of reference	Ref.ISPM	Current text	Proposed revision	Reasons
				contracting party and to conform with the current phytosanitary requirements of the importing contracting party.” It thus confirms that the specified risk management options have been followed. An additional declaration may be required to indicate that a particular measure has been carried out. Other compliance measures may be used subject to bilateral or multilateral agreement.	contracting party and to conform with the current phytosanitary requirements of the importing contracting party.” It thus confirms that the specified risk management options have been followed. An additional declaration may be required to indicate that a particular measure has been carried out. Other compliance measures may be used subject to bilateral or multilateral agreement.	part of the certifying statement on the model certificates; it leaves out the end of the sentence on RNQPs, not relevant for ISPM 11)
11	49.	3.5 Phytosanitary certificates and other compliance measures, 2nd parag.	12 (previous)	S2 Information on phytosanitary certificates regarding LMOs (as with any other regulated articles) should only be related to phytosanitary measures (see ISPM 12:2001).	S2 Information on phytosanitary certificates regarding LMOs (as with any other regulated articles) should only be related to phytosanitary measures (see ISPM 12: <del>2004</del> ).	General cross-reference to ISPM 12 (LMOs are not specifically mentioned in ISPM 12, the reference here is presumably intended to be general)
11	50.	Annex 4, section Plants as pests, last parag.	11 (previous)	The remainder of the text generally follows the sequence of ISPM 11:2004, with the corresponding sections of the standard indicated in parentheses. In each section, guidance is provided on the analytical aspects particular to plants as pests.	The remainder of the text generally follows the sequence of ISPM 11: <del>2004</del> , with the corresponding sections of the standard indicated in parentheses. In each section, guidance is provided on the analytical aspects particular to plants as pests.	[ISPMs revised since: 11] The sequence is the same in the revised ISPM 11 (the annex was adopted at the same time as ISPM 11 was revised)
11	51.	Footnote	5 App. 1	“Invasive plants” are often taken to mean invasive alien species in the CBD sense (see ISPM 5, Appendix 1 (2009)). The term “weed” usually refers to pests of cultivated plants. However, some countries use the term “weed” irrespective of whether cultivated plants or wild flora are at risk, and other countries use the term “noxious weed”, “landscape weed”, “environmental weed” or similar terms to distinguish them from plants only affecting crops.	“Invasive plants” are often taken to mean invasive alien species in the CBD sense (see ISPM 5, Appendix 1 ( <del>2009</del> )). The term “weed” usually refers to pests of cultivated plants. However, some countries use the term “weed” irrespective of whether cultivated plants or wild flora are at risk, and other countries use the term “noxious weed”, “landscape weed”, “environmental weed” or similar terms to distinguish them from plants only affecting crops.	Not needed, general cross-reference
11	52.	Stage 1, pre-selection	2	ISPM 2:2007 describes, as part of the initiation stage, a pre-selection step intended for determining whether or not an organism is a pest, and provides some indicators that a plant may be a pest. Particular attention is needed for plants that have proven to be pests elsewhere or that have intrinsic characteristics such as high propagation rate or strong competitive or propagule dispersal abilities. In most cases, consideration of these factors in Stage 1 of the PRA may not be sufficient to terminate the process; however, in cases where it is clearly determined that the plant is only suited to a specific type of habitat that does not exist in the PRA area, it may be concluded that the plant cannot become a pest in that area and the PRA process may stop at that point.	ISPM 2: <del>2007</del> describes, as part of the initiation stage, a pre-selection step intended for determining whether or not an organism is a pest, and provides some indicators that a plant may be a pest. Particular attention is needed for plants that have proven to be pests elsewhere or that have intrinsic characteristics such as high propagation rate or strong competitive or propagule dispersal abilities. In most cases, consideration of these factors in Stage 1 of the PRA may not be sufficient to terminate the process; however, in cases where it is clearly determined that the plant is only suited to a specific type of habitat that does not exist in the PRA area, it may be concluded that the plant cannot become a pest in that area and the PRA process may stop at that point.	Specific cross-reference to a basic elements of ISPM 2.
11	53.	Stage 2, Intended use	32	The PRA should include consideration of the intended use (refer to ISPM 32:2009) of the plants as this may affect the probability of establishment, spread and economic	The PRA should include consideration of the intended use (refer to ISPM 32: <del>2009</del> ) of the plants as this may affect the probability of establishment, spread and economic	General cross-reference.

APPENDIX 15 – TABLE 2					
ISPM	Location of reference	Ref.ISPM	Current text	Proposed revision	Reasons
			consequences. However, it should also be recognized that plants, once entered, may escape or be diverted from the use for which they were originally intended.	consequences. However, it should also be recognized that plants, once entered, may escape or be diverted from the use for which they were originally intended.	
<b>ISPM 12 Phytosanitary certificates</b>					
12	54. Scope	7	Specific guidance on requirements and components of a phytosanitary certification system to be established by national plant protection organizations (NPPOs) is provided in ISPM 7:2011.	Specific guidance on requirements and components of a phytosanitary certification system to be established by national plant protection organizations (NPPOs) is provided in ISPM 7: <del>2011</del> .	General cross-reference to the topic of ISPM 7
12	55. 3. Considerations for Importing Countries and NPPOs Issuing Phytosanitary Certificates, 1st parag.	32	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, or for other articles that do not require phytosanitary measures (see IPPC Article VI.2 and ISPM 32:2009).	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, or for other articles that do not require phytosanitary measures (see IPPC Article VI.2 and ISPM 32: <del>2009</del> ).	General cross-reference
12	56. 3. Considerations for Importing Countries and NPPOs Issuing Phytosanitary Certificates, 2nd parag.	1	NPPOs should consult bilaterally when there are differences between their views regarding the technical justification for requiring phytosanitary certificates. Requirements for phytosanitary certificates should respect the principles of transparency, non-discrimination, necessity and technical justification (see ISPM 1:2006).	NPPOs should consult bilaterally when there are differences between their views regarding the technical justification for requiring phytosanitary certificates. Requirements for phytosanitary certificates should respect the principles of transparency, non-discrimination, necessity and technical justification (see ISPM 1: <del>2006</del> ).	General cross-reference to basic principles in ISPM 1
12	57. 3.1 Unacceptable phytosanitary certificates	13	NPPOs of importing countries should not accept phytosanitary certificates that they determine to be invalid or fraudulent. The NPPO of the declared country of issuance should be notified as soon as possible regarding unacceptable or suspect phytosanitary certificates as described in ISPM 13:2001. Where the NPPO of the importing country suspects that phytosanitary certificates may be unacceptable, it may require the prompt cooperation of the NPPO of the exporting or re-exporting country in determining the validity or non-validity of the phytosanitary certificates. The NPPO of the exporting or re-exporting country should take corrective action where necessary and review systems for the issuance of phytosanitary certificates so as to ensure that a high level of confidence is associated with its phytosanitary certificates.	NPPOs of importing countries should not accept phytosanitary certificates that they determine to be invalid or fraudulent. The NPPO of the declared country of issuance should be notified as soon as possible regarding unacceptable or suspect phytosanitary certificates as described in ISPM 13: <del>2001</del> . Where the NPPO of the importing country suspects that phytosanitary certificates may be unacceptable, it may require the prompt cooperation of the NPPO of the exporting or re-exporting country in determining the validity or non-validity of the phytosanitary certificates. The NPPO of the exporting or re-exporting country should take corrective action where necessary and review systems for the issuance of phytosanitary certificates so as to ensure that a high level of confidence is associated with its phytosanitary certificates.	General cross-reference. One of the basic elements of ISPM 13.
12	58. 5. Guidelines and Requirements for Completing Sections of a Phytosanitary Certificate for Export, under III.	18	For irradiation treatments, the provisions of ISPM 18:2003 should be considered.	For irradiation treatments, the provisions of ISPM 18: <del>2003</del> should be considered.	General cross-reference. ISPM 18 is about irradiation

APPENDIX 15 – TABLE 2					
ISPM	Location of reference	Ref.ISPM	Current text	Proposed revision	Reasons
	Disinfestation and/or Disinfection Treatment, last parag.				
12	59. 6.2 Transit, 1st parag	25	If a consignment is in transit through a country, the NPPO of the country of transit is not involved unless risks for the country of transit have been identified (ISPM 25:2006).	If a consignment is in transit through a country, the NPPO of the country of transit is not involved unless risks for the country of transit have been identified (ISPM 25: <del>2006</del> ).	Specific cross-reference to a basic element under ISPM 25
<b>ISPM 13 Guidelines for the notification of non-compliance and emergency action</b>					
13	60. 2. The Use of Notification Information	8	Notification is normally bilateral. Notifications and information used for notification are valuable for official purposes but may also be easily misunderstood or misused if taken out of context or used imprudently. To minimize the potential for misunderstandings or abuse, countries should be careful to ensure that notifications and information about notifications are distributed in the first instance only to the exporting country. In particular, the importing country may consult with the exporting country and provide the opportunity for the exporting country to investigate instances of apparent non-compliance, and correct as necessary. This should be done before changes in the phytosanitary status of a commodity or area, or other failures of phytosanitary systems in the exporting country are confirmed or reported more widely (see also good reporting practices for interceptions in ISPM 8:1998).	Notification is normally bilateral. Notifications and information used for notification are valuable for official purposes but may also be easily misunderstood or misused if taken out of context or used imprudently. To minimize the potential for misunderstandings or abuse, countries should be careful to ensure that notifications and information about notifications are distributed in the first instance only to the exporting country. In particular, the importing country may consult with the exporting country and provide the opportunity for the exporting country to investigate instances of apparent non-compliance, and correct as necessary. This should be done before changes in the phytosanitary status of a commodity or area, or other failures of phytosanitary systems in the exporting country are confirmed or reported more widely (see also good reporting practices for interceptions in ISPM 8: <del>1998</del> ).	<b>[ISPMs under revision: 8]</b> General cross-reference. The revised ISPM 8 is expected to contain such good reporting practices
13	61. 9.1 Non-compliance	8	The exporting country should investigate significant instances of non-compliance to determine the possible cause with a view to avoid recurrence. Upon request, the results of the investigation should be reported to the importing country. Where the results of the investigation indicate a change of pest status, this information should be communicated according to the good practices noted in ISPM 8:1998.	The exporting country should investigate significant instances of non-compliance to determine the possible cause with a view to avoid recurrence. Upon request, the results of the investigation should be reported to the importing country. Where the results of the investigation indicate a change of pest status, this information should be communicated according to the good practices noted in ISPM 8: <del>1998</del> .	As above
<b>ISPM 14 The use of integrated measures in a systems approach for pest risk management</b>					
14	62. Outline of Requirements, 1st parag.	2, 11 (previous), 21	ISPM 2:2007, ISPM 11:2004 and ISPM 21:2004 provide general guidance on measures for pest risk management. Systems approaches, which integrate measures for pest risk management in a defined manner, could provide an alternative to single measures to meet the appropriate level of phytosanitary protection of an importing country. They can also be developed in situations where no single measure is available. A systems approach requires the integration of	ISPM 2: <del>2007</del> , ISPM 11: <del>2004</del> and ISPM 21: <del>2004</del> provide general guidance on measures for pest risk management. Systems approaches, which integrate measures for pest risk management in a defined manner, could provide an alternative to single measures to meet the appropriate level of phytosanitary protection of an importing country. They can also be developed in situations where no single measure is available. A systems approach requires the integration of	<b>[ISPMs revised since: 11]</b> General cross-reference to ISPMs dealing with pest risk management

APPENDIX 15 – TABLE 2						
ISPM	Location of reference	Ref.ISPM	Current text	Proposed revision	Reasons	
			different measures, at least two of which act independently, with a cumulative effect.	different measures, at least two of which act independently, with a cumulative effect.		
14	63. 1. Purpose of Systems Approaches	2, 11 (previous), 21	Many of the elements and individual components of pest risk management are described in ISPM 2:2007, ISPM 11:2004 and ISPM 21:2004. All phytosanitary measures must be technically justified according to Article VII.2(a) of the IPPC. A systems approach integrates measures to meet phytosanitary import requirements. Systems approaches provide, where appropriate, an equivalent alternative to procedures such as treatments or replace more restrictive measures like prohibition. This is achieved by considering the combined effect of different conditions and procedures. Systems approaches provide the opportunity to consider both pre- and post-harvest procedures that may contribute to the effective management of pest risk. It is important to consider systems approaches among pest risk management options because the integration of measures may be less trade restrictive than other risk management options (particularly where the alternative is prohibition).	Many of the elements and individual components of pest risk management are described in ISPM 2: <del>2007</del> , ISPM 11: <del>2004</del> and ISPM 21: <del>2004</del> . All phytosanitary measures must be technically justified according to Article VII.2(a) of the IPPC. A systems approach integrates measures to meet phytosanitary import requirements. Systems approaches provide, where appropriate, an equivalent alternative to procedures such as treatments or replace more restrictive measures like prohibition. This is achieved by considering the combined effect of different conditions and procedures. Systems approaches provide the opportunity to consider both pre- and post-harvest procedures that may contribute to the effective management of pest risk. It is important to consider systems approaches among pest risk management options because the integration of measures may be less trade restrictive than other risk management options (particularly where the alternative is prohibition).	[ISPMs revised since: 11] General cross-reference to ISPMs dealing with pest risk management	
14	64. 3. Relationship with PRA and Available Pest Risk Management Options, 2nd parag.	11 (previous)	A combination of phytosanitary measures in a systems approach is one of the options which may be selected as the basis for phytosanitary import requirements. As in the development of all pest risk management measures, these should take into account uncertainty of the risk. (see ISPM 11:2004).	A combination of phytosanitary measures in a systems approach is one of the options which may be selected as the basis for phytosanitary import requirements. As in the development of all pest risk management measures, these should take into account uncertainty of the risk. (see ISPM 11: <del>2004</del> ).	[ISPMs revised since: 11] Specific cross-reference to uncertainty of the risk. The degree of uncertainty is a basic element of PRA, not expected to change	
<b>ISPM 15 Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade</b>						
15	65. 3.2 Approval of new or revised treatments		As new technical information becomes available, existing treatments may be reviewed and modified, and new alternative treatments and/or treatment schedule(s) for wood packaging material may be adopted by the CPM. ISPM 28:2007 provides guidance on the IPPC's process for approval of treatments. If a new treatment or a revised treatment schedule is adopted for wood packaging material and incorporated into this ISPM, material already treated under the previous treatment and/or schedule does not need to be re-treated or re-marked.	As new technical information becomes available, existing treatments may be reviewed and modified, and new alternative treatments and/or treatment schedule(s) for wood packaging material may be adopted by the CPM. ISPM 28: <del>2007</del> provides guidance on the IPPC's process for approval of treatments. If a new treatment or a revised treatment schedule is adopted for wood packaging material and incorporated into this ISPM, material already treated under the previous treatment and/or schedule does not need to be re-treated or re-marked.	General cross-reference. ISPM 28 is on approval of treatments	
15	66. 4.1 Regulatory considerations, 1st parag., 2nd and 3rd indents	7 (previous), 23	- monitoring treatment and marking systems implemented in order to verify compliance (further information on related responsibilities is provided in ISPM 7:1997)	- monitoring treatment and marking systems implemented in order to verify compliance (further information on related responsibilities is provided in ISPM 7: <del>1997</del> )	[ISPMs revised since: 7] Specific cross-reference to ISPM 7. Revised version applies.	

