March 2007

منظمة الأغذية والزراعة للأمم المتحدة | 联合国粮食及农业组织 | Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations | Organisation des Nations Unies pour l'alimentation et l'agriculture | Organización de las Naciones Unidas para la Agricultura y la Alimentación

COMMISSION ON PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES

Second Session

Rome, 26 – 30 March 2007

Comments on draft standards (CPM 2007/2 - Annex III)
Phytosanitary treatments for regulated pests

Agenda Item 9.2 of the Provisional Agenda

Document by the IPPC Secretariat

1. The Secretariat compiled comments received in advance of the CPM on the draft ISPM on phytosanitary treatments for regulated pests from the following members and RPPO:

- Argentina
- Australia
- Bolivia
- Brazil
- Canada
- Chile
- COSAVE
- EC and its 27 member states
- Korea (Republic)
- New Zealand
- Paraguay
- Uruguay
- USA.

For reasons of economy, this document is produced in a limited number of copies. Delegates and observers are kindly requested to bring it to the meetings and to refrain from asking for additional copies, unless strictly indispensable.
Most FAO meeting documents are available on Internet at www.fao.org

Draft ISPMs for adoption at CPM-2 (2007)

ANNEX III OF DOCUMENT CPM 2007/2

DRAFT ISPM: PHYTOSANITARY TREATMENTS FOR REGULATED PESTS

The following are comments received as of 14 March 2007 according to guidelines given in the document CPM 2007/2. They are provided for information and the final document will be provided at the CPM meeting.

The Secretariat has compiled in the order of the text the comments received in advance of the CPM meeting, exactly as provided by countries.

	1. Section	2. Country	3. Type of comment	4. Location	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation
1.	***GENERAL COMMENTS***	European Commission and its 27 member states (hereafter EC + 27 MS)	This draft has been substantially rewritten by the November 2006 SC. Without an application form (which is to be placed on the IPP) some aspects of the operation of this Standard may prove to be a problem. The quantity and quality of information that will be submitted to the TPPT may be variable. The operation of the TPPT and this Standard should be reviewed 3 years after adoption.			
2.	GENERAL COMMENTS	Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Paraguay, Uruguay, COSAVE	1) In item 3.2, 2ND paragraph is missing in the Spanish version 2) This draft ISPM is different from the one that has been submitted for country consultation. Annexes have been eliminated to be part of the IPPC Procedural manual, maintaining the commented inconsistencies in the draft ISPM text. These documents that have been included into the Procedural manual must be also formally approved. 3) Critical parameters are mentioned in the definition, but not broken down in the body of the ISPM. Suggested parameters must be: Active ingredient, treatment type , target regulated pest, application method, exposure time, dose, temperature .			
3.	SCOPE	Australia	editorial	para 1 sentence 1	and adopted by the **Commission on Phytosanitary Measures** (CPM).	first mention of CPM
4.	SCOPE	Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Paraguay, Uruguay, COSAVE	Editorial	Relocation of 1st para	~~This standard presents in Annex 1 phytosanitary treatments evaluated and adopted by the CPM~~. ~~It also~~ This standard describes the requirements for submission and evaluation of the efficacy data and other relevant information on a phytosanitary treatment that can be used as a phytosanitary measure and that will be included in Annex 1 after its adoption. This standard presents in Annex 1 phytosanitary treatments evaluated and adopted by the CPM The treatments are for the control of regulated pests on regulated articles, primarily those	It's adequate to begin the scope talking about the standard and not about its annex. The first paragraph has been relocated below.

