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

**September 18-20, 2012**

**Hyatt Regency Hotel**

**Port of Spain, Trinidad and Tobago**

**REPORT**



**1. OPENING SESSION**

**1.1 Welcome and Other Remarks**

The opening exercise of the meeting began with words of welcome by Ms. Carol Thomas, IICA Regional Agricultural Health and Food Safety Specialist based in Barbados. Ms. Thomas thanked persons for attending considering the involved national schedules that had to be put on hold to allow such attendance. She extended a warm welcome to the participants, IPPC Secretariat representatives (Mr. Orlando Sosa – representing the IPPC Secretariat in Rome, Ms. Beatriz Melchó of Uruguay – Member of the Standards Committee), Mr. Barton Clarke – FAO Representative in Trinidad and Tobago, Dr. Lilory McComie – Director of the Northern Region, Ministry of Food Production in Trinidad and Tobago, Dr. Ricardo Molins – Head, Agricultural Health and Food Safety and Mariela Madrigal – Administrative Assistant, IICA headquarters in San José, Costa Rica.

Several presentations were made during the Opening Session. The content of these presentations is summarized below.

Dr. Molins was called on to make brief remarks and he welcomed all, noting the pleasure of being back in Trinidad at the Hyatt Regency. In his remarks, he wished all a productive meeting.

Dr. McComie in her remarks at this point welcomed all the representatives of national, regional and international organisations, participants, and Ministry of Food Production staff of Trinidad and Tobago as she brought greetings from the Permanent Secretary and the Ministry. Dr. McComie noted that though her position had changed, she is still called on from time to time for advice on phytosanitary issues. She expressed joy at the fact that plant protection personnel had been brought together to discuss phytosanitary issues with the financial and other support of organisations in the region. She went on to outline how the IPPC functions and gave information on the standard-setting process of which the review of draft standards is part. Dr. McComie pointed out that 34 standards have been adopted over the 60-year existence of the IPPC, the ISPMs taking on a greater significance with the onset of the WTO. She spoke about the IPPC in the context of the three (3) sisters (OIE, CODEX, IPPC) and the sometimes slow pace of adoption of these ISPMs due to inadequate national legislation to facilitate adoption of same. She encouraged participants to interact with regional colleagues to build friendships and to engage in face-to-face meetings to thrash out outstanding trade-related bilateral issues. She noted that this was a good foundation on which to build relationships which facilitate the amicable resolution of issues as they arise. Dr. McComie thanked all for the opportunity to make brief remarks and wished all a successful and productive meeting.

In remarks to the participants, Mr. Barton Clarke welcomed all, noting that activities such as this workshop supported the “1 billion hungry” programme of the FAO. He expressed happiness with the fact that the workshop has been taken on by the IICA as part of its Agricultural Health and Food Safety programme. Mr. Clarke noted that 177 countries are party to the IPPC and are encouraged to participate in the review of draft standards. All stakeholders (including hucksters and traders) should be involved in the process at the national level. Mr. Clarke urged participants to bear in mind the particular challenges and vulnerabilities of our small countries, noting the important role of plant protection personnel on the front line as well as the importance of the framework provided by the ISPMs. The FAO has embarked upon programmes on black sigatoka, citrus greening and others. He urged participants to seize the moment to participate in the review process as we tackle the problem of soaring food prices. Mr. Clarke stated that the FAO will continue to participate in a two-way process of managing plant pests.

**1.2 Purpose of the workshop**

Dr. Molins in the presentation that followed on the purpose of the meeting mentioned a number of factors that impacted on this workshop. The IICA has made a significant impact through its partnership with standard-setting organisations. He noted that this symbiosis is very helpful and very well understood by the Secretariat and staff of the IPPC. This workshop was framed by the IPPC and IICA’s role was to work on the logistics. Dr. Molins noted that IICA is currently organising a regional draft ISPM review workshop for Latin American countries, to be held in Costa Rica the following week, and efforts by IICA are currently ongoing to ensure participation of the countries in the Andean region. Dr. Molins noted that there would be no human or animal life without plant life so that the role played by plant protection personnel is pivotal. Palm diseases, black sigatoka, the Giant African Snail and other invasive plant pests were mentioned as problems being faced so that this exercise was just one way of developing benchmarks to be followed in an attempt to reduce the incidents of pest introduction. He noted that many Caribbean countries in the region are net importers and so it was even more important to reduce the rate of pest entry, particularly where no natural predators exist. Dr. Molins reinforced the point that we were here to do a very important job for the region and encouraged participants to submit their national comments which should be scientifically-based, technically feasible and applicable to the region.