APPENDIX 15 – TABLE 2					
ISPM	Location of reference	Ref.ISPM	Current text	Proposed revision	Reasons
			- inspection, establishing verification procedures and auditing where appropriate (further information is provided in ISPM 23:2005).	- inspection, establishing verification procedures and auditing where appropriate (further information is provided in ISPM 23: <del>2005</del> ).	General cross-references to ISPM 23 on inspection.
15	67. 4.4 Transit	25	- Where consignments moving in transit have wood packaging material that does not meet the requirements of this standard, NPPOs of countries of transit may require measures to ensure that wood packaging material does not present an unacceptable risk. Further guidance on transit arrangements is provided in ISPM 25:2006.	- Where consignments moving in transit have wood packaging material that does not meet the requirements of this standard, NPPOs of countries of transit may require measures to ensure that wood packaging material does not present an unacceptable risk. Further guidance on transit arrangements is provided in ISPM 25: <del>2006</del> .	General cross-reference. ISPM 25 is on transit
<b>ISPM 16 Regulated non-quarantine pests: concept and application</b>					
16	68. 4.5 “Regulated”	5 Suppl. 1	“Regulated” in the definition of RNQP refers to official control. An official control programme for RNQPs can be applied on a national, subnational, or local area basis. (see ISPM 5 Supplement 1, <i>Guidelines on the interpretation and application of the concepts of “official control” and “not widely distributed”</i> , 2012)	“Regulated” in the definition of RNQP refers to official control. An official control programme for RNQPs can be applied on a national, subnational, or local area basis. (see ISPM 5 Supplement 1, <i>Guidelines on the interpretation and application of the concepts of “official control” and “not widely distributed”</i> , <del>2012</del> )	[ISPMs revised since: Suppl. 1] Specific cross-reference to Supplement 1, expected to remain so. Title kept when Supplement 1 is first mentioned in the ISPM.
16	69. 5. Relevant Principles and Obligations	1	The application of the concept of RNQPs follows in particular the principles and obligations of technical justification, pest risk analysis, managed risk, minimal impact, equivalence, non-discrimination and transparency (see ISPM 1:2006).	The application of the concept of RNQPs follows in particular the principles and obligations of technical justification, pest risk analysis, managed risk, minimal impact, equivalence, non-discrimination and transparency (see ISPM 1: <del>2006</del> ).	Specific cross-references, but principles expected to remain
<b>ISPM 17 Pest reporting</b>					
17	70. 3.1 Surveillance	6	Pest reporting depends on the establishment, within countries, of national systems for surveillance, as required by the Article IV.2(b) of the IPPC. Information for pest reporting may be derived from either of the two types of pest surveillance systems defined in ISPM 6:1997, general surveillance or specific surveys. Systems should be put in place to ensure that such information is sent to and collected by the NPPO. The surveillance and collection systems should operate on an ongoing and timely basis. Surveillance should be conducted in accordance with ISPM 6:1997.	Pest reporting depends on the establishment, within countries, of national systems for surveillance, as required by the Article IV.2(b) of the IPPC. Information for pest reporting may be derived from either of the two types of pest surveillance systems defined in ISPM 6: <del>1997</del> , general surveillance or specific surveys. Systems should be put in place to ensure that such information is sent to and collected by the NPPO. The surveillance and collection systems should operate on an ongoing and timely basis. Surveillance should be conducted in accordance with ISPM 6: <del>1997</del> .	[ISPMs under revision: 6] General cross-references. ISPM 6 is on surveillance and still expected to refer to general surveillance and specific surveys
17	71. 3.3 Verification and analysis	8	NPPOs should put in place systems for verification of domestic pest reports from official and other sources (including those brought to their attention by other countries). This should be done by confirming the identification of the pest concerned and making a preliminary determination of its geographical distribution– and thus establishing its “pest status” in the country, according to ISPM 8:1998. NPPOs should also put in place systems of PRA to determine whether	NPPOs should put in place systems for verification of domestic pest reports from official and other sources (including those brought to their attention by other countries). This should be done by confirming the identification of the pest concerned and making a preliminary determination of its geographical distribution– and thus establishing its “pest status” in the country, according to ISPM 8: <del>1998</del> . NPPOs should also put in place systems of PRA to determine whether	[ISPMs under revision: 8] General cross-references. ISPM 8 is on pest status

APPENDIX 15 – TABLE 2						
ISPM		Location of reference	Ref.ISPM	Current text	Proposed revision	Reasons
				new or unexpected pest situations constitute an immediate or potential danger to their country (i.e. the reporting country), requiring phytosanitary action. PRA may also be used to identify, as appropriate, whether the situations that have been reported may be of concern to other countries.	new or unexpected pest situations constitute an immediate or potential danger to their country (i.e. the reporting country), requiring phytosanitary action. PRA may also be used to identify, as appropriate, whether the situations that have been reported may be of concern to other countries.	
17	72.	4.3 Reporting of changed status, absence or correction of earlier reports	4, 8, 9	Countries may also report cases where immediate or potential danger has changed or is absent (including in particular pest absence). Where there has been an earlier report indicating immediate or potential danger and it later appears that the report was incorrect or circumstances change so that the risk changes or disappears, countries should report the change. Countries may also report that all or part of their territory has been categorized as a pest free area, according to ISPM 4:1995, or report successful eradication according to ISPM 9:1998, or changes in host range or in the pest status of a pest according to one of the descriptions in ISPM 8:1998.	Countries may also report cases where immediate or potential danger has changed or is absent (including in particular pest absence). Where there has been an earlier report indicating immediate or potential danger and it later appears that the report was incorrect or circumstances change so that the risk changes or disappears, countries should report the change. Countries may also report that all or part of their territory has been categorized as a pest free area, according to ISPM 4: <del>1995</del> , or report successful eradication according to ISPM 9: <del>1998</del> , or changes in host range or in the pest status of a pest according to one of the descriptions in ISPM 8: <del>1998</del> .	[ISPMs under revision: 4, 8] Specific cross-references to reporting aspects in the three ISPMs. Reporting expected to remain in these ISPMs
17	73.	4.4 Reporting of pests in imported consignments	13	Reporting the pests detected in imported consignments is covered by the ISPM 13:2001 and not by this standard.	Reporting the pests detected in imported consignments is covered by the ISPM 13: <del>2001</del> and not by this standard.	General cross-references. ISPM 13 is on notification of non-compliance and emergency action
17	74.	5.2 Outbreak, 1st parag.	8	An outbreak refers to a recently detected pest population. An outbreak should be reported when its presence corresponds at least to the status of “Transient: actionable” in ISPM 8:1998. This means that it should be reported even when the pest may survive in the immediate future, but is not expected to establish.	An outbreak refers to a recently detected pest population. An outbreak should be reported when its presence corresponds at least to the status of “Transient: actionable” in ISPM 8: <del>1998</del> . This means that it should be reported even when the pest may survive in the immediate future, but is not expected to establish.	[ISPMs under revision: 8] Specific cross-reference. Transience is expected to remain in the revised ISPM 8
17	75.	5.4 Successful eradication	9	Eradication may be reported when it is successful, that is when an established or transient pest is eliminated from an area and the absence of that pest is verified (see ISPM 9:1998).	Eradication may be reported when it is successful, that is when an established or transient pest is eliminated from an area and the absence of that pest is verified (see ISPM 9: <del>1998</del> ).	General cross-references. ISPM 9 is on eradication
17	76.	5.5 Establishment of pest free area	4	The establishment of a pest free area may be reported where this constitutes a change in the pest status in that area (see ISPM 4:1995).	The establishment of a pest free area may be reported where this constitutes a change in the pest status in that area (see ISPM 4: <del>1995</del> ).	[ISPMs under revision: 4] Specific cross-reference to a basic elements of ISPM 4
17	77.	6.1 Content of reports, 1st parag., 4th indent	8	- the status of the pest under ISPM 8:1998	- the status of the pest under ISPM 8: <del>1998</del>	[ISPMs under revision: 8] General cross-references. ISPM 8 is on pest status
17	78.	6.1 Content of reports, 1st parag.	8	It may also indicate the phytosanitary measures applied or required, their purpose, and any other information as indicated for pest records in ISPM 8:1998.	It may also indicate the phytosanitary measures applied or required, their purpose, and any other information as indicated for pest records in ISPM 8: <del>1998</del> .	[ISPMs under revision: 8] General cross-references. ISPM 8 is on pest status
17	79.	6.4 Good reporting practices, first parag.	8	Countries should follow the “good reporting practices” set out in ISPM 8:1998.	Countries should follow the “good reporting practices” set out in ISPM 8: <del>1998</del> .	[ISPMs under revision: 8]

APPENDIX 15 – TABLE 2						
ISPM	Location of reference	Ref.ISPM	Current text	Proposed revision	Reasons	
					Specific cross-reference. Good reporting practices in general is expected to remain in ISPM 8	
17	80.	9. Documentation	6	National pest surveillance and reporting systems should be adequately described and documented and this information should be made available to other countries on request (see ISPM 6:1997).	National pest surveillance and reporting systems should be adequately described and documented and this information should be made available to other countries on request (see ISPM 6: <del>1997</del> ).	[ISPMs under revision: 6] General cross-references. ISPM 6 is on surveillance
<b>ISPM 18 Guidelines for the use of irradiation as a phytosanitary measure</b>						
18	81.	3.1 Application, last parag.	14	According to the pest risks to be addressed and the available options for pest risk management, irradiation can be used as a single treatment or combined with other treatments as part of a systems approach to meet the level of efficacy required (see ISPM 14:2002).	According to the pest risks to be addressed and the available options for pest risk management, irradiation can be used as a single treatment or combined with other treatments as part of a systems approach to meet the level of efficacy required (see ISPM 14: <del>2002</del> ).	General cross-references. ISPM 14 is on systems approaches
18	82.	8.2 Phytosanitary certification	7 (previous), 12 (previous)	The NPPO may issue phytosanitary certificates based on treatment information provided to it by an entity approved by the NPPO. It should be recognized that the phytosanitary certificate may require other information supplied to verify that additional phytosanitary requirements have also been met (see ISPM 7:1997 and ISPM 12:2001).	The NPPO may issue phytosanitary certificates based on treatment information provided to it by an entity approved by the NPPO. It should be recognized that the phytosanitary certificate may require other information supplied to verify that additional phytosanitary requirements have also been met (see ISPM 7: <del>1997</del> and ISPM 12: <del>2001</del> ).	[ISPMs revised since: 7 and 12] General cross-references to ISPMs on phytosanitary certification. Revised versions apply
18	83.	8.3 Import inspection, last parag.	13	In case of non-compliance or emergency action, the NPPO of the importing country should notify the NPPO of the exporting country as soon as possible (see ISPM 13:2001).	In case of non-compliance or emergency action, the NPPO of the importing country should notify the NPPO of the exporting country as soon as possible (see ISPM 13: <del>2001</del> ).	General cross-references. ISPM 13 is on non-compliance and emergency actions
18	84.	8.5 Administration and documentation by the NPPO, last parag.	13	All NPPO procedures should be appropriately documented and records, including those of monitoring inspections made and phytosanitary certificates issued, should be maintained for at least one year. In cases of non-compliance or new or unexpected phytosanitary situations, documentation should be made available as described in ISPM 13:2001.	All NPPO procedures should be appropriately documented and records, including those of monitoring inspections made and phytosanitary certificates issued, should be maintained for at least one year. In cases of non-compliance or new or unexpected phytosanitary situations, documentation should be made available as described in ISPM 13: <del>2001</del> .	General cross-references. ISPM 13 is on non-compliance and emergency actions
<b>ISPM 19 Guidelines on lists of regulated pests</b>						
19	85.	4.1 Required information, 2nd parag.	11 (previous)	<i>Name of pest.</i> The scientific name of the pest is used for listing purposes, at the taxonomic level which has been justified by PRA (see also ISPM 11:2003). The scientific name should include the authority (where appropriate) and be complemented by a common term for the relevant taxonomic group (e.g. insect, mollusc, virus, fungus, nematode).	<i>Name of pest.</i> The scientific name of the pest is used for listing purposes, at the taxonomic level which has been justified by PRA (see also ISPM 11: <del>2003</del> ). The scientific name should include the authority (where appropriate) and be complemented by a common term for the relevant taxonomic group (e.g. insect, mollusc, virus, fungus, nematode).	[ISPMs revised since: 11] Specific reference. The concept has not changed when ISPM 11 was revised
19	86.	5. Maintenance of Lists of Regulated Pests, 2nd parag.	8	Lists of regulated pests require updating when pests are added or deleted, or the category of listed pests changes, or when information is added or changed for listed pests. The	Lists of regulated pests require updating when pests are added or deleted, or the category of listed pests changes, or when information is added or changed for listed pests. The	[ISPMs under revision: 8] General cross-references. ISPM 8 is on pest status