	1. Section	2. Country	3. Type of comment	4. Location	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation
					moving in international trade. The adopted treatments provide the minimum requirements necessary to control a regulated pest at a stated efficacy. The scope of this standard does not include issues related to pesticide registration or other domestic requirements for approval of treatments (e.g. irradiation)1.	
5.	DEFINITIONS	Australia	**substantive**	treatment schedule	treatment ~~schedule~~ **procedure**	noting the difficulty of translating 'schedule' into Spanish, suggest using the term 'procedure'. The term 'protocol' is not considered to be an alternative term because of its use in English. Another option instead of 'schedule' would be 'regime'
6.	DEFINITIONS	Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Paraguay, Uruguay, COSAVE	Technical	Definition	**New term and definition:** Treatment protocol ~~schedule~~ The critical parameters of a treatment which need to be met to achieve the intended outcome (i.e. the killing, inactivation or removal of pests, or rendering pests infertile, or devitalization) at a stated efficacy.	Treatment protocol is widely used instead of schedule . Protocol is the right term and more common than schedule. Schedule implies a time component that is not correct under this use.
7.	DEFINITIONS	Canada	Substantive	Definition for "treatment schedule"	Preferred change: The critical parameters of a **treatment** ~~which need~~ required to be met in order for it to achieve ~~the~~ a stated **efficacy** ~~intended outcome (i.e. the killing, inactivation or removal of pests, or rendering pests infertile, or devitalization) at a stated efficacy~~. If it is felt necessary to retain the bracketed text that repeats the definition of 'treatment', it should be moved within the sentence as below: The critical parameters of a **treatment** (i.e. the killing, inactivation or removal of pests, or rendering pests infertile, or devitalization)~~which need~~ required to be met in order for it to achieve ~~the~~ a stated **efficacy** ~~intended outcome (i.e. the killing, inactivation or removal of pests, or rendering pests infertile, or devitalization) at a stated efficacy~~.	The existing definition was poorly worded and, in fact, tautological since "efficacy" and "intended outcome" are very similar in meaning. In addition the bracketed text describing what a treatment is should not be included, as this word is already defined in the glossary as "*Official procedure for the killing, inactivation or removal of pests, or for rendering pests infertile or for devitalization*". Normally, the word 'treatment' would simply be bolded to indicate to the reader that a specific definition for the word exists. Note that 'efficacy' is also present in the glossary, so this word should be bolded too.

	1. Section	2. Country	3. Type of comment	4. Location	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation
8.	OUTLINE OF REQUIREMENTS	Korea (Rep.)	Technical	Para 2, sentence 3	The efficacy data should be clear and should ~~preferably~~ include data on the treatment under laboratory or controlled conditions as well as under operational conditions.	See 3.2.2
9.	OUTLINE OF REQUIREMENTS	Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Paraguay, Uruguay, COSAVE	Technical	Last para	Submissions with complete information will be considered by the Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments (TPPT), and if the treatment is deemed acceptable, it will be recommended to the CPM for adoption, through the SC.	Recommendation for CPM adoption must be performed through the SC.
10.	**BACKGROUND**	USA	editorial	First paragraph, third line	Delete “commodities and”	It is already covered in regulated articles.
11.	**BACKGROUND**	Canada	Editorial	Fourth paragraph, first sentence	~~For many years, NPPOs have utilized~~ Pp~~h~~ytosanitary treatments are used to prevent the introduction and spread of regulated pests.	The existing sentence reads strangely, allowing certain unfortunate interpretations to be drawn that treatments are a recent phenomenon, that the approach to using treatments is now changing, or even that NPPOs have been using treatments without sound rationale. A simplification is proposed that avoids all this.
12.	**BACKGROUND**	Australia	editorial	para 4 sentence 5	Interim ~~Commission on Phytosanitary Measures~~ CPM	
13.	**1. Purpose and Use**	Korea (Rep.)	Technical	Para 1, sentence 1	The purpose of harmonizing phytosanitary treatment is to support efficient phytosanitary measures in a wide range of circumstances and to enhance the mutual recognition of treatment efficacy by NPPOs~~, which may also facilitate trade.~~	1- “Facilitation of trade” is not appropriate fro the purpose of ISPM developed under IPPC
14.	**1. Purpose and Use**	Korea (Rep.)	Technical	Para 1, sentence 2	Furthermore, these treatment schedules should aid the development of expertise and technical cooperation~~, and they may be relevant to the accreditation and/or approval of treatment facilities~~.	2- This standard deals with the requirements to evaluate treatment, and not relevant to accreditation or approval of treatment facilities.