**1.3 Procedural Matters**

The meeting agenda (Appendix I) was distributed and Carol Thomas, Chairperson of the Opening Session, urged participants to be forthcoming and open with their comments during the course of the meeting. It was pointed out that Mr. Orlando Sosa and Ms. Beatriz Melchó would be the main facilitators of the workshop. The Chair urged participants to try to achieve a balance in maintaining the suggested timelines indicated on the agenda while ensuring that all views could be heard, discussed and documented accordingly.

**1.4 Introduction of Participants**

Participants from the various countries present were given the chance to introduce themselves. Countries represented were Antigua and Barbuda, Barbados, St. Vincent and the Grenadines, the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago, Belize, Suriname, Guyana, St. Lucia, Grenada, Bahamas, Jamaica, St. Kitts and Nevis and the Commonwealth of Dominica. The Chair informed participants that Mr. Michael Delpeche of St. Vincent and the Grenadines was the newly appointed Chair of the Caribbean Plant Health Directors Forum while Mr. Ryan Anselm of the Commonwealth of Dominica was the newly-appointed Co-Chair. The list of participants and their contact details can be found in Appendix II.

**1.5 Election of Chair & Rapporteur**

Participants nominated and seconded Mr. Paul Graham of Grenada and Dr. Janil Gore-Francis of Antigua and Barbuda as meeting chairperson and rapporteur, respectively. These nominations were unopposed and the respective roles were thereby conferred.

**1.6 Any Other Business**

Mr. Orlando Sosa urged members to make every attempt to attend the CPM meetings, as the region is very poorly represented.

In the closing remarks, the Chair informed of the inclusion of funds for SPS in the EU-EDF to facilitate participation in various meetings over the next four years, including meetings of the CPM. Ms. Thomas urged full participation in the workshop over the three-day period.

**2. REVIEW AND DISCUSSION ON DRAFT ISPMs**

**2.1 Electronic certification, information on standard XML schemas and exchange mechanisms (Draft Appendix 1 to ISPM 12:2011) (2006-003)**

**2.1.1 Introductory Presentation**

A presentation summarizing the draft to be discussed was given by Beatriz Melchó.

**2.1.2 Participant Review of the Draft Appendix**

Participants reviewed the document and comments were simultaneously entered on the IPPC-OCS. The comprehensive list and details of comments can be found in Appendix III. Several general comments were made and are listed below:

1. It was generally felt that the cost of implementation of the electronic certification system could be prohibitive.
2. Countries without legislation on electronic certification may wish to seek a legal opinion on the application of this electronic system.
3. Concern was expressed regarding para. [20] that the lists referred to in Link 10 should be refined and main categories of treatment (e.g., heat treatment, cold treatment, chemical, irradiation) should be distinguishable from the specific treatment methods. In addition, some of the listed treatments are not considered to be phytosanitary treatments.
4. The concept of products in transit and obligations of the country of export is not captured. The guidelines should, therefore, consider those situations for transit requiring further phytosanitary measures for consistency with ISPM 12 and ISPM 25.

**2.2 Determination of host status of fruits and vegetables to fruit fly (Tephritidae) infestation (2006-031)**

**2.2.1 Introductory Presentation**

A presentation summarizing the draft to be discussed was given by Beatriz Melchó.

**2.2.2 Participant Review of the Protocol**

Participants reviewed the document and comments were simultaneously entered on the IPPC-OCS. The comprehensive list and details of comments can be found in Appendix IV. Several general comments were made and are listed below:

1. It was generally agreed that thought should be given to the apparent preference by some fruit fly species for different hosts based on geographical location and this should be considered in this protocol.
2. Although the draft standards were important, there is a need to be mindful of the cost of implementation during the review process, particularly in the case of the Small Island Developing States (SIDS).
3. A definition for “semi-natural conditions” is required as the term is used several times in the document and there is no current definition for the term in the glossary of phytosanitary terms.

**2.3 Draft Annex to ISPM 26: Establishment of fruit fly quarantine areas within a pest free area in the event of an outbreak (2009-007)**

**2.3.1 Introductory Presentation**

A presentation summarizing the draft to be discussed was given by Beatriz Melchó.

**2.3.2 Participant Review of the Draft Annex**

Participants reviewed the document and comments were simultaneously entered on the IPPC-OCS. The comprehensive list and details of comments can be found in Appendix V. Several general comments were made and are listed below:

1. A definition is required for the term “safeguarding measures” as no definition currently exists in the ISPM 5. This was the general observation throughout the document where the term “phytosanitary measure” and “phytosanitary actions” appeared to be used interchangeably and some attention needs to be given in order to resolve this apparent problem.
2. It was thought that the guideline in its current form did not give the kind of clear, detailed guidance that is really required. For example, the titles of some of the sections do not reflect the current content.

**3. PRESENTATIONS ON TOPICAL ISSUES OF THE IPPC**

Several issues relating to the IPPC were reported on in the form of presentations made by Mr. Orlando Sosa. The main points of these presentations are outlined below.