APPENDIX 15 – TABLE 2						
ISPM	Location of reference	Ref.ISPM	Current text	Proposed revision	Reasons	
			<p>following are some of the more common reasons for updating these lists:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- changes to prohibitions, restrictions or requirements</li> <li>- change in pest status (see ISPM 8:1998)</li> <li>- result of a new or revised PRA</li> <li>- change in taxonomy.</li> </ul>	<p>following are some of the more common reasons for updating these lists:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- changes to prohibitions, restrictions or requirements</li> <li>- change in pest status (see ISPM 8:<del>1998</del>)</li> <li>- result of a new or revised PRA</li> <li>- change in taxonomy.</li> </ul>		
<b>ISPM 20 Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system</b>						
20	87.	3.1 International agreements, principles and standards, 2nd parag.	1	The drafting, adoption and application of phytosanitary regulations require recognition of certain principles and concepts such as in ISPM 1:2006, including:	The drafting, adoption and application of phytosanitary regulations require recognition of certain principles and concepts such as in ISPM 1: <del>2006</del> , including:	Specific reference to some principles and concepts. The list that follows was adjusted during the consistency study of ISPMs to take account of the principles' names in the revised ISPM 1. Other terms used are not principles.
20	88.	4.2.1 Phytosanitary measures for consignments to be imported, 1st parag.	14	The phytosanitary regulations should specify the phytosanitary measures with which imported consignments <sup>1</sup> of plants, plant products and other regulated articles should comply. These phytosanitary measures may be general, applying to all types of commodities, or the measures may be specific, applying to specified commodities from a particular origin. Phytosanitary measures may be required prior to entry, at entry or post entry. Systems approaches may also be used when appropriate (see ISPM 14:2002).	The phytosanitary regulations should specify the phytosanitary measures with which imported consignments <sup>1</sup> of plants, plant products and other regulated articles should comply. These phytosanitary measures may be general, applying to all types of commodities, or the measures may be specific, applying to specified commodities from a particular origin. Phytosanitary measures may be required prior to entry, at entry or post entry. Systems approaches may also be used when appropriate (see ISPM 14: <del>2002</del> ).	General cross-references. ISPM 14 is on systems approaches
20	89.	4.2.1 Phytosanitary measures for consignments to be imported, 2nd parag.	7	Phytosanitary measures required in the exporting country, which the NPPO of the exporting country may be required to certify (ISPM 7:2011) include:	Phytosanitary measures required in the exporting country, which the NPPO of the exporting country may be required to certify (ISPM 7: <del>2011</del> ) include:	General cross-references. ISPM 7 is on export certification. Revised version applies
20	90.	4.2.1.1 Provision for special imports	3 (previous)	Contracting parties may make special provision for the import of pests, biological control agents (see also ISPM 3:1995) or other regulated articles for scientific research, education or other purposes. Such imports may be authorized subject to the provision of adequate safeguards.	Contracting parties may make special provision for the import of pests, biological control agents (see also ISPM 3: <del>1995</del> ) or other regulated articles for scientific research, education or other purposes. Such imports may be authorized subject to the provision of adequate safeguards.	<b>[ISPMs revised since: 3]</b> General cross-references. ISPM 3 is on export, shipment, import and release of biological control agents and other beneficial organisms. Revised version applies
20	91.	4.2.1.2 Pest free areas, pest free places of production, pest free production sites, areas of low pest prevalence	4, 22, 29	Importing contracting parties may designate pest free areas, areas of low pest prevalence (ISPM 4:1995, ISPM 22:2005, ISPM 29:2007) and official control programmes within their country. Phytosanitary regulations may be required to protect or sustain such designations within the importing country.	Importing contracting parties may designate pest free areas, areas of low pest prevalence (ISPM 4: <del>1995</del> , ISPM 22: <del>2005</del> , ISPM 29: <del>2007</del> ) and official control programmes within their country. Phytosanitary regulations may be required to protect or sustain such designations within the importing country.	<b>[ISPMs under revision: 4]</b> General cross-references

APPENDIX 15 – TABLE 2						
ISPM		Location of reference	Ref.ISPM	Current text	Proposed revision	Reasons
		and official control programmes		However such phytosanitary measures should respect the principle of non-discrimination.	However such phytosanitary measures should respect the principle of non-discrimination.	
20	92.	4.3 Consignments in transit	25	Consignments in transit are not imported. However, the phytosanitary import regulatory system may be extended to cover consignments in transit and to establish technically justified phytosanitary measures to prevent the introduction and/or spread of pests (Article VII.4 of the IPPC, ISPM 25:2006). Measures may be required to track consignments, to verify their integrity or to confirm that they leave the country of transit. Countries may establish points of entry, routes within the country, conditions for transportation and time spans permitted within their territories.	Consignments in transit are not imported. However, the phytosanitary import regulatory system may be extended to cover consignments in transit and to establish technically justified phytosanitary measures to prevent the introduction and/or spread of pests (Article VII.4 of the IPPC, ISPM 25: <del>2006</del> ). Measures may be required to track consignments, to verify their integrity or to confirm that they leave the country of transit. Countries may establish points of entry, routes within the country, conditions for transportation and time spans permitted within their territories.	General cross-references. ISPM 25 is on transit
20	93.	4.4 Measures concerning non-compliance and emergency action, 1st parag.	13	The phytosanitary import regulatory system should include provisions for phytosanitary action to be taken in the case of non-compliance or for emergency action (Article VII.2(f) of the IPPC; detailed information is contained in ISPM 13:2001), taking into consideration the principle of minimal impact.	The phytosanitary import regulatory system should include provisions for phytosanitary action to be taken in the case of non-compliance or for emergency action (Article VII.2(f) of the IPPC; detailed information is contained in ISPM 13: <del>2001</del> ), taking into consideration the principle of minimal impact.	General cross-references. ISPM 13 is on non-compliance and emergency action
20	94.	5.1.3 Surveillance	6	The technical justification of phytosanitary measures is determined in part by the pest status of regulated pests within the regulating country. Pest status may change and this may necessitate revision of phytosanitary import regulations. Surveillance of cultivated and non-cultivated plants in the importing country is required to maintain adequate information on pest status (according to ISPM 6:1997), and may be required to support PRA and pest listing.	The technical justification of phytosanitary measures is determined in part by the pest status of regulated pests within the regulating country. Pest status may change and this may necessitate revision of phytosanitary import regulations. Surveillance of cultivated and non-cultivated plants in the importing country is required to maintain adequate information on pest status (according to ISPM 6: <del>1997</del> ), and may be required to support PRA and pest listing.	[ISPMs under revision: 6] General cross-reference to ISPM 6 on surveillance
20	95.	5.1.4 Pest risk analysis and pest listing, 1st parag.	11 (previous), 19, 21, 32	Technical justification such as through PRA is required to determine if pests should be regulated and the strength of phytosanitary measures to be taken against them (ISPM 11:2004; ISPM 21:2004). 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 level of processing or its intended use (see ISPM 32:2009). Regulated pests should be listed (according to ISPM 19:2003) and lists of regulated pests should be made available (Article VII.2(i) of the IPPC). If appropriate international standards are available, measures should take account of such standards and should not be more stringent unless technically justified.	Technical justification such as through PRA is required to determine if pests should be regulated and the strength of phytosanitary measures to be taken against them (ISPM 11: <del>2004</del> ; ISPM 21: <del>2004</del> ). 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 level of processing or its intended use (see ISPM 32: <del>2009</del> ). Regulated pests should be listed (according to ISPM 19: <del>2003</del> ) and lists of regulated pests should be made available (Article VII.2(i) of the IPPC). If appropriate international standards are available, measures should take account of such standards and should not be more stringent unless technically justified.	[ISPMs revised since: 11] General cross-references to the concepts in the standards mentioned

APPENDIX 15 – TABLE 2						
ISPM		Location of reference	Ref.ISPM	Current text	Proposed revision	Reasons
20	96.	5.1.5.2.2 Sampling	31	Samples may be taken from consignments for the purposes of inspection, or for subsequent laboratory testing, or for reference purposes (see ISPM 31:2008).	Samples may be taken from consignments for the purposes of inspection, or for subsequent laboratory testing, or for reference purposes (see ISPM 31: <del>2008</del> ).	Specific cross-reference to basic elements of sampling.
20	97.	5.1.6 Non-compliance and emergency action	13	Detailed information about non-compliance and emergency action is contained in ISPM 13:2001.	Detailed information about non-compliance and emergency action is contained in ISPM 13: <del>2001</del> .	General cross-references. ISPM 13 is on non-compliance and emergency action
20	98.	5.1.8 International liaison, 1st parag.	13	notification of non-compliance and emergency action (ISPM 13:2001)	notification of non-compliance and emergency action (ISPM 13: <del>2001</del> )	General cross-references. ISPM 13 is on non-compliance and emergency action
20	99.	5.2.2 Information, 2nd parag.	19	The NPPO should have access to information on the presence of pests in its country (preferably as pest lists), to facilitate the categorization of pests during pest risk analysis. The NPPO should also maintain lists of all its regulated pests. Detailed information on lists of regulated pests is contained in ISPM 19:2003.	The NPPO should have access to information on the presence of pests in its country (preferably as pest lists), to facilitate the categorization of pests during pest risk analysis. The NPPO should also maintain lists of all its regulated pests. Detailed information on lists of regulated pests is contained in ISPM 19: <del>2003</del> .	General cross-references. ISPM 19 is about lists of regulated pests
20	100.	6.2 Records, 1st parag.	11 (previous), 13	Records should be kept of all actions, results and decisions concerning the regulation of imports, following the relevant sections of ISPMs where appropriate, including: - documentation of pest risk analyses (in accordance with ISPM 11:2004, and other relevant ISPMs) - where established, documentation of pest free areas, areas of low pest prevalence, and official control programmes (including information on the distribution of the pests and the phytosanitary measures used to maintain the pest free area or area of low pest prevalence) - records of inspection, sampling and testing - non-compliance and emergency action (in accordance with ISPM 13:2001).	Records should be kept of all actions, results and decisions concerning the regulation of imports, following the relevant sections of ISPMs where appropriate, including: - documentation of pest risk analyses (in accordance with ISPM 11: <del>2004</del> , and other relevant ISPMs) - where established, documentation of pest free areas, areas of low pest prevalence, and official control programmes (including information on the distribution of the pests and the phytosanitary measures used to maintain the pest free area or area of low pest prevalence) - records of inspection, sampling and testing - non-compliance and emergency action (in accordance with ISPM 13: <del>2001</del> ).	<b>[ISPMs revised since: 11]</b> General cross-references. ISPM 11 is on pest risk analysis and ISPM 13 on non-compliance and emergency action
<b>ISPM 21 Pest risk analysis for regulated non-quarantine pests</b>						
21	101.	Requirements, 1st parag.	1 (previous)	In most cases, the following steps will be applied sequentially in a PRA but it is not essential to follow a particular sequence. Pest risk assessment needs to be only as complex as is technically justified by the circumstances. This standard allows a specific PRA to be judged against the principles of necessity, minimal impact, transparency, equivalence, risk analysis, managed risk and non-discrimination set out in ISPM 1:1995 as well as the interpretation and application of official control (see ISPM 5 Supplement 1).	In most cases, the following steps will be applied sequentially in a PRA but it is not essential to follow a particular sequence. Pest risk assessment needs to be only as complex as is technically justified by the circumstances. This standard allows a specific PRA to be judged against the principles of necessity, minimal impact, transparency, equivalence, risk analysis, managed risk and non-discrimination set out in ISPM 1: <del>1995</del> as well as the interpretation and application of official control (see ISPM 5 Supplement 1).	<b>[ISPMs revised since: 1 and Suppl.1]</b> Specific reference to some principles in ISPM 1. Are also in the revised ISPM 1. General reference to Supplement 1. still applies
21	102.	4.3 Factors to be taken into account in the	1 (previous)	Appropriate measures should be chosen based on their effectiveness in limiting the economic impact of the pest on	Appropriate measures should be chosen based on their effectiveness in limiting the economic impact of the pest on	<b>[ISPMs revised since: 1]</b>

APPENDIX 15 – TABLE 2						
ISPM		Location of reference	Ref.ISPM	Current text	Proposed revision	Reasons
		identification and selection of appropriate risk management options		the intended use of the plants for planting. The choice should be based on the following considerations, which include several of the principles of plant quarantine as related to international trade (ISPM 1:1993):	the intended use of the plants for planting. The choice should be based on the following considerations, which include several of the principles of plant quarantine as related to international trade (ISPM 1: <del>1993</del> ):	General cross-reference. Still true for ISPM 1 of 2006 (minimal impact, equivalence, non-discrimination)
21	103.	4.4.1 Zero tolerance, 2nd indent	10	the pest fulfils the defining criteria of an RNQP and an official control programme is in place requiring pest freedom in plants for planting (zero tolerance) for the same intended use for all domestic places of production or production sites. Similar requirements could be used as described in ISPM 10:1999.	the pest fulfils the defining criteria of an RNQP and an official control programme is in place requiring pest freedom in plants for planting (zero tolerance) for the same intended use for all domestic places of production or production sites. Similar requirements could be used as described in ISPM 10: <del>1999</del> .	General cross-reference to ISPM 10
21	104.	4.5 Options to achieve the required tolerance levels, 2nd parag.	14	Management options may consist of a combination of two or more options (see ISPM 14:2002). Sampling, testing and inspection for the required tolerance may be relevant for all the management options.	Management options may consist of a combination of two or more options (see ISPM 14: <del>2002</del> ). Sampling, testing and inspection for the required tolerance may be relevant for all the management options.	General reference to the standard on systems approaches
21	105.	4.5.2 Place of production, 2nd indent	10	pest free place of production or pest free production site (see ISPM 10:1999)	pest free place of production or pest free production site (see ISPM 10: <del>1999</del> )	General cross-reference. ISPM 10 is on pest free places of production and pest free production sites
<b>ISPM 22 Requirements for the establishment of areas of low pest prevalence</b>						
22	106.	Outline of Requirements, 4th parag.	6	Surveillance of the relevant pest should be conducted according to appropriate protocols (ISPM 6:1997). Additional phytosanitary procedures may be required to establish and maintain an ALPP.	Surveillance of the relevant pest should be conducted according to appropriate protocols (ISPM 6: <del>1997</del> ). Additional phytosanitary procedures may be required to establish and maintain an ALPP.	<b>[ISPMs under revision: 6]</b> General cross-reference. ISPM 6 is about surveillance
22	107.	2.1 Determination of an area of low pest prevalence, 2nd parag., 5th indent	16	as part of official control in relation to regulated non-quarantine pests (see ISPM 16:2002)	as part of official control in relation to regulated non-quarantine pests (see ISPM 16: <del>2002</del> )	Specific cross-reference. Official control for RNQPs is one aspect of ISPM 16. Expected to remain
22	108.	2.1 Determination of an area of low pest prevalence, 3rd parag.	14	Where an ALPP is established and host materials are intended to be exported, they may be subject to additional phytosanitary measures. In this way, an ALPP would be part of a systems approach. Systems approaches are detailed in ISPM 14:2002. Such systems may be very efficient in ensuring that phytosanitary import requirements are met and thus, in some cases, the pest risk may be reduced to that of host material originating from a PFA.	Where an ALPP is established and host materials are intended to be exported, they may be subject to additional phytosanitary measures. In this way, an ALPP would be part of a systems approach. Systems approaches are detailed in ISPM 14: <del>2002</del> . Such systems may be very efficient in ensuring that phytosanitary import requirements are met and thus, in some cases, the pest risk may be reduced to that of host material originating from a PFA.	General cross-reference to ISPM 14 on systems approaches
22	109.	3.1.1 Determination of specified pest levels	11 (previous), 21	Specified levels for the relevant pests should be established by the NPPO of the country where the ALPP is located, with sufficient precision to allow assessment of whether surveillance data and protocols are adequate to determine that pest incidence is below these levels. Specified pest levels may be established through PRA, for example as described in ISPM 11:2004 and ISPM 21:2004. If the ALPP is intended	Specified levels for the relevant pests should be established by the NPPO of the country where the ALPP is located, with sufficient precision to allow assessment of whether surveillance data and protocols are adequate to determine that pest incidence is below these levels. Specified pest levels may be established through PRA, for example as described in ISPM 11: <del>2004</del> and ISPM 21: <del>2004</del> . If the ALPP is intended	<b>[ISPMs revised since: 11]</b> General cross-reference to standards on PRA