	1. Section	2. Country	3. Type of comment	4. Location	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation
15.	**1. Purpose and Use**	Canada	Substantive	Third paragraph, third indent	- Importing NPPOs are not obliged to require the use ~~these~~ of the treatments contained in Annex I, and may require the use of other phytosanitary treatments for ~~treating~~ the same regulated pests or regulated articles.	NPPOs are indeed obligated to meet an importing contracting party's import requirements, which may of course include specified treatments, if a given export is to proceed; i.e., importing parties retain the sovereign right to regulate imports (to apply conditions of import, such as required treatments) to reduce risk. Unfortunately, this indent has the potential to cause problems between trading parties as currently worded, since it would allow an exporting party to make reference to this standard and claim that they are not obligated to apply a treatment specified by an importing party. While this may be true, it is also true that the importing party could then refuse to accept the consignment in such circumstances. Wording is proposed to clarify this situation. This proposed wording also takes into account the fact that the chapeau indicates that the subject of the paragraph relates to specifying treatments for imports. The following could be appended to the end of the indent for further clarity if felt desirable: "(i.e., sovereign rights of importing contracting parties remain unaffected by this standard)"
16.	**2. Process for Treatment ~~Development~~Submission and Adoption**	Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Paraguay, Uruguay, COSAVE	Technical	1st para	The ~~development~~ submission process is initiated by a call for topics for standards (including topics for treatments) according to the "IPPC standard setting procedure" and the "Procedure and criteria for identifying topics for inclusion in the IPPC standard setting work programme" (provided in the *International Plant Protection Convention procedural manual*).	Development is undertaken under research projects, this item refers to the submission of treatment proposals.
17.	**2. Process for Treatment Development and Adoption**	Australia	**substantive**	1st paragraph	*Clarify location or access to IPPC procedural manual*	Critical reference but not easily accessed via internet without in-depth knowledge of location on IPP and where to be found in procedural manual. Provide section numbers to these documents in the manual (and indicate that manual is updated annually if these section numbers may change)
18.	**2. Process for Treatment Development and Adoption**	EC + 27 MS	Substantive	Para 1	**Delete** '(provided in the International Plant protection convention manual)' **Insert '**These procedures are available on the IPP.'	The manual has not been adopted by the CPM. Also it is not publicly available. As the guidance is beneficial for any person considering requesting adoption of a treatment presence on the IPP is necessary.

	1. Section	2. Country	3. Type of comment	4. Location	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation
19.	**2. Process for Treatment ~~Development~~Submission and Adoption**	Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Paraguay, Uruguay, COSAVE	Technical	1st para, 3rd bullet	In particular, the following points apply to treatments: - Once a topic for treatments (e.g. treatments for fruit flies or for pests on wood) has been added to the IPPC standard-setting work programme, the IPPC Secretariat, under direction of the Standards Committee (with recommendations from the TPPT), will call for the submissions and data on treatments on that topic. - NPPOs or RPPOs submit treatments (accompanied by relevant information as requested in section 3) to the Secretariat. - Only submissions of treatments that are deemed by the NPPO or RPPO to meet the requirements listed in this standard should be submitted, and it is recommended that these treatments have been approved for national use before their submission. Treatments include, but are not limited to, mechanical, chemical, irradiation, physical (heat, cold) and controlled atmosphere treatments. NPPOs and RPPOs should take into account other factors when considering phytosanitary treatments for submission, such as the effects on human health and safety, animal health and the impact on the environment (as described in the preamble and Article I.1 of the IPPC, 1997 and in article III of IPPC, 1997 regarding relationship with other international agreements)~~2~~. Effects on the quality and intended use of the regulated article should also be considered.	To incorporate related IPPC text. Footnote should not be needed
20.	**2. Process for Treatment ~~Development~~Submission and Adoption**	Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Paraguay, Uruguay, COSAVE	Technical	Footnote , bullet 3, item 2	~~2 Contracting parties may have obligations related to treatments under other international agreements, e.g. The Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer (1999) and/or the Rotterdam Convention (1998).~~	Specific mentions are not needed since IPPC 1997 text contains references to other international agreements. Other relevant Conventions or agreements are not specifically addressed in this footnote.