**3.1 Overview of IRSS**

The IRSS has two components, namely the Implementation Review System (IRS) and the Implementation Support System (ISS). The presentation spoke of the genesis of the IRSS, the funds provided and the various activities forming part of the system. The system is aimed at reviewing the implementation of the IPPC and ISPMs. It is hoped that the programme can be continued beyond 2014.

In 2011 there were several achievements as follows:

1. The IRSS webpage was established.
2. A survey on the state of implementation of ISPM 6 and best practices was conducted along with surveys on the state of implementation on ISPM 4 and ISPM8. This information is used to determine how standards can be improved and is provided to the CPM for the relevant action to be taken.
3. A general survey on the implementation of the IPPC is to be released in October 2012 but the survey was designed in 2011.
4. Case studies were conducted on emerging phytosanitary issues and included topics such as pest surveillance, aquatic plants, Internet trade of plants and plant products, and the application of equivalence in the context of the IPPC. A manual is currently being prepared.

In 2012, activities being (to be) conducted include the following:

1. The IPPC survey (to be launched in October and will last for 5 months)
2. Improvement of the IRSS webpage
3. Review of ISPM 13 (just completed)
4. Preparation of implementation review response review document.

A demonstration of the IRSS webpage on the IPPC website was then done. The use of the Help Desk and other key features were highlighted.

A suggestion was made to reformat the country profiles page to display official information such as pest lists and the like., Mr. Sosa noted that this is would be taken into consideration. He further urged participants to submit any recommendations they may have for improvement of the IRSS webpage.

A query was made on how to deal with appointing a new IPPC Contact Point. Mr. Sosa informed that the online form on the IPP country page should be completed and submitted to the IPPC. Mr. Sosa noted the importance of having a functional Contact Point as it is to that person that the IPPC directs all surveys and the like for completion. IICA offered its services to follow up with countries in the region on these matters if the IPPC could notify them whenever such surveys are dispatched for response.

In response to a query as to what should be done if problems are being faced by NPPO Contact Points in accessing their country information, such problems should be addressed to ippc@fao.org .

**3.2 Provision of technical resources by the NPPOs for the phytosanitary information page**

Mr. Sosa noted that full documents were preferred rather than links when information is being provided on the website. He noted that any technical resources that countries have could be sent for placement on the website regardless of the language. Mr. Sosa noted that anyone can access the website once they register using the link on that page.

**3.3 Implementation problems of ISPMs no. 15 and possible actions to improve the current situation**

It was noted that World Intellectual Property Rights Organisation (WIPO) was consulted regarding the registration of the ISPM 15 mark. The conclusion was that it could not be done under the WIPO system. It was recommended that contracting parties make the effort to register the mark. Several gaps were identified in the implementation of ISPM 15. These include issues on policy and legislation, human resource capacity, advocacy and trade. In response to questions on the process of registration of the mark by Parties, the Legal Division of the FAO could be contacted for details. Mr. Sosa will provide participants with the name of the person to be contacted.

**3.4 Fulfilment of reporting obligations in the IPPC**

Mr. Sosa noted that this falls under the information exchange area. A presentation was made on the genesis and history of the IPPC and participants were informed that in 1997, the reporting responsibility was handed over to Parties. It was noted that fulfilment of the reporting obligations to the WTO does not constitute fulfilment of the reporting obligations to the IPPC. He emphasized that a separate report has to be made to the IPPC.

Several challenges are faced including the inconsistency of provision of information. Assistance has been requested of participants regarding what can be done to improve the level of participation. It was noted that a regulated pest list is required rather than the list of all pests that exists in a country. If all pest information is provided, there must be a distinction regarding which of those pests are actually regulated pests. It was noted by some participants that access to complete pest lists is also necessary and therefore these should also be included.

**3.5 Regional priorities for capacity development activities in the region**

The presenter introduced a document on the IPPC’s National Phytosanitary Capacity Building Strategy finalised in March 2010. Countries were encouraged to use the strategy contained therein. The document is available on the IPPC website. In addition, two projects were proposed to address capacity building, namely a Trainer-of-Trainers on Phytosanitary Capacity development (status: on hold pending sourcing of funds) and a Training of PCE facilitators (status: funding being considered).

**4. ORGANIZATION OF FUTURE REGIONAL WORKSHOPS ON DRAFT ISPMs (2013 SESSION)**

* 1. **Tentative date and venue**

After discussion of several proposed dates, participants decided that an appropriate date for the 2013 consultation would be during the week of September 2nd. Regarding the venue, the broad recommendation was that the workshop be held in conjunction with the meeting of the CPHD Forum.

* 1. **Identification of sponsors**

Participants were urged to begin to think strategically as to how these meetings could be funded in the future. IICA noted that suggestions have been made to couple the consultation with the Caribbean Plant Health Directors Forum as one of the options for shared sponsorship.