APPENDIX 15 – TABLE 2						
ISPM	Location of reference	Ref.ISPM	Current text	Proposed revision	Reasons	
			to facilitate exports, the specified levels should be established in conjunction with the importing country.	to facilitate exports, the specified levels should be established in conjunction with the importing country.		
22	110. 3.1.4.1 Surveillance activities, 1st parag.	6	The status of the relevant pest situation in the area, and when appropriate of the buffer zone, should be determined by surveillance (as described in ISPM 6:1997) during appropriate periods of time and at a level of sensitivity that will detect the specified pest at the specified level with an appropriate level of confidence. Surveillance should be conducted according to protocols for the specified pest(s). These protocols should include how to measure if the specified pest level has been maintained, e.g. type of trap, number of traps per hectare, acceptable number of pest individuals per trap per day or week, number of samples per hectare that need to be tested or inspected, part of the plant to be tested or inspected.	The status of the relevant pest situation in the area, and when appropriate of the buffer zone, should be determined by surveillance (as described in ISPM 6: <del>1997</del> ) during appropriate periods of time and at a level of sensitivity that will detect the specified pest at the specified level with an appropriate level of confidence. Surveillance should be conducted according to protocols for the specified pest(s). These protocols should include how to measure if the specified pest level has been maintained, e.g. type of trap, number of traps per hectare, acceptable number of pest individuals per trap per day or week, number of samples per hectare that need to be tested or inspected, part of the plant to be tested or inspected.	[ISPMs under revision: 6] General cross-reference to ISPM 16 is on surveillance	
<b>ISPM 23 Guidelines for inspection</b>						
23	111. 1.3 Responsibility for inspection	7, 20	NPPOs have the responsibility for inspection. Inspections are carried out by NPPOs or under their authority (see also ISPM 7:2011, ISPM 20:2004, and Articles IV.2(a), IV.2(c) and V.2(a) of the IPPC).	NPPOs have the responsibility for inspection. Inspections are carried out by NPPOs or under their authority (see also ISPM 7: <del>2011</del> , ISPM 20: <del>2004</del> , and Articles IV.2(a), IV.2(c) and V.2(a) of the IPPC).	General cross-references	
23	112. 1.6 Inspection in relation to pest risk analysis, last parag.	11 (previous) 21	When considering inspection as an option for risk management and the basis for phytosanitary decision-making, it is important to consider both technical and operational factors associated with a particular type and intensity of inspection. Such an inspection may be required to detect specified regulated pests at the desired level and confidence depending on the risk associated with them (see also ISPM 11:2004 and ISPM 21:2004).	When considering inspection as an option for risk management and the basis for phytosanitary decision-making, it is important to consider both technical and operational factors associated with a particular type and intensity of inspection. Such an inspection may be required to detect specified regulated pests at the desired level and confidence depending on the risk associated with them (see also ISPM 11: <del>2004</del> and ISPM 21: <del>2004</del> ).	General cross-references to the standards on PRA	
23	113. 2.1 Examination of documents associated with a consignment, 1st parag., 4th indent	12	valid and not fraudulent (see ISPM 12:2011).	valid and not fraudulent (see ISPM 12: <del>2011</del> ).	Specific cross-reference to one component of ISPM 12, not expected to change	
23	114. 2.1 Examination of documents associated with a consignment, 2nd parag., 4th indent	15	treatment documents or certificates, marks (such as provided for in ISPM 15:2009) or other indicators of treatment	treatment documents or certificates, marks (such as provided for in ISPM 15: <del>2009</del> ) or other indicators of treatment	Specific cross-reference to one component of ISPM 15, not expected to change	
23	115. 2.3.1 Pests, 1st parag.	31	A sample is taken from consignments or lots to determine if a pest is present, or if it exceeds a specified tolerance level. The ability to detect in a consistent manner the presence of a regulated pest with the desired confidence level requires practical and statistical considerations, such as the	A sample is taken from consignments or lots to determine if a pest is present, or if it exceeds a specified tolerance level. The ability to detect in a consistent manner the presence of a regulated pest with the desired confidence level requires practical and statistical considerations, such as the	General cross-reference. ISPM 31 is about sampling	

APPENDIX 15 – TABLE 2						
ISPM	Location of reference	Ref.ISPM	Current text	Proposed revision	Reasons	
			probability of detecting the pest, the number of units making up the lot, the desired confidence level, and the sample size (i.e. the intensity of inspection) (see ISPM 31:2008).	probability of detecting the pest, the number of units making up the lot, the desired confidence level, and the sample size (i.e. the intensity of inspection) (see ISPM 31: <del>2008</del> ).		
23	116. 2.3.1 Pests, 4th parag.	20	The sampling method adopted should be based on transparent technical and operational criteria, and should be consistently applied (see also ISPM 20:2004).	The sampling method adopted should be based on transparent technical and operational criteria, and should be consistently applied (see also ISPM 20: <del>2004</del> ).	<b>[no solution found]</b> It is not clear what this refers to. There is a section on sampling in ISPM 20, but it does not mention the aspects indicated here. There may be a need to expand the reference, but no proposal is made here. It is only proposed to delete the date of adoption of ISPM 20.	
23	117. 2.5 Inspection outcome, 2nd parag.	20	If phytosanitary regulations are not met, further actions can be taken. These actions may be determined by the nature of the findings, considering the regulated pest or other inspection objectives, and the circumstances. Actions for non-compliance are described in detail in ISPM 20:2004.	If phytosanitary regulations are not met, further actions can be taken. These actions may be determined by the nature of the findings, considering the regulated pest or other inspection objectives, and the circumstances. Actions for non-compliance are described in detail in ISPM 20: <del>2004</del> .	Specific cross-reference to a part of ISPM 20 and easy to find.	
23	118. 2.5 Inspection outcome, last parag.	13, 8, 20	Where a pest is detected in an import, the inspection report should be sufficiently detailed to allow for notifications of non-compliance (in accordance with ISPM 13:2001). Certain other record-keeping requirements may also rely on the availability of adequately completed inspection reports (e.g. as described in Articles VII and VIII of the IPPC, ISPM 8:1998 and ISPM 20:2004).	Where a pest is detected in an import, the inspection report should be sufficiently detailed to allow for notifications of non-compliance (in accordance with ISPM 13: <del>2001</del> ). Certain other record-keeping requirements may also rely on the availability of adequately completed inspection reports (e.g. as described in Articles VII and VIII of the IPPC, ISPM 8: <del>1998</del> and ISPM 20: <del>2004</del> ).	<b>[ISPMs under revision: 8]</b> General cross-references	
23	119. 2.7 Transparency	1	As part of the inspection process, information concerning inspection procedures for a commodity should be documented and made available on request to the parties concerned in application of the transparency principle (ISPM 1:2006). This information may be part of bilateral arrangements covering the phytosanitary aspects of a commodity trade.	As part of the inspection process, information concerning inspection procedures for a commodity should be documented and made available on request to the parties concerned in application of the transparency principle (ISPM 1: <del>2006</del> ). This information may be part of bilateral arrangements covering the phytosanitary aspects of a commodity trade.	Specific cross-reference to a basic principle in ISPM 1	
23	120.	31	Guidance on sampling is provided in ISPM 31:2008.	Guidance on sampling is provided in ISPM 31: <del>2008</del> .	General cross-reference. ISPM 31 is about sampling	
<b>ISPM 24 Guidelines for the determination and recognition of equivalence of phytosanitary measures</b>						
24	121. 1. General Considerations	15 (previous)	Although equivalence is generally a bilateral process between importing and exporting contracting parties, multilateral arrangements for comparing alternative measures take place as part of the standard setting process of the IPPC. For example, there are alternative measures approved in ISPM 15:2002.	Although equivalence is generally a bilateral process between importing and exporting contracting parties, multilateral arrangements for comparing alternative measures take place as part of the standard setting process of the IPPC. For example, there are alternative measures approved in ISPM 15: <del>2002</del> .	<b>[ISPMs revised since: 15]</b> Specific cross-reference to the content of ISPM 15. There are alternative measures in the revised version, and expected to remain so.	

APPENDIX 15 – TABLE 2						
ISPM	Location of reference	Ref.ISPM	Current text	Proposed revision	Reasons	
24	122. 3.2 Existing measures, last parag.	11 (previous), 21	Where new commodities or commodity classes are presented for importation and no measures exist, contracting parties should refer to ISPM 11:2004 and ISPM 21:2004 for the normal PRA procedure.	Where new commodities or commodity classes are presented for importation and no measures exist, contracting parties should refer to ISPM 11: <del>2004</del> and ISPM 21: <del>2004</del> for the normal PRA procedure.	[ISPMs revised since: 11] General cross-references to the standards on PRA.	
24	123. 3.8 Review and monitoring	13	After the recognition of equivalence, and to provide continued confidence in the equivalence arrangements, contracting parties should implement the same review and monitoring procedures as for similar phytosanitary measures. These may include assurance procedures such as audits, periodic checks, reporting of non-compliances (see also ISPM 13:2001 or other forms of verification.	After the recognition of equivalence, and to provide continued confidence in the equivalence arrangements, contracting parties should implement the same review and monitoring procedures as for similar phytosanitary measures. These may include assurance procedures such as audits, periodic checks, reporting of non-compliances (see also ISPM 13: <del>2004</del> or other forms of verification.	Specific cross-reference to the content of ISPM 13. Reporting of non-compliance is expected to remain in ISPM 13	
<b>ISPM 25 Consignments in transit</b>						
25	124. 1.3 Pest risk management	11 (previous)	Further details on pest risk management are provided in ISPM 11:2004.	Further details on pest risk management are provided in ISPM 11: <del>2004</del> .	[ISPMs revised since: 11] General cross-reference. Also applies to revised version	
25	125. 1.3.2 Transit requiring further phytosanitary measures, 1st parag., 1st indent	23	verification of consignment identity or integrity (further details provided in ISPM 23:2005)	verification of consignment identity or integrity (further details provided in ISPM 23: <del>2005</del> )	Specific cross-reference. Verification of identity and integrity is a section of ISPM 23, and this aspect is expected to remain (note: these terms are currently under consideration in the TPG, but it is currently proposed that they both be maintained)	
25	126. 3. Measures for Non-compliance and Emergency Situations	13	The transit system may include measures, established by the NPPO, for non-compliance and emergency situations (for example, accidents in the country of transit which could lead to the unexpected escape of a regulated pest from a consignment moving in transit). ISPM 13:2001 contains specific guidelines for the country of transit for issuing notices of non-compliance to the exporting country and, where appropriate, to the country of destination.	The transit system may include measures, established by the NPPO, for non-compliance and emergency situations (for example, accidents in the country of transit which could lead to the unexpected escape of a regulated pest from a consignment moving in transit). ISPM 13: <del>2004</del> contains specific guidelines for the country of transit for issuing notices of non-compliance to the exporting country and, where appropriate, to the country of destination.	Specific cross-reference to one aspect of ISPM 13. Expected to remain	
<b>ISPM 26 Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)</b>						
26	127. Background	4, 5, 9	A pest free area is “an area in which a specific pest does not occur as demonstrated by scientific evidence and in which, where appropriate, this condition is being officially maintained” (ISPM 5). Areas initially free from fruit flies may remain naturally free from fruit flies due to the presence of barriers or climate conditions, and/or maintained free through movement restrictions and related measures (though fruit flies have the potential to establish there) or may be made free by an eradication programme (ISPM 9:1998). ISPM 4:1995 describes different types of pest free areas and provides	A pest free area is “an area in which a specific pest does not occur as demonstrated by scientific evidence and in which, where appropriate, this condition is being officially maintained” (ISPM 5). Areas initially free from fruit flies may remain naturally free from fruit flies due to the presence of barriers or climate conditions, and/or maintained free through movement restrictions and related measures (though fruit flies have the potential to establish there) or may be made free by an eradication programme (ISPM 9: <del>1998</del> ). ISPM 4: <del>1995</del> describes different types of pest free areas and provides	[ISPMs under revision: 4] General cross-references to ISPMs 4 and 9	