	1. Section	2. Country	3. Type of comment	4. Location	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation
21.	**2. Process for Treatment Development and Adoption**	Australia	editorial	footnote to 3rd dash point	Rotterdam Convention **on the Prior Informed Consent Procedure for Certain Hazardous Chemicals and Pesticides in International Trade**	completeness - full title
22.	**2. Process for Treatment ~~Development~~Submission and Adoption**	Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Paraguay, Uruguay, COSAVE	Technical	1st para, 4th bullet	- Treatment submissions will be evaluated based on the requirements listed in section 3. ~~If the volumes of submissions are high~~, the relevant TPPT criteria listed in the *International Plant Protection Convention procedural manual* will be applied to determine the priority for reviewing submissions. - Treatments that meet the requirements listed in section 3 will be recommended and the treatment submitted, along with a report and a summary of the information evaluated, to the Standards Committee and in turn to the IPPC standard setting process - The CPM will adopt or reject a treatment. If adopted, the treatment is annexed to this standard.	Prioritization is not a matter of volume of submissions.
23.	**2. Process for Treatment Development and Adoption**	Canada	Technical	Second paragraph, second indent	- NPPOs or RPPOs may submit treatments (accompanied by relevant information as requested in section 3) to the Secretariat.	The word "may", or alternatively the phrase "are invited to", would be more appropriate here. Not all NPPOs and RPPOs will submit proposed treatments, nor is there an obligation for them to do so.
24.	**2. Process for Treatment Development and Adoption**	Australia	**substantive**	para 2 4th dash point, sentence 2	If ~~the~~ **large numbers** ~~volumes~~ of submissions **are received**, the **Standards Committee will work with the TPPT to determine priorities** relevant TPPT criteria in the International Plant Protection Convention **in Annex 18 of the** ~~p~~**P**rocedural ~~m~~**M**anual	better language better process to indicate the procedures that will be carried out if large numbers are received
25.	**2. Process for Treatment Development and Adoption**	USA	editorial	Fourth indent	"If the volumes of submissions are high, the TPPT will work with the SC to determine the priority for reviewing the submissions"	

	1. Section	2. Country	3. Type of comment	4. Location	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation
26.	**2. Process for Treatment Development and Adoption**	EC + 27 MS	Substantive	Para 2 indent 4	**Delete** …. 'TPPT criteria listed in the International Plant protection Convention procedural manual' **Insert** **'**criteria, available on the IPP,'	The manual has not been adopted by the CPM. Also it is not publicly available. As the guidance is beneficial for any person considering requesting adoption of a treatment presence on the IPP is necessary. The TPPT is not authorised to prioritise; this is done by the SC on behalf of the CPM.
27.	**2. Process for Treatment Development and Adoption**	New Zealand	Substantive	Addition to end of 5th dash point	The report of the technical panel with the summary information and the SC report will be available to contracting parties. Further detailed information (as long as it is not confidential) will be available on request from the Secretariat	Information on the treatments should be available to contracting parties.
28.	**3. Requirements for Phytosanitary Treatments**	Korea (Rep.)	Technical	Indent 1, sentence 3	Where experimental data is ~~unavailable~~ not sufficient, other evidence that supports the efficacy (i.e. historical and/or practical information/experience) should be provided.	See 3.2.2
29.	**3. Specific Requirements for Phytosanitary Treatments**	EC + 27 MS	Technical	Para 1 indent 2	**Insert** 'where relevant' to read Including **where relevant** an appropriate experimental design	Not all submissions will include experimental data as some may be based on historical and practical information.
30.	**3. Requirements for Phytosanitary Treatments**	Australia	editorial	para 1 3rd dash point	be feasible and applicable for use primarily in international trade or for other purposes (eg ~~to protect endangered areas domestically or~~ for research)**, or to ensure that the outcome is not affected due to phytotoxicity or other adverse effects of the treatment**.	what is meant by 'to protect endangered areas domestically'? delete text picks up on comment at section 3.3.
31.	3.1 Summary information	Australia	editorial	para 1 4th dash point	…(active ingredient**(s)**, other **relevant** information)	completeness
32.	3.1 Summary information	Australia	editorial	para 2	(IPP, http~~s~~://www.ippc.int)	delete 's' from net address
33.	3.1 Summary information	Australia	editorial	para 2	*Location of form should be clearly given*	Location of form should be clearly given not just the general indication that is on the IPP ie indicate that is Annex 11 of Procedural Manual – see also comments at section 2 re better identifying location.
34.	3.1 Summary information	USA	Substantial	Last paragraph		The form should be made available on the IPP as soon as possible.