* 1. **Funding strategy and action plan**

IICA mentioned that under the proposed EU-SPS project, funds could be sourced for supporting regional ISPM consultations during the life of the project. Countries were encouraged to include in their national budgets (partial) allocations to facilitate meeting attendance and it was noted that meetings to be attended may have to be prioritised due to the scarcity of funds to attend the myriad of meetings addressing plant health issues.

**5. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

**5.1** **Discussion on current IPPC diagnostic tools**

The IPPC Secretariat is interested in receiving brief comments from contracting parties on the value of the diagnostic protocols that have been adopted to date by CPM. These protocols are available on the International Phytosanitary Portal of the IPPC and include:

ISPM 27 Annex 01     DP 1 (2010): *Thrips palmi* Karny

ISPM 27 Annex 02     DP 2 (2012): Plum pox virus

ISPM 27 Annex 03     DP 3 (2012): *Trogoderma granarium* Everts

Participants were asked to engage in a very brief discussion based on the following questions:

1. *Are the current diagnostic protocols (ISPM 27 Annex 1, 2 and 3) useful or not?*
2. *Which of the protocols (ISPM 27 Annex 1, 2 and 3) are used frequently?*
3. *Who uses them?*
4. *Which other protocols would your NPPO want prioritized for development?*

The responses received on questions 1 to 4 above are listed below.

1. *Are the current diagnostic protocols (ISPM 27 annex 1, 2, 3) useful or not?*

* + Barbados – has used the one on *Thrips palmi*, Plum pox –no, *Trogoderma* – no;
	+ Saint Vincent and the Grenadines – has not used any of them;
	+ Trinidad and Tobago – *Thrips palmi* is in T&T and so it is not a regulated pest. The others they do not use;
	+ Belize – Uses *Thrips palmi* and *Trogoderma* as references. Plum pox, not present in Belize;
	+ Suriname – uses *Thrips palmi*. The others – no;
	+ Guyana – *Thrips palmi* as reference – others –no;
	+ Grenada – *Thrips palmi* is used. Plum pox is not of importance and Khapra beetle not identified as yet so not used;
	+ Antigua and Barbuda – has not used any of them;
	+ Bahamas – has not used any of them;
	+ Jamaica – uses *Thrips palmi*. Has not used the others;
	+ Saint Kitts and Nevis – Use *Thrips palmi* for reference. Others no;
	+ Dominica – *Thrips palmi* for training and identification. Plum pox to initiate PRA and to use as a reference. The other one not used;
	+ Saint Lucia – aware of the presence of *Thrips palmi* but not sure if the protocol is in use. Plum pox – does not see the importance of this protocol to the country at this stage. As far as he knows Khapra beetle not present so there is no reason to use it.

2. *Which of the protocols (ISPM annex 1, 2, 3) are used frequently?*

* *Thrips palmi* is used most frequently

3. *Who uses them?*

* Lab technicians
* Entomologists
* Quarantine officers
* Plant health officers (Belize)
* PRA team
* Plant protection officers
* Extension officers

4. *Which other protocols would your NPPO want prioritized for development?*

* Barbados – HLB, Red Palm mite, Black Sigatoka, *Tuta absoluta*, Lethal yellowing
* Saint Vincent and the Grenadines – Sand/aggregates (inspection), Black Sigatoka, Moko disease, HLB, Lethal Yellowing, *Tuta absoluta*, Frosty pod rot.
* Trinidad and Tobago – Frosty Pod rot, HLB, Lethal Yellowing, Papaya Mealybug, Asian Longhorn Beetle, Powder Post Beetle, *Tuta absoluta*
* Belize – Potato pathogens, *Fusarium gutiforme* (Pineapple disease), *Anastrepha grandis*, *Tuta absoluta*, Kudzu bug (*Megacopta cribraria*)
* Suriname – HLB, Black Sigatoka, *Tuta absoluta*, Carambola fruit fly
* Guyana – Carambola Fruit fly, potato pathogens/pests, HLB, Mango seed weevil, Giant African Snail, LY
* Grenada – Frosty Pod rot in cocoa, LY, HLB, *Tuta absoluta*, *Anastrepha* complex, viral diseases on peppers
* Antigua and Barbuda – Lab maintenance of various specimen types, LY, Bud rot, Red Palm Weevil, GAS, HLB, Black Sigatoka
* The Bahamas – LY, HLB, Citrus Canker, *Tuta absoluta*, Red Palm Mite, GAS
* Jamaica – GAS, *Tuta absoluta*, Citrus Canker, Red palm weevil, Frosty pod disease
* Saint Kitts and Nevis – *Tuta absoluta*, LY, HLB, GAS, Bud rot, Red Palm mite, Black Sigatoka
* Dominica – Protocol for the management of HLB and its vector, *Musa* spp. pathogens (Black sigatoka, Moko, viruses), Management of LY and its vector, Red Palm mite, generalized protocol for PCR and molecular analyses.
* Saint Lucia – HLB, Moko disease, LY, Frosty Pod, *Anastrepha* complex.