APPENDIX 15 – TABLE 2						
ISPM	Location of reference		Ref.ISPM	Current text	Proposed revision	Reasons
				general guidance on the establishment of pest free areas. However, a need for additional guidance on establishment and maintenance of pest free areas specifically for fruit flies (fruit fly-pest free areas, FF-PFA) was recognized. This standard describes additional requirements for establishment and maintenance of FF-PFAs. The target pests for which this standard was developed include insects of the order Diptera, family Tephritidae, of the genera <i>Anastrepha</i> , <i>Bactrocera</i> , <i>Ceratitis</i> , <i>Dacus</i> , <i>Rhagoletis</i> and <i>Toxotrypana</i> .	general guidance on the establishment of pest free areas. However, a need for additional guidance on establishment and maintenance of pest free areas specifically for fruit flies (fruit fly-pest free areas, FF-PFA) was recognized. This standard describes additional requirements for establishment and maintenance of FF-PFAs. The target pests for which this standard was developed include insects of the order Diptera, family Tephritidae, of the genera <i>Anastrepha</i> , <i>Bactrocera</i> , <i>Ceratitis</i> , <i>Dacus</i> , <i>Rhagoletis</i> and <i>Toxotrypana</i> .	
26	128.	1. General Requirements, 1st parag.	4	The concepts and provisions of ISPM 4:1995 apply to the establishment and maintenance of pest free areas for all pests including fruit flies and therefore ISPM 4 should be referred to in conjunction with this standard.	The concepts and provisions of ISPM 4: <del>1995</del> apply to the establishment and maintenance of pest free areas for all pests including fruit flies and therefore ISPM 4 should be referred to in conjunction with this standard.	[ISPMs under revision: 4] General cross-reference to ISPM 4, which is on pest free areas
26	129.	1.2 Documentation and record-keeping, 1st parag.	4	The phytosanitary measures used for the establishment and maintenance of FF-PFA should be adequately documented as part of phytosanitary procedures. They should be reviewed and updated regularly, including corrective actions, if required (see also ISPM 4:1995).	The phytosanitary measures used for the establishment and maintenance of FF-PFA should be adequately documented as part of phytosanitary procedures. They should be reviewed and updated regularly, including corrective actions, if required (see also ISPM 4: <del>1995</del> ).	[ISPMs under revision: 4] Specific cross-reference to ISPM 4. Corrective actions are expected to remain in that standard
26	130.	2.1 Characterization of the FF-PFA	4	Further guidance on establishing and describing a PFA is provided in ISPM 4:1995.	Further guidance on establishing and describing a PFA is provided in ISPM 4: <del>1995</del> .	[ISPMs under revision: 4] General cross-reference to ISPM 4
26	131.	2.2.2 Surveillance activities prior to establishment, 2nd parag.	8	Prior to the establishment of a FF-PFA, surveillance should be undertaken for a period determined by the climatic characteristics of the area, and as technically appropriate for at least 12 consecutive months in the FF-PFA in all relevant areas of commercial and non-commercial host plants to demonstrate that the pest is not present in the area. There should be no populations detected during the surveillance activities prior to establishment. A single adult detection, depending on its status (in accordance with ISPM 8:1998), may not disqualify an area from subsequent designation as an FF-PFA. For qualifying the area as a pest free area, there should be no detection of an immature specimen, two or more fertile adults, or an inseminated female of the target species during the survey period. There are different trapping and fruit sampling regimes for different fruit fly species. Surveys should be conducted using the guidelines in Appendixes 1 and 2. These guidelines may be revised as trap, lure and fruit sampling efficiencies improve.	Prior to the establishment of a FF-PFA, surveillance should be undertaken for a period determined by the climatic characteristics of the area, and as technically appropriate for at least 12 consecutive months in the FF-PFA in all relevant areas of commercial and non-commercial host plants to demonstrate that the pest is not present in the area. There should be no populations detected during the surveillance activities prior to establishment. A single adult detection, depending on its status (in accordance with ISPM 8: <del>1998</del> ), may not disqualify an area from subsequent designation as an FF-PFA. For qualifying the area as a pest free area, there should be no detection of an immature specimen, two or more fertile adults, or an inseminated female of the target species during the survey period. There are different trapping and fruit sampling regimes for different fruit fly species. Surveys should be conducted using the guidelines in Appendixes 1 and 2. These guidelines may be revised as trap, lure and fruit sampling efficiencies improve.	[ISPMs under revision: 8] General reference to the statuses in ISPM 8.
26	132.	2.4.1 Suspension, 2nd parag.	17	If the criteria for an outbreak are met, this should result in the implementation of the corrective action plan as specified in	If the criteria for an outbreak are met, this should result in the implementation of the corrective action plan as specified in	General cross-reference to ISPM 17 on pest reporting.

APPENDIX 15 – TABLE 2					
ISPM	Location of reference	Ref.ISPM	Current text	Proposed revision	Reasons
			this standard and immediate notification to interested importing countries' NPPOs (see ISPM 17:2002). The whole or part of the FF-PFA may be suspended or revoked. In most cases a suspension radius will delimit the affected part of the FF-PFA. The radius will depend on the biology and ecology of the target fruit fly. The same radius will generally apply for all FF-PFAs for a given target species unless scientific evidence supports any proposed deviation. Where a suspension is put in place, the criteria for lifting the suspension should be made clear. Interested importing countries' NPPOs should be informed of any change in FF-PFA status.	this standard and immediate notification to interested importing countries' NPPOs (see ISPM 17: <del>2002</del> ). The whole or part of the FF-PFA may be suspended or revoked. In most cases a suspension radius will delimit the affected part of the FF-PFA. The radius will depend on the biology and ecology of the target fruit fly. The same radius will generally apply for all FF-PFAs for a given target species unless scientific evidence supports any proposed deviation. Where a suspension is put in place, the criteria for lifting the suspension should be made clear. Interested importing countries' NPPOs should be informed of any change in FF-PFA status.	
26	133. Annex 1, Actions to apply the corrective action plan	8	(1.1) If the detection is a transient non-actionable occurrence (ISPM 8:1998), no further action is required.	(1.1) If the detection is a transient non-actionable occurrence (ISPM 8: <del>1998</del> ), no further action is required.	<b>[ISPMs under revision: 8]</b> Specific cross-reference to one pest status in ISPM 8, "transient non-actionable". It has to remain here, but the wording may need to be modified when ISPM 8 is revised.
26	134. Annex 1, Actions to apply the corrective action plan	9	(3) <i>Implementation of control measures in the affected area</i> As per ISPM 9:1998, specific corrective or eradication actions should be implemented immediately in the affected area(s) and adequately communicated to the community. Eradication actions may include:	(3) <i>Implementation of control measures in the affected area</i> As per ISPM 9: <del>1998</del> , specific corrective or eradication actions should be implemented immediately in the affected area(s) and adequately communicated to the community. Eradication actions may include:	Specific cross-reference to ISPM 9. It is expected that these aspects will remain in ISPM 9
26	135. Annex 1, Actions to apply the corrective action plan	17	(5) <i>Notification of relevant agencies</i> Relevant NPPOs and other agencies should be kept informed of any change in FF-PFA status as appropriate, and IPPC pest reporting obligations observed (ISPM 17:2002).	(5) <i>Notification of relevant agencies</i> Relevant NPPOs and other agencies should be kept informed of any change in FF-PFA status as appropriate, and IPPC pest reporting obligations observed (ISPM 17: <del>2002</del> ).	General cross-reference to ISPM 17, which is on pest reporting.
26	136. Annex 2, Section 3. Documentation and Record-Keeping	4	The control measures, including corrective actions, used in the eradication area should be adequately documented, reviewed and updated (see also ISPM 4:1995). Such documents should be made available to the NPPO of the importing country on request.	The control measures, including corrective actions, used in the eradication area should be adequately documented, reviewed and updated (see also ISPM 4: <del>1995</del> ). Such documents should be made available to the NPPO of the importing country on request.	<b>[ISPMs under revision: 4]</b> Specific cross-reference to a basic element of ISPM 4, expected to remain valid
26	137. APPENDIX 1: Fruit fly trapping (2011), 1. Pest status and survey types, 3rd parag.	8, 26, 30	Monitoring surveys are necessary to verify the characteristics of the pest population before the initiation or during the application of suppression and eradication measures to verify the population levels and to evaluate the efficacy of the control measures. These are necessary for situations A, B and C. Delimiting surveys are applied to determine the boundaries of an area considered to be infested by or free from the pest such as boundaries of an established FF-ALPP (situation B) (ISPM 30:2008) and as part of a corrective action	Monitoring surveys are necessary to verify the characteristics of the pest population before the initiation or during the application of suppression and eradication measures to verify the population levels and to evaluate the efficacy of the control measures. These are necessary for situations A, B and C. Delimiting surveys are applied to determine the boundaries of an area considered to be infested by or free from the pest such as boundaries of an established FF-ALPP (situation B) (ISPM 30: <del>2008</del> ) and as part of a corrective action plan when	<b>[ISPMs under revision: 8]</b> Although there would not normally be a reference to ISPM 26 as this annex belongs to it, the text is not understandable without.  Specific cross-reference to "transient actionable" in ISPM 8. Needed here,

APPENDIX 15 – TABLE 2																																						
ISPM	Location of reference	Ref.ISPM	Current text	Proposed revision	Reasons																																	
			plan when the pest exceeds the established low prevalence levels or in an FF-PFA (situation E) (ISPM 26:2006) as part of a corrective action plan when a detection occurs. Detection surveys are to determine if the pest is present in an area, that is to demonstrate pest absence (situation D) and to detect a possible entry of the pest into the FF-PFA (pest transient actionable) (ISPM 8:1998).	the pest exceeds the established low prevalence levels or in an FF-PFA (situation E) (ISPM 26: <del>2006</del> ) as part of a corrective action plan when a detection occurs. Detection surveys are to determine if the pest is present in an area, that is to demonstrate pest absence (situation D) and to detect a possible entry of the pest into the FF-PFA (pest transient actionable) (ISPM 8: <del>1998</del> ).	but may need to be adjusted at revision of ISPM 8.																																	
<b>ISPM 27 Diagnostic protocols for regulated pests</b>																																						
27	138.	Background, 1st parag.	4, 6, 7 (previous), 8, 9, 13, 17, 20	Proper pest detection and pest identification are crucial for the appropriate application of phytosanitary measures (see for example ISPM 4:1995, ISPM 6:1997, ISPM 7:1997, ISPM 9:1998 and ISPM 20:2004). In particular, contracting parties need proper diagnostic procedures for determination of pest status and pest reporting (ISPM 8:1998; ISPM 17:2002), and the diagnosis of pests in imported consignments (ISPM 13:2001).	Proper pest detection and pest identification are crucial for the appropriate application of phytosanitary measures (see for example ISPM 4: <del>1995</del> , ISPM 6: <del>1997</del> , ISPM 7: <del>1997</del> , ISPM 9: <del>1998</del> and ISPM 20: <del>2004</del> ). In particular, contracting parties need proper diagnostic procedures for determination of pest status and pest reporting (ISPM 8: <del>1998</del> ; ISPM 17: <del>2002</del> ), and the diagnosis of pests in imported consignments (ISPM 13: <del>2001</del> ).	[ISPMs revised since: 7; under revision: 4, 6, 8] General cross-references.																																
27	139.	2.5 Records, 2nd parag.	8, 13, 17	Evidence such as culture(s) of the pest, nucleic acid of the pest, preserved/mounted specimens or test materials (e.g. photograph of gels, ELISA plate printout results) should be retained, in particular in cases of non-compliance (ISPM 13:2001) and where pests are found for the first time (ISPM 17:2002). Additional items may be required under other ISPMs such as ISPM 8:1998.	Evidence such as culture(s) of the pest, nucleic acid of the pest, preserved/mounted specimens or test materials (e.g. photograph of gels, ELISA plate printout results) should be retained, in particular in cases of non-compliance (ISPM 13: <del>2001</del> ) and where pests are found for the first time (ISPM 17: <del>2002</del> ). Additional items may be required under other ISPMs such as ISPM 8: <del>1998</del> .	[ISPMs under revision: 8] General cross-references																																
27	140.	APPENDIX 2: List of adopted diagnostic protocols	27	The following diagnostic protocols have been adopted by the Commission of Phytosanitary Measures as annexes to ISPM 27:2006. Diagnostic protocols are published separately and are available on the International Phytosanitary Portal ( <a href="https://www.ippc.int">https://www.ippc.int</a> ).	The following diagnostic protocols have been adopted by the Commission of Phytosanitary Measures as annexes to ISPM 27: <del>2006</del> . Diagnostic protocols are published separately and are available on the International Phytosanitary Portal ( <a href="https://www.ippc.int">https://www.ippc.int</a> ).	[Depending on CPM-10 (2015) decision] If Appendix 2 is not deleted, the change here and below are needed:																																
27	141.	APPENDIX 2: List of adopted diagnostic protocols		<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Annex no.</th> <th>Title of diagnostic protocol</th> <th>Annex no.</th> <th>Title of diagnostic protocol</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><a href="#">DP 1:2010</a></td> <td><i>Thrips palmi</i> Karny</td> <td><a href="#">DP 1:<del>2010</del></a></td> <td><i>Thrips palmi</i> Karny</td> </tr> <tr> <td><a href="#">DP 2:2012</a></td> <td><i>Plum pox virus</i></td> <td><a href="#">DP 2:<del>2012</del></a></td> <td><i>Plum pox virus</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td><a href="#">DP 3:2012</a></td> <td><i>Trogoderma granarium</i> Everts</td> <td><a href="#">DP 3:<del>2012</del></a></td> <td><i>Trogoderma granarium</i> Everts</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Annex no.	Title of diagnostic protocol	Annex no.	Title of diagnostic protocol	<a href="#">DP 1:2010</a>	<i>Thrips palmi</i> Karny	<a href="#">DP 1:<del>2010</del></a>	<i>Thrips palmi</i> Karny	<a href="#">DP 2:2012</a>	<i>Plum pox virus</i>	<a href="#">DP 2:<del>2012</del></a>	<i>Plum pox virus</i>	<a href="#">DP 3:2012</a>	<i>Trogoderma granarium</i> Everts	<a href="#">DP 3:<del>2012</del></a>	<i>Trogoderma granarium</i> Everts	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Annex no.</th> <th>Title of diagnostic protocol</th> <th>Annex no.</th> <th>Title of diagnostic protocol</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><a href="#">DP 1:2010</a></td> <td><i>Thrips palmi</i> Karny</td> <td><a href="#">DP 1:<del>2010</del></a></td> <td><i>Thrips palmi</i> Karny</td> </tr> <tr> <td><a href="#">DP 2:2012</a></td> <td><i>Plum pox virus</i></td> <td><a href="#">DP 2:<del>2012</del></a></td> <td><i>Plum pox virus</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td><a href="#">DP 3:2012</a></td> <td><i>Trogoderma granarium</i> Everts</td> <td><a href="#">DP 3:<del>2012</del></a></td> <td><i>Trogoderma granarium</i> Everts</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Annex no.	Title of diagnostic protocol	Annex no.	Title of diagnostic protocol	<a href="#">DP 1:2010</a>	<i>Thrips palmi</i> Karny	<a href="#">DP 1:<del>2010</del></a>	<i>Thrips palmi</i> Karny	<a href="#">DP 2:2012</a>	<i>Plum pox virus</i>	<a href="#">DP 2:<del>2012</del></a>	<i>Plum pox virus</i>	<a href="#">DP 3:2012</a>	<i>Trogoderma granarium</i> Everts	<a href="#">DP 3:<del>2012</del></a>	<i>Trogoderma granarium</i> Everts	[Depending on CPM-10 (2015) decision] Date not needed
Annex no.	Title of diagnostic protocol	Annex no.	Title of diagnostic protocol																																			
<a href="#">DP 1:2010</a>	<i>Thrips palmi</i> Karny	<a href="#">DP 1:<del>2010</del></a>	<i>Thrips palmi</i> Karny																																			
<a href="#">DP 2:2012</a>	<i>Plum pox virus</i>	<a href="#">DP 2:<del>2012</del></a>	<i>Plum pox virus</i>																																			
<a href="#">DP 3:2012</a>	<i>Trogoderma granarium</i> Everts	<a href="#">DP 3:<del>2012</del></a>	<i>Trogoderma granarium</i> Everts																																			
Annex no.	Title of diagnostic protocol	Annex no.	Title of diagnostic protocol																																			
<a href="#">DP 1:2010</a>	<i>Thrips palmi</i> Karny	<a href="#">DP 1:<del>2010</del></a>	<i>Thrips palmi</i> Karny																																			
<a href="#">DP 2:2012</a>	<i>Plum pox virus</i>	<a href="#">DP 2:<del>2012</del></a>	<i>Plum pox virus</i>																																			
<a href="#">DP 3:2012</a>	<i>Trogoderma granarium</i> Everts	<a href="#">DP 3:<del>2012</del></a>	<i>Trogoderma granarium</i> Everts																																			
<b>ISPM 28 Phytosanitary treatments for regulated pests</b>																																						
29	142.	2.5 Transparency, 2nd parag.	17	Any change in the status of the regulated pest in the area under consideration, or in the importing contracting party's territory, relevant to recognition shall be communicated appropriately and promptly as required by the IPPC (Article VIII.1(a)) and relevant ISPMs (e.g. ISPM 17:2002).	Any change in the status of the regulated pest in the area under consideration, or in the importing contracting party's territory, relevant to recognition shall be communicated appropriately and promptly as required by the IPPC (Article VIII.1(a)) and relevant ISPMs (e.g. ISPM 17: <del>2002</del> ).	General cross-reference																																