	1. Section	2. Country	3. Type of comment	4. Location	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation
35.	3.2 Efficacy data in support of the submission of a phytosanitary treatment	Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Paraguay, Uruguay, COSAVE	Technical	2nd para	The source of all efficacy data (published or unpublished) should be provided in the submission. Supporting data should be presented clearly and systematically. ~~The experience or expertise in the subject area of the laboratory, organization and/or scientist(s) involved in producing the data, and~~ whether the research utilized a quality assurance or accreditation programme in the development and/or testing of the phytosanitary treatment, will be considered when evaluating the data submitted) . Any claims on the efficacy must be substantiated by data.	What has to be evaluated is the treatment and not the CV of who has produced the data. Additionally, the submission has been presented by a NPPO or a RPPO that knows the expertise of labs and authors.
36.	3.2 Efficacy data in support of the submission of a phytosanitary treatment	EC + 27 MS	Substantive	3.2 second para	**Delete "**and whether the research utilized a quality assurance or accreditation programme" **Insert**"and any quality assurance system or accreditation programme applied	The present text allows simply yes or no answer, without requiring any description of the programmes applied. The rewording corrects this omission.
37.	3.2 Efficacy data in support of the submission of a phytosanitary treatment	USA	editorial	Last paragraph, second line	Write "and" instead of "or"	
38.	3.2.1 Efficacy data under laboratory/controlled conditions	Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Paraguay, Uruguay, COSAVE	Technical	2nd para	Where possible, data should be presented on methods used to determine the effective dose/treatment to demonstrate the range of efficacy of the treatment (e.g. dose/efficacy curves). Treatments can normally be evaluated only for the conditions under which they were tested However, additional information can be provided to support any extrapolation if the scope of a treatment is to be extended (e.g. extension of the range of temperatures, inclusion of other ~~varieties~~ cultivars or pest species). Where the information provided is adequate to demonstrate the effectiveness of the treatment, only a summary of relevant preliminary laboratory tests will be required. The materials and methods used in the experiments should be suitable for the use of	The right term to be used is cultivar. A variety refers to a botanical subespecific taxon.

	1. Section	2. Country	3. Type of comment	4. Location	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation
					the treatment at the stated efficacy. The data provided should include detailed information on, but not limited to, the following elements:	
39.	Regulated article information	EC + 27 MS	Technical	2nd indent	after 'plant product' **Insert** '(where applicable)**'**	Not all regulated plant products are described by their botanical name (for example wood packaging)
40.	3.2.1 Efficacy data under laboratory/controlled conditions	Korea (Rep.)	Technical	Para 5, indent 2, bullet 1	• type/cultivar (where varietal differences impact on treatment efficacy, data should be provided). ~~The requirement for varietal testing should be based on evidence to support the requirement~~	To avoid repetition of the same meaning in the parenthesis
41.	3.2.1 Efficacy data under laboratory/controlled conditions	Korea (Rep.)	Editorial	Para 5, indent 2, bullet 2	- conditions of the plant or plant product, for example…	Conditions of the plant or plant product are not subordinating to the item botanical name for plant or plant products
42.	Regulated article information	EC + 27 MS	editorial	2nd indent	Alter 2nd bullet to a new indent (conditions of the plant…..	Typographical mistake
43.	3.2.1 Efficacy data under laboratory/controlled conditions	Korea (Rep.)	Technical	Para5, indent 2, bullet 2, last dot	Add: after-harvest period, storage condition (temperature, humidity etc.)	Another necessary information on the condition of plant or plant product for evaluating the treatment efficacy
44.	3.2.1 Efficacy data under laboratory/controlled conditions	USA	Technical	Third indent under Experimental parameters	Add "if needed"	In some cases you may not need one: e.g., large scale confirmatory testing without any preliminary testing because that part may already be known sufficiently.
45.	3.2.1 Efficacy data under laboratory/controlled conditions	Korea (Rep.)	Technical	Para 6, last indent	Add: methodology to measure phytotoxicity (definition of phytotoxicity, time to check, calculation of filling rate)	Another necessary information on the experimental parameters for evaluating the treatment efficacy
46.	3.2.1 Efficacy data under laboratory/controlled conditions	USA	Technical	Add another indent under Experimental parameters	"Dosimetry system, calibration of it, and accuracy of measurements".	Explains how controls should respond within normal limits for research to be acceptable.