**5.2** **Important Topics for the countries**

Discussions were held on issues of importance to the countries and the following were identified as important topics that need to be addressed. These are as follows:

* There is need for the inclusion of diagrams in standards; for example, a floor plan to be included in the standard on Post-Entry quarantine facilities.
* Development/provision of pest diagnostic devices/tools that can be readily used in the field, particularly for those pests (insects, viruses, fungi) that are of concern to our region.

**5.3** **Participants Survey**

This survey was conducted online by participants.

**5.4 Online Demonstration of the use of the IPPC Online Comments System (IPPC-OCS)**

Mr. Sosa engaged participants in a demonstration of how to use the IPPC-OCS and included discussion on how to optimise use of the facility to provide country comments on relevant draft standards that are being reviewed.

**6. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT**

The report was adopted.

**7.** **CLOSING SESSION**

The Chairman reminded participants that there are a number of issues which need to be followed up including submission of the comments on the draft ISPMs. He further thanked facilitators, participants, sponsors and administrative personnel for ensuring that the meeting was a success through their full participation. Participants also agreed that the meeting was a success.

Words of appreciation by Ms. Carol Thomas (IICA) were expressed to all persons who participated in various capacities to contribute to the

Final words of gratitude were offered by the main workshop facilitators, Mr. Orlando Sosa and Beatriz Melchó, and a country representative.

**Appendix I**

**AGENDA**

|  |
| --- |
| **Tuesday, September 18** |
| **9:00**  | Opening Session. *Dr. Ricardo Molins, Head, Agricultural Health and Food Safety Program of IICA,* *Dr. Lilory McComie, Director of Research,* – *Ministry of Food Production, Trinidad and Tobago* *Mr. Barton Clarke, FAO Representative in Trinidad & Tobago*  |
| **9:40**  | Purpose of the workshop. *Dr. Ricardo Molins. Head, Agricultural Health and Food Safety Program, IICA* |
| **09:50**  | Procedural Matters. *Ms. Carol Thomas*  |
| **10:30**  | Coffee Break  |
| **11:00**  | * election of chair
* election of rapporteur
* any other business
 |
| **11:30**  | **Review and discussion on draft ISPMs** (download at IPPC Online Comment System (OCS, [http://ocs.ippc.int/#](http://ocs.ippc.int/)* Draft Appendix to ISPM 12: Electronic certification, information on standard XML schemes and exchange mechanisms (2006-003) *Ms. Beatiz Melchó*
* Protocol to determine host status of fruits and vegetables to fruit fly (Tephritidae) infestations (2006-031) *Ms. Beatriz Melchó*
* Draft Annex to ISPM 26: Establishment of fruit fly quarantine areas within a pest free area in the event of an outbreak (2009-007) *Ms. Beatiz Melchó*
 |
| **12:30**  | Lunch  |
| **14:00**  |  Review and discussion of the ISPMs. |
| **15:30**  | Coffee Break  |
| **16:00**  | Review and discussion of the ISPMs. |
| **17:30**  | End of Session  |
| **Wednesday, September 19** |
| **8:00**  | Review and discussion of the ISPMs. |
| **10:00**  | Coffee Break  |
| **10:30**  | Review and discussion of the ISPMs. |
| **12:30**  | Lunch  |
| **13:45**  | Review and discussion of the ISPMs. |
| **15:30**  | Coffee Break  |
| **16:00**  | Overview of IRSS. *Orlando Sosa, IPPC* |
| **17:45**  | End of Session |
| **Thursday, September 20** |
| **8:00** |  Implementation problems of ISPM no. 15 and possible actions to improve the current situation. *Orlando Sosa, IPPC* |
| **9:00** | Provision of technical resources by the NPPOs for the phytosanitary info page. *Orlando Sosa, IPPC* |
| **10:00**  | Coffee Break  |
| **10:30** |  Fulfillment of reporting obligations in the IPPC. *Orlando Sosa, IPPC* |
| **11:30** | Regional priorities for capacity development activities in the region *Orlando Sosa, IPPC* |
| **12:30**  | Lunch. |
| **13:45** | Organization of future regional workshops on draft ISPMs (2013 session) - Chairperson* tentative date and venue 2013 consultation (between July – September 15, 2013)
* identification of sponsors
* funding strategy and action plan
 |
| **14:30** | Any other business1. Discussion on current IPPC diagnostic tools2. Important topics for the countries 3. Participants Survey ([https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=workshops\_on\_draft\_ispm\_eval&no\_cache=1&L=0&tx\_simplesurvey\_pi1[showUid]=53&cHash=d90cc765cce546fda63821b9104b2915](https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=workshops_on_draft_ispm_eval&no_cache=1&L=0&tx_simplesurvey_pi1%5bshowUid%5d=53&cHash=d90cc765cce546fda63821b9104b2915)) |
| **15:30**  | Coffee Break  |
| **16:00**  | Adoption of Report. |
| **17:00** | Closing Session. *Carol Thomas* |

**Appendix II**

**LIST OF PARTICIPANTS**

**ANTIGUA & BARBUDA**

Janil Gore-Francis, PhD.