APPENDIX 15 – TABLE 2						
ISPM	Location of reference	Ref.ISPM	Current text	Proposed revision	Reasons	
29	143.	3. Requirements for the Recognition of Pest Free Areas and Areas of Low Pest Prevalence, 1st parag.	4, 8, 22	NPPOs are responsible for designation, maintenance and surveillance of PFAs and ALPPs within their territories (Article IV.(2)e of the IPPC). To establish PFAs or ALPPs and before asking for recognition, NPPOs should take into account the appropriate ISPMs that provide technical guidance, e.g. ISPM 4:1995 for PFAs, ISPM 22:2005 for ALPPs, and ISPM 8:1998.	NPPOs are responsible for designation, maintenance and surveillance of PFAs and ALPPs within their territories (Article IV.(2)e of the IPPC). To establish PFAs or ALPPs and before asking for recognition, NPPOs should take into account the appropriate ISPMs that provide technical guidance, e.g. ISPM 4: <del>1995</del> for PFAs, ISPM 22: <del>2005</del> for ALPPs, and ISPM 8: <del>1998</del> .	[ISPMs under revision: 4, 8] General cross-references. These topics will remain in the ISPMs referred to, even if revised
29	144.	3. Requirements for the Recognition of Pest Free Areas and Areas of Low Pest Prevalence, 5thparag.	9	In other cases, such as in areas where a pest has recently been eradicated (ISPM 9:1998) or suppressed, more detailed information and verification may be required, including items listed in section 4.1 of the present standard.	In other cases, such as in areas where a pest has recently been eradicated (ISPM 9: <del>1998</del> ) or suppressed, more detailed information and verification may be required, including items listed in section 4.1 of the present standard.	General cross-reference to eradication  Internal cross-reference
29	145.	4.1 Request for recognition by the NPPO of the exporting contracting party, 1st parag.	4, 22	The exporting contracting party submits its request for recognition of a PFA or ALPP to an importing contracting party. To support its request, the exporting contracting party provides a technical information package based on ISPM 4:1995 or ISPM 22:2005 as appropriate. This information package should be sufficiently detailed to demonstrate objectively that the areas are, and are likely to remain, PFAs or ALPPs, as appropriate. The package may include the following information: - the type of recognition requested, i.e. either a PFA or an ALPP - location and description of the area to be recognized, with supporting maps, as appropriate pest(s) under consideration, and biology(ies) and known distribution relevant to the area (as described in ISPM 4 or ISPM 22 as appropriate)	The exporting contracting party submits its request for recognition of a PFA or ALPP to an importing contracting party. To support its request, the exporting contracting party provides a technical information package based on ISPM 4: <del>1995</del> or ISPM 22: <del>2005</del> as appropriate. This information package should be sufficiently detailed to demonstrate objectively that the areas are, and are likely to remain, PFAs or ALPPs, as appropriate. The package may include the following information: - the type of recognition requested, i.e. either a PFA or an ALPP - location and description of the area to be recognized, with supporting maps, as appropriate pest(s) under consideration, and biology(ies) and known distribution relevant to the area (as described in ISPM 4 or ISPM 22 as appropriate)	[ISPMs under revision: 4] Specific cross-reference to some elements of ISPM 4 and 22
29	146.	4.4 Assessment of the technical information, 1st parag., 1st indent	4, 22	provisions of the relevant ISPMs that specifically address either PFAs (ISPM 4:1995) or ALPPs (ISPM 22:2005), including the following information:	provisions of the relevant ISPMs that specifically address either PFAs (ISPM 4: <del>1995</del> ) or ALPPs (ISPM 22: <del>2005</del> ), including the following information:	[ISPMs under revision: 4] General cross-references
<b>ISPM 30 Establishment of areas of low pest prevalence for fruit flies (Tephritidae)</b>						
30	147.	Background, 1st parag.	14, 22	The International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC, 1997) contains provisions for areas of low pest prevalence (ALPPs), as does the World Trade Organization Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (Article 6 of the WTO-SPS Agreement). ISPM 22:2005 describes different types of ALPPs and provides general guidance on the establishment of ALPPs. ALPPs may also be used as part of a systems approach (ISPM 14:2002).	The International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC, 1997) contains provisions for areas of low pest prevalence (ALPPs), as does the World Trade Organization Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (Article 6 of the WTO-SPS Agreement). ISPM 22: <del>2005</del> describes different types of ALPPs and provides general guidance on the establishment of ALPPs. ALPPs may also be used as part of a systems approach (ISPM 14: <del>2002</del> ).	General and specific cross-references to ISPM 22. Specific cross-reference to ISPM 14. Both are expected to remain valid

APPENDIX 15 – TABLE 2						
ISPM		Location of reference	Ref.ISPM	Current text	Proposed revision	Reasons
30	148.	Background, 8th parag.	29	If an FF-ALPP is established for export of fruit fly host commodities, the parameters for establishment and maintenance of the FF-ALPP should be determined and agreed to in conjunction with the importing country and in consideration of the guidelines presented in this standard and in accordance with ISPM 29:2007.	If an FF-ALPP is established for export of fruit fly host commodities, the parameters for establishment and maintenance of the FF-ALPP should be determined and agreed to in conjunction with the importing country and in consideration of the guidelines presented in this standard and in accordance with ISPM 29: <del>2007</del> .	General cross-reference to ISPM 29, on recognition of PFAs and ALPPs.
30	149.	1.3 Documentation and record-keeping, 1st parag.	22	The phytosanitary procedures used for the determination, establishment, verification and maintenance of an FF-ALPP should be adequately documented. These procedures should be reviewed and updated regularly, including the corrective actions if required (as described in ISPM 22:2005). It is recommended that a manual of procedures relating to the operational plan be prepared for the FF-ALPP.	The phytosanitary procedures used for the determination, establishment, verification and maintenance of an FF-ALPP should be adequately documented. These procedures should be reviewed and updated regularly, including the corrective actions if required (as described in ISPM 22: <del>2005</del> ). It is recommended that a manual of procedures relating to the operational plan be prepared for the FF-ALPP.	Specific cross-reference to ISPM 22. Corrective actions are expected to remain
30	144 a	2.2.2 Reduction and maintenance of target fruit fly species population level, 1st parag.	22, 26	Specific control measures may be applied to reduce fruit fly populations to or below the specified level of low pest prevalence. Suppression of fruit fly populations may involve the use of more than one control option; some of these are described in section 3.1.4.2 of ISPM 22:2005 and Annex 1 of ISPM 26:2006.	Specific control measures may be applied to reduce fruit fly populations to or below the specified level of low pest prevalence. Suppression of fruit fly populations may involve the use of more than one control option; some of these are described in section 3.1.4.2 of ISPM 22: <del>2005</del> and Annex 1 of ISPM 26: <del>2006</del> .	Specific cross-reference to ISPM 22 and 26. Corrective actions are expected to remain
30	144 b	2.2.3 Phytosanitary measures related to movement of host material or regulated articles	22, 26	Phytosanitary measures may be required to reduce the risk of entry of the specified pests into the FF-ALPP. These are outlined in section 3.1.4.3 of ISPM 22:2005 and 2.2.3 of ISPM 26:2006.	Phytosanitary measures may be required to reduce the risk of entry of the specified pests into the FF-ALPP. These are outlined in section 3.1.4.3 of ISPM 22: <del>2005</del> and 2.2.3 of ISPM 26: <del>2006</del> .	Specific cross-reference to ISPM 22 and 26. Corrective actions are expected to remain
30	144 c	2.3.2 Measures to maintain low prevalence levels of target fruit fly species, 2nd parag.	22	If the monitored fruit fly prevalence level is observed to be increasing (but remains below the specified level for the area), a threshold set by the NPPO for the application of additional control measures may be reached. At this point the NPPO may require implementation of such measures (e.g. as described in section 3.1.4.2 of ISPM 22:2005). This threshold should be set to provide adequate warning of potentially exceeding the specified level of low pest prevalence and avert suspension.	If the monitored fruit fly prevalence level is observed to be increasing (but remains below the specified level for the area), a threshold set by the NPPO for the application of additional control measures may be reached. At this point the NPPO may require implementation of such measures (e.g. as described in section 3.1.4.2 of ISPM 22: <del>2005</del> ). This threshold should be set to provide adequate warning of potentially exceeding the specified level of low pest prevalence and avert suspension.	Specific cross-reference to ISPM 22. Corrective actions are expected to remain
30	144 d	Appendix 2, 1.2 Establishment of an FF-ALPP as a buffer zone	26	The establishment procedures are described in section 2.1 of this standard. The movement of relevant fruit fly host commodities into the area may need to be regulated. Additional information can be found in section 2.2.3 of ISPM 26:2006.	The establishment procedures are described in section 2.1 of this standard. The movement of relevant fruit fly host commodities into the area may need to be regulated. Additional information can be found in section 2.2.3 of ISPM 26: <del>2006</del> .	Specific cross-reference to ISPM 26. Corrective actions are expected to remain

APPENDIX 15 – TABLE 2						
ISPM		Location of reference	Ref.ISPM	Current text	Proposed revision	Reasons
30	144e	Appendix 2, 1.3 Maintenance of an FF-ALPP as a buffer zone	22, 26	Maintenance procedures include those listed in section 2.3 of this standard. Since the buffer zone has features similar to the area or place of production it protects, procedures for maintenance may include those listed for the FF-PFA as described in section 2.3 of ISPM 26:2006 and sections 3.1.4.2, 3.1.4.3 and 3.1.4.4 of ISPM 22:2005. The importance of information dissemination may also be considered in the maintenance of an FF-ALPP as a buffer zone.	Maintenance procedures include those listed in section 2.3 of this standard. Since the buffer zone has features similar to the area or place of production it protects, procedures for maintenance may include those listed for the FF-PFA as described in section 2.3 of ISPM 26: <del>2006</del> and sections 3.1.4.2, 3.1.4.3 and 3.1.4.4 of ISPM 22: <del>2005</del> . The importance of information dissemination may also be considered in the maintenance of an FF-ALPP as a buffer zone.	Specific cross-reference to ISPM 22 and 26. Corrective actions are expected to remain
30	150.	2.2.4 Domestic declaration of an FF-ALPP	8	The NPPO should verify the status of the FF-ALPP (in accordance with ISPM 8:1998) specifically by confirming compliance with the procedures established in accordance with this standard (surveillance and controls). The NPPO should declare and notify the establishment of the FF-ALPP, as appropriate.	The NPPO should verify the status of the FF-ALPP (in accordance with ISPM 8: <del>1998</del> ) specifically by confirming compliance with the procedures established in accordance with this standard (surveillance and controls). The NPPO should declare and notify the establishment of the FF-ALPP, as appropriate.	[ISPMs under revision: 8] Specific cross-reference.
30	151.	2.5.1 Suspension of FF-ALPP status, 2nd parag.	17	Relevant importing NPPOs should be notified without undue delay of these actions (further information on pest reporting requirements is provided in ISPM 17:2002).	Relevant importing NPPOs should be notified without undue delay of these actions (further information on pest reporting requirements is provided in ISPM 17: <del>2002</del> ).	General cross-reference. ISPM 17 is on pest reporting
30	152.	2.5.3 Loss of FF-ALPP status	17	Loss of FF-ALPP status should occur after suspension if reinstatement has failed to take place within a justifiable time frame, taking into account the biology of the fruit fly target species. Relevant importing NPPOs should be notified without undue delay of the change in status of the FF-ALPP (further information on pest reporting requirements is provided in ISPM 17:2002).	Loss of FF-ALPP status should occur after suspension if reinstatement has failed to take place within a justifiable time frame, taking into account the biology of the fruit fly target species. Relevant importing NPPOs should be notified without undue delay of the change in status of the FF-ALPP (further information on pest reporting requirements is provided in ISPM 17: <del>2002</del> ).	General cross-reference. ISPM 17 is on pest reporting
30	153.	Annex 2, (6) <i>Notification of relevant agencies</i>	17	Relevant NPPOs and other agencies should be kept informed of corrective actions. Information on pest reporting requirements under the IPPC is provided in ISPM 17:2002.	Relevant NPPOs and other agencies should be kept informed of corrective actions. Information on pest reporting requirements under the IPPC is provided in ISPM 17: <del>2002</del> .	Specific cross-reference. ISPM 17 is on pest reporting and expected to still contain these elements even if revised
30	154.	Appendix 2, 1. An FF-ALPP as a buffer zone	26	In cases where the biology of the target fruit fly species is such that it is likely to disperse from an infested area into a protected area, it may be necessary to define a buffer zone with a low fruit fly prevalence (as described in ISPM 26:2006). Establishment of the FF-ALPP and FF-PFA should occur at the same time, enabling the FF-ALPP to be defined for the purpose of protecting the FF-PFA.	In cases where the biology of the target fruit fly species is such that it is likely to disperse from an infested area into a protected area, it may be necessary to define a buffer zone with a low fruit fly prevalence (as described in ISPM 26: <del>2006</del> ). Establishment of the FF-ALPP and FF-PFA should occur at the same time, enabling the FF-ALPP to be defined for the purpose of protecting the FF-PFA.	Specific cross-reference, expected to remain in ISPM 26
<b>ISPM 31 Methodologies for sampling of consignments</b>						
31	155.	Background, 1st parag.	20, 23	This standard provides the statistical basis for, and complements, ISPM 20:2004 and ISPM 23:2005. Inspection of consignments of regulated articles moving in trade is an essential tool for the management of pest risks and is the most frequently used phytosanitary procedure worldwide to	This standard provides the statistical basis for, and complements, ISPM 20: <del>2004</del> and ISPM 23: <del>2005</del> . Inspection of consignments of regulated articles moving in trade is an essential tool for the management of pest risks and is the most frequently used phytosanitary procedure worldwide to	General cross-reference. Still expected to apply if these standards are revised.