	1. Section	2. Country	3. Type of comment	4. Location	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation
47.	3.2.2 Efficacy date using operational conditions	Korea (Rep.)	Technical	Para 1, sentence 1	Treatment may be submitted for evaluation ~~without going through the process~~ with basic efficacy data under laboratory/controlled conditions even though the data have some deficiency compared to those outlined in section 3.2.1, when there is sufficient efficacy data available from the operational application of the treatment.	Even though a treatment has sufficient efficacy data from the operational application, efficacy data on laboratory/controlled conditions should not be neglected for being evaluated as an ISPM . Basic information and experimental parameters under laboratory/controlled conditions should be presented, at least
48.	3.2.2 Efficacy data using operational conditions	Australia	**substantive**	para 1 sentence 3	Results of these tests should confirm that the application of the treatment schedule achieves the stated efficacy under conditions in which the treatment will be used **commercially.**	Focus on practical applications to support trade. Extrapolations from experimental scale may not be sufficient for endorsement.
49.	3.3 Feasibility and applicability	Australia	Editorial	8TH dot point	Delete number '2' after the word 'effects'	
50.	3.3 Feasibility and applicability	EC + 27 MS	editorial	8th indent	**Delete** footnote number 2	No footnote given and no need to repeat same footnote twice
51.	3.3 Feasibility and applicability	Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Paraguay, Uruguay, COSAVE	Technical	1st para , footnote 2	Information should be provided, where appropriate, to evaluate if the phytosanitary treatment is feasible and applicable. This includes such items as:….. - consideration of potential indirect effects~~2~~ (e.g. impacts on the environment, impacts on non-target organisms, human and animal health….	This footnote has been also eliminated, see comment under item 2. Specific mentions are not needed since IPPC 1997 text contains references to other international agreements.
52.	3.3 Feasibility and applicability	EC + 27 MS	Technical	8th indent	**Delete** 'indirect effects' **Insert** 'undesirable side-effects'	A better description of intention and 'indirect effects' is a PRA term used for pests.
53.	3.3 Feasibility and applicability	EC + 27 MS	Substantive - technical	8th indent	**Delete** 'consideration' **Insert** 'Summary of available information'	There may be considerable knowledge of such effects if a product or procedure has been through a registration process. The procedures described in this Standard are not intended to duplicate or replace registration; therefore the information provided should be limited to that necessary to evaluate the efficacy, feasibility and applicability of the treatment.
54.	3.3 Feasibility and applicability	USA	Editorial	Eighth indent	Change to read: " summary of available information of potential undesirable effects"	

	1. Section	2. Country	3. Type of comment	4. Location	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation
55.	3.3 Feasibility and applicability	Australia	**substantive**	10th dash point		Phytotoxicity is often a major issue with regard to the feasibility of many post harvest treatments. However, this is the only time in this document where phytotoxicity is referred to. Some greater reference to the significance of phytotoxicity some be made somewhere within this document. See suggested amendment at section 3.
56.	**5. Publication of Phytosanitary Treatments**	Australia	**substantive**	new sentence	After adoption by the CPM, phytosanitary treatment will be annexed to this standard. **The TPPT report on the treatment will be provided on the International Phytosanitary Portal.**	Countries should be able to access the Technical Panel report on the treatment to assist it in its evaluation of the treatment as it may be integrated into the production/export system