Plant Protection Officer

Plant Protection Unit

Department of Agriculture

Ministry of Agriculture, Lands, Housing & Environment

P.O. Box 1282

Queen Elizabeth Highway

St. John's, ANTIGUA

Tel.: 1-268-764-1255

Fax.: 1-268-462-6104

Email: janilg@yahoo.com, janil.gore-francis@antigua.gov.ag,

plantprotection@antigua.gov.ag

**BAHAMAS**

Gwendolyn Hammerton

Assistant Director of Agriculture

Department of Agriculture, Marine Resources and Local Government

Nassau, Bahamas

PO Box N-3028

Tel: 242 325 7502/7859

E-mail: gwendolynhammerton@bahamas.gov.bs;

gwenhammerton@yahoo.com

**BARBADOS**

Michael James

Senior Agricultural Officer

Ministry of Agriculture, Food, Fisheries and Water Resource Management, Graeme Hall, Christ Church, Barbados

St. Thomas, Barbados

Telephone  246-424-1372, 246-434-5112

Fax: 246-428-7777

E-mail: pathology\_mar@caribsurf.com

**BELIZE**

Margarito García

Quarantine Director
Belize Agricultural Health Authority
Central Farm, Cayo Distric
Tel: (501) 824-4899/4872
E-mail: margargarciabzkind@gmail.com;
 quarantine@baha.bz

**DOMINICA**

**Ryan Anselm**

**Head of Plant Protection Quarantine Services**

**Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry**

**Botanical Gardens, Roseau**

**Tel nos.** 1 767 266 3803 **or 3820,** 1 767 6160975

**Email:** **anselmr@dominica.gov.dm****,** **anselmpope@hotmail.com**

**GRENADA**

Paul Graham

Pest Management Officer

Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries

St Georges, Grenada:

Telephone: 473-4400019 / 2708, 3078, 3083

E-mail address: paulgraham@spiceisle.com; pestmanagementunitgda@spiceisle.com; agricultura@gov.gd

**GUYANA**

Ms. Zareefa Bachus

Plant Quarantine Officer

NPPO Guyana

Telephone: 592-220-5858

Cel: 592-699-3139

E-mail: zareefa\_bacchus@yahoo.com; zaarefanppo@gmail.com

**JAMAICA**

Ms. Karen Barrett-Christie

Entomologist / Identifier

Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries

Hope Gardens, Kingston 6

Telephone: 1 876-924-8906, 1-876 3245694

Email address: kbfox\_2000@yahoo.com

**SAINT KITTS & NEVIS**

Jeanelle Kelly

Quarantine Officer

Department of Agriculture

P.O Box 39, La Guerite

Basseterre

Tel : 1-869-465-2335

Fax: 1-869-465-2928

Email: quarantinedoastk@hotmail.com

 agrideps@gmail.com

**SAINT LUCIA**

Mr. Gregory Squires

Crop Protection Officer – Plant Quarantine

Ministry of Agriculture, Food Production, Fisheries and Rural Development

Waterfront, Castries

Telephone: 758-4522526 / 758-4503206 Ext. 5607

Email:pegsqu@yahoo.com

**SAINT VINCENT AND THE GRENADINES**

Michael Delpeche

Agricultural Officer

Ministry of Agriculture, Industry, Forestry, fisheries and Rural Transformation

Richmond Hill, Kingstown

Telephone 784 4561410, 784-4571283

E-mail: michaeldelpy@yahoo.com

 ppq@gov.vc

**SURINAME**

Debie Radjendrekoemar

Coordinator of Plant Protection Unit

Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Husbandry and Fisheries

Phone: 597-402065 / 402040

E-mail: radebie@hotmail.com

**TRINIDAD & TOBAGO**

Dale Nandlal

Entomologist

Research Division

Ministry of Food Production

Centeno Via Arima

Telephone: 646-4335 Ext. 4035 / 646-2149

E-mail address: d.nandlal@hotmail.com

Kishore Ragbir

Agricultural Officer

Ministry of Food Production

Research Division

Centono Via Arima

Telephone: 642-0718

E-mail address: plantquarantine.centeno@gmail.com

Anjanie Ramlogan

Agricultural Officer

Ministry of Food Production

Port of Spain

Telephone: 646-4335

E-mail address: minfpmrenquirypoint@tstt.net.tt

 anjielogan@yahoo.com

**IPPC Secretariat**

Orlando Sosa

Programm Officer / IRSS

International Plant Protection Convention

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

Vialle terme di Caracalla

Rome, Italy 005

Telephone> 39/0657053613

E-mail address: Orlando.Sosa@fao.org

**Member of the Standards Committee**

Beatriz Melchó

Plant Protection Division
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**Appendix III**