APPENDIX 15 – TABLE 2						
ISPM	Location of reference	Ref.ISPM	Current text	Proposed revision	Reasons	
			determine if pests are present and/or the compliance with phytosanitary import requirements.	determine if pests are present and/or the compliance with phytosanitary import requirements.		
31	156. Background, 4th parag.	1	It is important that sampling procedures established and used by NPPOs are documented and transparent, and take into account the principle of minimum impact (ISPM 1:2006), particularly because inspection based on sampling may lead to the refusal to issue a phytosanitary certificate, refusal of entry, or treatment or destruction of a consignment or part of a consignment.	It is important that sampling procedures established and used by NPPOs are documented and transparent, and take into account the principle of minimum impact (ISPM 1: <del>2006</del> ), particularly because inspection based on sampling may lead to the refusal to issue a phytosanitary certificate, refusal of entry, or treatment or destruction of a consignment or part of a consignment.	Specific cross-reference to a principle. Expected to remain in ISPM 1.	
<b>ISPM 33 Pest free potato (<i>Solanum spp.</i>) micropropagative material and minitubers for international trade</b>						
33	157. Background 3rd parag.	16	As per ISPM 16:2002, programmes for the certification of plants for planting for seed potatoes (sometimes known as "seed potato certification schemes") frequently include specific requirements for pests as well as non-phytosanitary requirements such as varietal purity, size of the product etc. Many seed potato certification schemes require potato micropropagative material to be derived from plants that have been tested and found free from the pests covered by the scheme. Such schemes are usually designed to control pests present in the production country that are of national economic importance. Therefore, the pests covered by a specific scheme or the strength of measures may not always meet all of the phytosanitary import requirements of importing countries. In such cases, additional phytosanitary measures may be required.	As per ISPM 16: <del>2002</del> , programmes for the certification of plants for planting for seed potatoes (sometimes known as "seed potato certification schemes") frequently include specific requirements for pests as well as non-phytosanitary requirements such as varietal purity, size of the product etc. Many seed potato certification schemes require potato micropropagative material to be derived from plants that have been tested and found free from the pests covered by the scheme. Such schemes are usually designed to control pests present in the production country that are of national economic importance. Therefore, the pests covered by a specific scheme or the strength of measures may not always meet all of the phytosanitary import requirements of importing countries. In such cases, additional phytosanitary measures may be required.	General cross-reference	
33	158. 2. Pest Risk Analysis, 2nd parag.	2, 11 (previous), 21	PRA provides technical justification for identifying regulated pests and for establishing phytosanitary import requirements for potato micropropagative material and minitubers. PRA should be carried out by the NPPO of the importing country in accordance with ISPM 2:2007 and ISPM 11:2004 for the pathways of "potato micropropagative material" and "minitubers" from given origins. The PRA may identify quarantine pests associated with these pathways. The PRA should also be carried out in accordance with ISPM 21:2004 as appropriate in order to identify regulated non-quarantine pests.	PRA provides technical justification for identifying regulated pests and for establishing phytosanitary import requirements for potato micropropagative material and minitubers. PRA should be carried out by the NPPO of the importing country in accordance with ISPM 2: <del>2007</del> and ISPM 11: <del>2004</del> for the pathways of "potato micropropagative material" and "minitubers" from given origins. The PRA may identify quarantine pests associated with these pathways. The PRA should also be carried out in accordance with ISPM 21: <del>2004</del> as appropriate in order to identify regulated non-quarantine pests.	[ISPMs revised since: 11] General cross-reference to the three standards on PRA	
33	159. 2.1 Pathway-specific lists of regulated potato pests	19	For the purposes of this standard, the NPPO of the importing country is encouraged to establish pathway-specific regulated pest lists for potato micropropagative material and minitubers respectively and, on request, should provide these lists to	For the purposes of this standard, the NPPO of the importing country is encouraged to establish pathway-specific regulated pest lists for potato micropropagative material and minitubers respectively and, on request, should provide these lists to	General cross-reference. ISPM 19 is about pest lists	

APPENDIX 15 – TABLE 2						
ISPM	Location of reference	Ref.ISPM	Current text	Proposed revision	Reasons	
			NPPOs of exporting countries. Guidance on regulated pest lists is provided in ISPM 19:2003.	NPPOs of exporting countries. Guidance on regulated pest lists is provided in ISPM 19: <del>2003</del> .		
33	160. 2.2 Pest risk management options	14	The pest risk management measures are determined based on the PRA. It may be appropriate for the measures to be integrated into a systems approach for production of potato material (as described in ISPM 14:2002). A flow chart showing the normal sequence of establishment, maintenance and production of pest free potato micropropagative material and minitubers is provided in Appendix 3.	The pest risk management measures are determined based on the PRA. It may be appropriate for the measures to be integrated into a systems approach for production of potato material (as described in ISPM 14: <del>2002</del> ). A flow chart showing the normal sequence of establishment, maintenance and production of pest free potato micropropagative material and minitubers is provided in Appendix 3.	General cross-reference. ISPM 14 is about systems approaches	
33	161. 3.2 Maintenance and propagation facilities for pest free potato micropropagative material	10	A facility that maintains and propagates pest free potato micropropagative material should be operated separately from the facilities that establish potato plants in vitro and conduct the testing for regulated pests (although exceptional circumstances are described in section 3.3). The facility should be operated as a pest free production site (as described in ISPM 10:1999) with respect to the pests of potato regulated by the importing country for potato micropropagative material. The facility should:	A facility that maintains and propagates pest free potato micropropagative material should be operated separately from the facilities that establish potato plants in vitro and conduct the testing for regulated pests (although exceptional circumstances are described in section 3.3). The facility should be operated as a pest free production site (as described in ISPM 10: <del>1999</del> ) with respect to the pests of potato regulated by the importing country for potato micropropagative material. The facility should:	General cross-reference. ISPM 10 is about pest free places of production and pest free production sites	
33	162. 4.2 Minituber facilities, 1st parag.	10	A minituber production facility should be operated as a pest free production site (as described in ISPM 10:1999) with respect to pests regulated by the importing country for minitubers. Pests that may be of concern include those for potato micropropagative material i.e. viruses, viroids, phytoplasmas and bacteria (listed in Appendix 1) and also fungi, nematodes, arthropods etc. (listed in Appendix 2).	A minituber production facility should be operated as a pest free production site (as described in ISPM 10: <del>1999</del> ) with respect to pests regulated by the importing country for minitubers. Pests that may be of concern include those for potato micropropagative material i.e. viruses, viroids, phytoplasmas and bacteria (listed in Appendix 1) and also fungi, nematodes, arthropods etc. (listed in Appendix 2).	General cross-reference.	
33	163. 8. Phytosanitary Certification, last parag.	12 (previous)	Pest free potato micropropagative material and minitubers moving in international trade should be accompanied by a phytosanitary certificate issued by the NPPO of the exporting country according to ISPM 12:2001 and complying with the phytosanitary import requirements of the importing country. The use of seed potato certification labels may assist with lot identification, in particular when these labels specify the reference number of the lot, including where appropriate the producer's identification number.	Pest free potato micropropagative material and minitubers moving in international trade should be accompanied by a phytosanitary certificate issued by the NPPO of the exporting country according to ISPM 12: <del>2001</del> and complying with the phytosanitary import requirements of the importing country. The use of seed potato certification labels may assist with lot identification, in particular when these labels specify the reference number of the lot, including where appropriate the producer's identification number.	<span style="color: orange;">[[ISPMs revised since: 12]</span>  General cross-reference to a standard revised since. ISPM 12 is about phytosanitary certificate. Cross-reference still applies	
<b>ISPM 34 Design and operation of post-entry quarantine stations for plants</b>						
34	164. Background	2, 11 (previous)	PRA should be carried out to determine the phytosanitary measures for specified commodities of plants for planting or other plants according to ISPM 2:2007 and ISPM 11:2004. The PRA determines the pest risk associated with the plants and identifies phytosanitary measures, which may include post-entry quarantine for a specified period, to manage the	PRA should be carried out to determine the phytosanitary measures for specified commodities of plants for planting or other plants according to ISPM 2: <del>2007</del> and ISPM 11: <del>2004</del> . The PRA determines the pest risk associated with the plants and identifies phytosanitary measures, which may include post-entry quarantine for a specified period, to manage the	<span style="color: orange;">[[ISPMs revised since: 11]</span>  General cross-reference to the standards on PRA. ISPM 11 was revised since but cross-reference still applies	

APPENDIX 15 – TABLE 2					
ISPM	Location of reference	Ref.ISPM	Current text	Proposed revision	Reasons
			risk. The physical and operational characteristics of a PEQ station determine the level of confinement provided by the station and its ability to confine adequately various quarantine pests.	risk. The physical and operational characteristics of a PEQ station determine the level of confinement provided by the station and its ability to confine adequately various quarantine pests.	
<b>ISPM 35 Systems approach for pest risk management of fruit flies (Tephritidae)</b>					
35	165. Background, 1st parag.	2, 11 (previous)	Many species of fruit flies of the family Tephritidae are pests of economic importance and their introduction may pose a pest risk. To identify and manage the target fruit fly species risk, a PRA should be conducted by the NPPO of the importing country and phytosanitary measures may be applied (ISPM 2:2007, ISPM 11:2004).	Many species of fruit flies of the family Tephritidae are pests of economic importance and their introduction may pose a pest risk. To identify and manage the target fruit fly species risk, a PRA should be conducted by the NPPO of the importing country and phytosanitary measures may be applied (ISPM 2: <del>2007</del> , ISPM 11: <del>2004</del> ).	[ISPMs revised since: 11]  General cross-reference to the standards on PRA. ISPM 11 was revised since but cross-reference still applies
35	166. Background, 3rd and 4th parag.	14, 26	A systems approach requires a combination of at least two measures that are independent of each other, and may include any number of measures that are dependent on each other (ISPM 14:2002). Treatments used in an FF SA are those not considered sufficiently efficacious to be applied as a single measure. The measures may be applied in different places at different times and may therefore involve a number of organizations and individuals. Often, countries have used phytosanitary measures such as treatments or pest free areas for fruit flies (FF-PFAs) (ISPM 26:2006) to support import or movement of host fruit. In other cases, prohibition has been applied. An FF SA may be an alternative to facilitate the export and movement of fruit fly hosts into endangered areas. NPPOs may recognize FF SAs as being equivalent to single measures. The exporting country may seek formal approval of equivalence of these measures with the importing country. In cases where an effective FF SA has been implemented, components of those systems may be used by other importing and exporting countries to facilitate the movement of fruit from areas with similar conditions.	A systems approach requires a combination of at least two measures that are independent of each other, and may include any number of measures that are dependent on each other (ISPM 14: <del>2002</del> ). Treatments used in an FF SA are those not considered sufficiently efficacious to be applied as a single measure. The measures may be applied in different places at different times and may therefore involve a number of organizations and individuals. Often, countries have used phytosanitary measures such as treatments or pest free areas for fruit flies (FF-PFAs) (ISPM 26: <del>2006</del> ) to support import or movement of host fruit. In other cases, prohibition has been applied. An FF SA may be an alternative to facilitate the export and movement of fruit fly hosts into endangered areas. NPPOs may recognize FF SAs as being equivalent to single measures. The exporting country may seek formal approval of equivalence of these measures with the importing country. In cases where an effective FF SA has been implemented, components of those systems may be used by other importing and exporting countries to facilitate the movement of fruit from areas with similar conditions.	General cross-references. ISPM 14 is about systems approaches and ISPM 26 about fruit fly PFAs
35	167. 1. Decision to Implement an FF SA, 1st parag.	14	It is the responsibility of the importing country to establish and communicate its technically justified phytosanitary import requirements. A combination of pest risk management measures integrated into an FF SA is one of the options that the importing country may select as the basis for phytosanitary import requirements (ISPM 14:2002).	It is the responsibility of the importing country to establish and communicate its technically justified phytosanitary import requirements. A combination of pest risk management measures integrated into an FF SA is one of the options that the importing country may select as the basis for phytosanitary import requirements (ISPM 14: <del>2002</del> ).	General cross-references. ISPM 14 is about systems approaches

APPENDIX 15 – TABLE 2					
ISPM	Location of reference	Ref.ISPM	Current text	Proposed revision	Reasons
35	168. 1. Decision to Implement an FF SA, 2nd parag., (2)	24	The importing country does not explicitly require a systems approach, but the NPPO of the exporting country deems a systems approach to be a suitable and effective approach for achieving the importing country's phytosanitary import requirements. The exporting country may need to negotiate formal approval of the equivalence of measures with the importing country (ISPM 24:2005).	The importing country does not explicitly require a systems approach, but the NPPO of the exporting country deems a systems approach to be a suitable and effective approach for achieving the importing country's phytosanitary import requirements. The exporting country may need to negotiate formal approval of the equivalence of measures with the importing country (ISPM 24: <del>2005</del> ).	General cross-references. ISPM 24 is about equivalence
35	169. 1. Decision to Implement an FF SA, 5th parag.	2	It may be advisable that NPPOs involve other stakeholders in the development of an FF SA (ISPM 2:2007).	It may be advisable that NPPOs involve other stakeholders in the development of an FF SA (ISPM 2: <del>2007</del> ).	Specific cross-reference to an element of ISPM 2, expected to remain
35	170. 6. Non-conformity and Non-compliance, 3rd parag.	13	The NPPO of the importing country should notify the NPPO of the exporting country of any non-compliances (see ISPM 13:2001).	The NPPO of the importing country should notify the NPPO of the exporting country of any non-compliances (see ISPM 13: <del>2004</del> ).	General cross-references. ISPM 13 is about notification of non-compliance
<b>ISPM 36 Integrated measures for plants for planting</b>					
36	171. Background, 1st parag.	2, 11 (previous), 21, 32	Several ISPMs provide general guidance on pest risk management (e.g. ISPM 2:2007, ISPM 11:2004, ISPM 21:2004, ISPM 32:2009). The conclusions from pest risk analyses (PRAs) should be used to decide the phytosanitary measures to reduce the pest risk to an acceptable level for the importing country.	Several ISPMs provide general guidance on pest risk management (e.g. ISPM 2: <del>2007</del> , ISPM 11: <del>2004</del> , ISPM 21: <del>2004</del> , ISPM 32: <del>2009</del> ). The conclusions from pest risk analyses (PRAs) should be used to decide the phytosanitary measures to reduce the pest risk to an acceptable level for the importing country.	[ISPMs revised since: 11] General cross-references to standards dealing with pest risk management
36	172. 1. Basis for Regulation, 1st parag.	2, 11 (previous), 21	The importing country may establish and shall communicate its technically justified phytosanitary import requirements for plants for planting (refer to ISPM 2:2007, ISPM 11:2004 and ISPM 21:2004). Annex 1 outlines factors to be taken into account when the NPPO of the importing country conducts a PRA for plants for planting.	The importing country may establish and shall communicate its technically justified phytosanitary import requirements for plants for planting (refer to ISPM 2: <del>2007</del> , ISPM 11: <del>2004</del> and ISPM 21: <del>2004</del> ). Annex 1 outlines factors to be taken into account when the NPPO of the importing country conducts a PRA for plants for planting.	[ISPMs revised since: 11] Specific cross-reference to a basic element of all PRA standards
36	173. 1. Basis for Regulation, 3rd parag.	24	If in the latter case the NPPO of the exporting country deems that the “integrated measures” that it has put in place are equivalent to the phytosanitary import requirements of an importing country, the exporting country should seek formal approval of equivalence of these measures with the importing country (ISPM 24:2005).	If in the latter case the NPPO of the exporting country deems that the “integrated measures” that it has put in place are equivalent to the phytosanitary import requirements of an importing country, the exporting country should seek formal approval of equivalence of these measures with the importing country (ISPM 24: <del>2005</del> ).	Specific cross-references to a basic element of ISPM 24 on equivalence
36	174. 3. Responsibilities of the NPPO of the Exporting Country, last indent	17	providing adequate information on relevant pest outbreaks to the NPPO of the importing country in accordance with ISPM 17:2002.	providing adequate information on relevant pest outbreaks to the NPPO of the importing country in accordance with ISPM 17: <del>2002</del> .	Specific cross-references to a basic element of ISPM 17 (reporting of outbreaks)
36	175. 3.4 Export inspections and issuance of phytosanitary certificates	12	The integrated measures may reduce the need for the NPPO to undertake growing season inspections and may also reduce the frequency or intensity of export inspections of consignments of plants for planting. A phytosanitary certificate should be issued in compliance with ISPM 12:2011.	The integrated measures may reduce the need for the NPPO to undertake growing season inspections and may also reduce the frequency or intensity of export inspections of consignments of plants for planting. A phytosanitary certificate should be issued in compliance with ISPM 12: <del>2011</del> .	General cross-references. ISPM 12 is about phytosanitary certificates