**REVIEW COMMENTS: *Electronic certification, information on standard XML schemas and exchange mechanisms (Draft Appendix 1 to ISPM 12:2011) (2006-003)***

| **Comment no.**  | **Paragraph no.**  | **Comment type**  | **Comment**  | **Explanation**  | **Author**  | **Status**  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| [1]  | G  | Substantive  | Countries indicated that the  cost of the implementation of the system could be  prohibitiveThinks it is applicable and will reduce tampering and falsification of information These guidelines should be consistent with ISPMs 12  and 25 and therefore should include provisions for intransit  consignments requiring further phytosanitary measures.  |  | IPPC Regional Workshop Caribbean English  | Pending  |
| [2]  | 4  | Editorial  | Electronic phytosanitary certificates are the electronic authentic and equivalents toof the wording and data of phytosanitary certificates in paper form. Electronic certificates should be issued by the national plant protection organization (NPPO) of the exporting or re-exporting country and made directly available to the NPPO of the importing country without any intermediate step. | With reference to Art. V, 2(a), 2(b), 3, Art. VII, 2 (g) and Art. XXI, 6 and 7 of IPPC, ISPM No. 7 and ISPM No. 12 determine the terms of implication of phytosanitary certificates and phytosanitary certificates for re-export in line with data entering.  | Lao People's Democratic Republic  | Share-Receive  |
| [3]  | 4  | Technical  | Electronic phytosanitary certificates are the electronic equivalents of the wording and data of phytosanitary certificates in paper form. Electronic certificates should be issued by the national plant protection organization (NPPO) of the exporting or re-exporting country and made directly available to the NPPO of the importing country without any intermediate step as soon as possible. | The reason is when internet connection fail, submission of electronic phytosanitary certificate can not be done on time.  | Lao People's Democratic Republic  | Share-Receive  |
| [4]  | 6  | Editorial  | All the requirements and procedures laid down in this standard for issuing  paper certificates apply to electronic certification unless more specific provisions are provided in this appendix.  |  | IPPC Regional Workshop Caribbean English  | Pending  |
| [5]  | 6  | Substantive  | All the requirements and procedures laid down in this standard apply to electronic certification unless more specific provisions are provided in this appendix. |  | IPPC Regional Workshop Caribbean English  | Pending  |
| [6]  | 10  | Editorial  | To standardize the XML message and to allow for automatic electronic processing of data, elements of the phytosanitary certificates should be coded as follows.: |  | IPPC Regional Workshop Caribbean English  | Pending  |
| [7]  | 12  | Technical  | The names of countries referred to in the certificate (i.e. the country of origin, of export, of re-export and of destination and transit) should be coded using the International Organization for Standardization (ISO) two-digit country codes ???(*Link 5*). | Clarification of references is needed, e.g. country code stands for two or three digits and two capital alphabets  | Lao People's Democratic Republic  | Share-Receive  |
| [8]  | 17  | Technical  | *[For 2012 member consultation, please indicate any commodity class you consider missing from Link 7.] Commodities should be consistent with the definitions and terms used in the ISPMs e.g 'cut flowers and branches' as opposed  to 'cut flowers'* *Include in the category level  a code for 'Other regulated articles'* |  | IPPC Regional Workshop Caribbean English  | Pending  |
| [9]  | 20  | Technical  | *[For 2012 member consultation, please indicate any treatment types you consider missing from Link 10.]**dielecltric heating treatment (to be added)**General comment: The list  should describe broad categories of treatment and not specific treatment methods (eg dusting, dipping ). The main categories should include: Fumigation, Heat Treatment, Cold treatment, Cjemical treatment, irradiation, dielectric treatment, hot water treatment.* | Several of the treatment listed in Link 10 are not considered to be phytosanitary treaments.  | IPPC Regional Workshop Caribbean English  | Pending  |
| [10]  | 21  | Technical  | **2.5 Additional declarations** **Propose to exclude from the list those additional declarations that are not consistent with appendix 2 of ISPM12.****I**f there is a need for a second additional declaration it could be included as free text.  |  | IPPC Regional Workshop Caribbean English  | Pending  |
| [11]  | 25  | Substantive  | Point of entry and point of destination should be coded using the United Nations Code for Trade and Transportation Locations (UN/LOCODE) code (*Link 15).* | In paragraph 12 the country of destination would have already been identified.  | IPPC Regional Workshop Caribbean English  | Pending  |
| [12]  | 26  | Substantive  | **2.7 Name and signature of authorized officer** |  | IPPC Regional Workshop Caribbean English  | Pending  |
| [13]  | 27  | Substantive  | The name and signature of the officer issuing the phytosanitary certificates should be automatically inserted on the certificate by the system. |  | IPPC Regional Workshop Caribbean English  | Pending  |
| [14]  | 32  | Substantive  | The phytosanitary certificate for re-export should have the original phytosanitary certificate for export or its certified copy as an attachment. In the situation where paper and electronic certificates are both in use, provisions are needed to fulfil this requirement when a phytosanitary certificate for re-export is issued in the following situations. |  | IPPC Regional Workshop Caribbean English  | Pending  |
| [15]  | 35  | Editorial  | **4.2 Re-export with electronic certificate while exporting  with paper certificate**  |  | IPPC Regional Workshop Caribbean English  | Pending  |
| [16]  | 37  | Editorial  | **4.3 Re-export with paper certificate while export;ing  with electronic certificate**  |  | IPPC Regional Workshop Caribbean English  | Pending  |