APPENDIX 15 – TABLE 2						
ISPM		Location of reference	Ref.ISPM	Current text	Proposed revision	Reasons
36	176.	4. Responsibilities of the NPPO of the Importing Country, 2nd parag.	13	The NPPO of the importing country should notify the NPPO of the exporting country of any non-compliances (see ISPM 13:2001) that are found upon import or at a later stage in the country of import.	The NPPO of the importing country should notify the NPPO of the exporting country of any non-compliances (see ISPM 13: <del>2001</del> ) that are found upon import or at a later stage in the country of import.	General cross-references. ISPM 13 is about non-compliance
36	177.	4.1 Auditing	13, 20	The NPPO of the importing country may request the NPPO of the exporting country to provide reports on audits undertaken by the producer and by the NPPO of the exporting country. It may also request to audit the integrated measures as developed and set up by the exporting country. This audit may consist of documentation review, inspection and testing of plants produced using integrated measures, and, where appropriate, site visits as a demonstration of the integrated measures used (see ISPM 20:2004) or visits to specific sites provided that there is specific justification, for example in cases of non-compliance (ISPM 13:2001).	The NPPO of the importing country may request the NPPO of the exporting country to provide reports on audits undertaken by the producer and by the NPPO of the exporting country. It may also request to audit the integrated measures as developed and set up by the exporting country. This audit may consist of documentation review, inspection and testing of plants produced using integrated measures, and, where appropriate, site visits as a demonstration of the integrated measures used (see ISPM 20: <del>2004</del> ) or visits to specific sites provided that there is specific justification, for example in cases of non-compliance (ISPM 13: <del>2001</del> ).	General cross-references to ISPM 13, which is about non-compliance. Specific cross-references to audits in ISPM 20 (expected to remain)
36	178.	Annex 1, Intended uses that affect pest risk	32	Plants for planting are classified in ISPM 32:2009 as a high pest risk commodity category. Different intended uses that affect the pest risk may include whether plants are grown as annuals or perennials, whether they are grown indoors or outdoors, whether they are grown in urban areas, field or nursery etc.	Plants for planting are classified in ISPM 32: <del>2009</del> as a high pest risk commodity category. Different intended uses that affect the pest risk may include whether plants are grown as annuals or perennials, whether they are grown indoors or outdoors, whether they are grown in urban areas, field or nursery etc.	Specific cross-reference to the ISPM on classification of commodities ISPM 32. Plants for planting likely to remain classified as high risk.
<b>PT 1</b>						
PT 1	179.	Scope of the treatment	18	This treatment applies to the irradiation of fruits and vegetables at 70 Gy minimum absorbed dose to prevent the emergence of adults of <i>Anastrepha ludens</i> at the stated efficacy. This treatment should be applied in accordance with the requirements outlined in ISPM 18:2003	This treatment applies to the irradiation of fruits and vegetables at 70 Gy minimum absorbed dose to prevent the emergence of adults of <i>Anastrepha ludens</i> at the stated efficacy. This treatment should be applied in accordance with the requirements outlined in ISPM 18: <del>2003</del>	General cross-reference. ISPM 18 is about irradiation
<b>PT 2</b>						
PT 2	180.	Scope of the treatment	18	This treatment applies to the irradiation of fruits and vegetables at 70 Gy minimum absorbed dose to prevent the emergence of adults of <i>Anastrepha obliqua</i> at the stated efficacy. This treatment should be applied in accordance with the requirements outlined in ISPM 18:2003	This treatment applies to the irradiation of fruits and vegetables at 70 Gy minimum absorbed dose to prevent the emergence of adults of <i>Anastrepha obliqua</i> at the stated efficacy. This treatment should be applied in accordance with the requirements outlined in ISPM 18: <del>2003</del>	General cross-reference. ISPM 18 is about irradiation
<b>PT 3</b>						
PT 3	181.	Scope of the treatment		This treatment applies to the irradiation of fruits and vegetables at 100 Gy minimum absorbed dose to prevent the emergence of adults of <i>Anastrepha serpentina</i> at the stated efficacy. This treatment should be applied in accordance with the requirements outlined in ISPM 18:2003	This treatment applies to the irradiation of fruits and vegetables at 100 Gy minimum absorbed dose to prevent the emergence of adults of <i>Anastrepha serpentina</i> at the stated efficacy. This treatment should be applied in accordance with the requirements outlined in ISPM 18: <del>2003</del>	General cross-reference. ISPM 18 is about irradiation
<b>PT 4</b>						

APPENDIX 15 – TABLE 2						
ISPM	Location of reference	Ref.ISPM	Current text	Proposed revision	Reasons	
PT 4	182. Scope of the treatment	18	This treatment applies to the irradiation of fruits and vegetables at 100 Gy minimum absorbed dose to prevent the emergence of adults of <i>Bactrocera jarvisi</i> at the stated efficacy. This treatment should be applied in accordance with the requirements outlined in ISPM 18:2003	This treatment applies to the irradiation of fruits and vegetables at 100 Gy minimum absorbed dose to prevent the emergence of adults of <i>Bactrocera jarvisi</i> at the stated efficacy. This treatment should be applied in accordance with the requirements outlined in ISPM 18: <del>2003</del>	General cross-reference. ISPM 18 is about irradiation	
		PT 5				
PT 5	183. Scope of the treatment	18	This treatment applies to the irradiation of fruits and vegetables at 100 Gy minimum absorbed dose to prevent the emergence of adults of <i>Bactrocera tryoni</i> at the stated efficacy. This treatment should be applied in accordance with the requirements outlined in ISPM 18:2003	This treatment applies to the irradiation of fruits and vegetables at 100 Gy minimum absorbed dose to prevent the emergence of adults of <i>Bactrocera tryoni</i> at the stated efficacy. This treatment should be applied in accordance with the requirements outlined in ISPM 18: <del>2003</del>	General cross-reference. ISPM 18 is about irradiation	
		PT 6				
PT 6	184. Scope of the treatment		This treatment applies to the irradiation of fruits and vegetables at 200 Gy minimum absorbed dose to prevent the emergence of adults of <i>Cydia pomonella</i> at the stated efficacy. This treatment should be applied in accordance with the requirements outlined in ISPM 18:2003	This treatment applies to the irradiation of fruits and vegetables at 200 Gy minimum absorbed dose to prevent the emergence of adults of <i>Cydia pomonella</i> at the stated efficacy. This treatment should be applied in accordance with the requirements outlined in ISPM 18: <del>2003</del>	General cross-reference. ISPM 18 is about irradiation	
		PT 7				
PT 7	185. Scope of the treatment	18	This treatment applies to the irradiation of fruits and vegetables at 150 Gy minimum absorbed dose to prevent the emergence of adults of fruit flies at the stated efficacy. This treatment should be applied in accordance with the requirements outlined in ISPM 18:2003	This treatment applies to the irradiation of fruits and vegetables at 150 Gy minimum absorbed dose to prevent the emergence of adults of fruit flies at the stated efficacy. This treatment should be applied in accordance with the requirements outlined in ISPM 18: <del>2003</del>	General cross-reference. ISPM 18 is about irradiation	
		PT 8				
PT 8	186. Scope of the treatment	18	This treatment applies to the irradiation of fruits and vegetables at 60 Gy minimum absorbed dose to prevent the development of phanerocephalic pupae of <i>Rhagoletis pomonella</i> at the stated efficacy. This treatment should be applied in accordance with the requirements outlined in ISPM 18:2003	This treatment applies to the irradiation of fruits and vegetables at 60 Gy minimum absorbed dose to prevent the development of phanerocephalic pupae of <i>Rhagoletis pomonella</i> at the stated efficacy. This treatment should be applied in accordance with the requirements outlined in ISPM 18: <del>2003</del>	General cross-reference. ISPM 18 is about irradiation	
		PT 9				
PT 9	187. Scope of the treatment	18	This treatment applies to the irradiation of fruits and vegetables at 92 Gy minimum absorbed dose to prevent the reproduction in adults of <i>Conotrachelus nenuphar</i> at the stated efficacy. This treatment should be applied in accordance with the requirements outlined in ISPM 18:2003	This treatment applies to the irradiation of fruits and vegetables at 92 Gy minimum absorbed dose to prevent the reproduction in adults of <i>Conotrachelus nenuphar</i> at the stated efficacy. This treatment should be applied in accordance with the requirements outlined in ISPM 18: <del>2003</del>	General cross-reference. ISPM 18 is about irradiation	
PT 9	188.	18	Treatment should be applied in accordance with the requirements of ISPM 18:2003.	Treatment should be applied in accordance with the requirements of ISPM 18: <del>2003</del> .	General cross-reference. ISPM 18 is about irradiation	
		PT 10				

APPENDIX 15 – TABLE 2						
ISPM	Location of reference	Ref.ISPM	Current text	Proposed revision	Reasons	
PT 10	189. Scope of the treatment	18	This treatment applies to the irradiation of fruits and vegetables at 232 Gy minimum absorbed dose to prevent the emergence of adults of <i>Grapholita molesta</i> at the stated efficacy. This treatment should be applied in accordance with the requirements outlined in ISPM 18:2003	This treatment applies to the irradiation of fruits and vegetables at 232 Gy minimum absorbed dose to prevent the emergence of adults of <i>Grapholita molesta</i> at the stated efficacy. This treatment should be applied in accordance with the requirements outlined in ISPM 18: <del>2003</del>	General cross-reference. ISPM 18 is about irradiation	
PT 10	190.	18	Treatment should be applied in accordance with the requirements of ISPM 18:2003.	Treatment should be applied in accordance with the requirements of ISPM 18: <del>2003</del> .	General cross-reference. ISPM 18 is about irradiation	
		<b>PT 11</b>				
PT 11	191. Scope of the treatment	18	This treatment applies to the irradiation of fruits and vegetables at 232 Gy minimum absorbed dose under hypoxic conditions to prevent oviposition of <i>Grapholita molesta</i> at the stated efficacy. This treatment should be applied in accordance with the requirements outlined in ISPM 18:2003	This treatment applies to the irradiation of fruits and vegetables at 232 Gy minimum absorbed dose under hypoxic conditions to prevent oviposition of <i>Grapholita molesta</i> at the stated efficacy. This treatment should be applied in accordance with the requirements outlined in ISPM 18: <del>2003</del>	General cross-reference. ISPM 18 is about irradiation	
PT 11	192.	18	Treatment should be applied in accordance with the requirements of ISPM 18:2003.	Treatment should be applied in accordance with the requirements of ISPM 18: <del>2003</del> .	General cross-reference. ISPM 18 is about irradiation	
		<b>PT 14</b>				
PT 14	193. Scope of the treatment	18	This treatment applies to the irradiation of fruits and vegetables at 100 Gy minimum absorbed dose to prevent the emergence of adults of <i>Ceratitis capitata</i> at the stated efficacy. This treatment should be applied in accordance with the requirements outlined in ISPM 18:2003	This treatment applies to the irradiation of fruits and vegetables at 100 Gy minimum absorbed dose to prevent the emergence of adults of <i>Ceratitis capitata</i> at the stated efficacy. This treatment should be applied in accordance with the requirements outlined in ISPM 18: <del>2003</del>	General cross-reference. ISPM 18 is about irradiation	
PT 14	194.		Treatment should be applied in accordance with the requirements of ISPM 18:2003.	Treatment should be applied in accordance with the requirements of ISPM 18: <del>2003</del> .	General cross-reference. ISPM 18 is about irradiation	
	<b>DP 2</b>					
DP 2	195. 3. Detection and Identification, 2 <sup>nd</sup> parag., 1 <sup>st</sup> sentence	31	General guidance on sampling methodologies is described in ISPM 31:2008 ( <i>Methodologies for sampling of consignments</i> ).	General guidance on sampling methodologies is described in ISPM 31: <del>2008</del> —( <i>Methodologies for sampling of consignments</i> ).	General cross-reference, to the standard dealing on sampling	
	<b>DP 6</b>					
	196. 5. Records, 2 <sup>nd</sup> parag.	13	In instances where other contracting parties may be affected by the results of the diagnosis, retention of the original sample (labelled for traceability) culture(s) of the pest, preserved or mounted specimens, or test materials (e.g. photograph of gels, ELISA results printout, PCR amplicons) for at least for one year is recommended, especially in cases of non-compliance (ISPM 13:2001, <i>Guidelines for the notification of non-compliance and emergency action</i> ) and where pests are found for the first time in a country or an area.	In instances where other contracting parties may be affected by the results of the diagnosis, retention of the original sample (labelled for traceability) culture(s) of the pest, preserved or mounted specimens, or test materials (e.g. photograph of gels, ELISA results printout, PCR amplicons) for at least for one year is recommended, especially in cases of non-compliance (ISPM 13: <del>2004</del> , <i>Guidelines for the notification of non-compliance and emergency action</i> ) and where pests are found for the first time in a country or an area.	General cross-reference, to the standard dealing on non-compliance	