**Appendix IV**

**REVIEW COMMENTS: *Determination of host status of fruits and vegetables to fruit fly (Tephritidae) infestation (2006-031)***

| **Comm-ent no.**  | **Paragraph no.**  | **Comment type**  | **Comment**  | **Explanation**  | **Author**  | **Status**  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| [1]  | G  | Substantive  | Participants indicated that though this draft standard was important there was a need to be mindful of the cost of implementation and the need for technical assistance especially in respect of Small Island Development States. The CPM should take special note of this The standard should include a definition for 'semi-natural conditions' | Many developing countries are likely to face resource constraints in the implementation of this standard. The term 'semi-natural conditions' is used widely in the standard without any definition or explanation of the expression.  | IPPC Regional Workshop Caribbean English  | Pending  |
| [2]  | 19  | Substantive  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| non-host  | a plant species or cultivar that  has never been found to be infested under natural field conditions by the target fruitfly species or on which they cannot produce reproductive adults under semi natural field conditions. is neither a natural host nor a non-natural host of the target fruit fly species.  |

 | For consistency with paragraph 44 and with the definition of natural host  | IPPC Regional Workshop Caribbean English  | Pending  |
| [3]  | 22  | Editorial  | The host status category for hosts of fruit flies is fundamental for pest risk assessment and for determining pest risk management options. Hence, Ccategories of, and procedures for determining the host status should threfore  be harmonized and applied to fruit fly risk analysis. |  | IPPC Regional Workshop Caribbean English  | Pending  |
| [4]  | 24  | Technical  | 1. proper identification of the fruit fly species, test fruit (including cultivar and stage of maturity) and, for field trials, control fruit
2. the specification of parameters for adult and larval fruit fly surveillance and the design of field trial under semi natural conditions design to determine host status and specify the defined condition(s) of the fruit to be evaluated as a host
3. biologicallife stages of the fruit fly (larvae, pupae or adults) to be used as the basis for determination of host status
4. holding and handling of the fruit to rear fruit flies after exposure
5. evaluation of collected data and interpretation of results.
 |  | IPPC Regional Workshop Caribbean English  | Pending  |
| [5]  | 25  | Editorial  | Further, this standard protocol recommends that laboratory trials should not be used as the basis for determination of host status of fruits to fruit fly infestation. |  | IPPC Regional Workshop Caribbean English  | Pending  |
| [6]  | 28  | Editorial  | The host status of fruits for fruit flies is a fundamental concept for pest risk analysis and the subsequent decision to take measures against fruit flies. Hence, cCategories of and procedures for determining the host status should therefore be harmonized (ISPM 26:2006, ISPM 30:2008 and ISPM 35:2012). |  | IPPC Regional Workshop Caribbean English  | Pending  |
| [7]  | 28  | Technical  | The host status of fruits for fruit flies is a fundamental concept for pest risk analysis and the subsequent decision to take phytosanitary measures against fruit flies. Hence, categories of and procedures for determining the host status should be harmonized (ISPM 26:2006, ISPM 30:2008 and ISPM 35:2012). |  | IPPC Regional Workshop Caribbean English  | Pending  |
| [8]  | 29  | Editorial  | Some host records listed in the scientific literature are flawed with respect to host status. Such host records have, in some cases, resulted in the imposition of unnecessary or overly restrictive phytosanitary measures by national plant protection organizations (NPPOs) on some fruit commodities. Given this, there is a need for an international guidance to assist that helps NPPOs to determine host status in order to avoid unnecessary trade restrictions. |  | IPPC Regional Workshop Caribbean English  | Pending  |
| [9]  | 31  | Editorial  | 1. Fruit fly and plant species or cultivars may be incorrectly identified and reference specimens may be unavailable for verification.
2. Collection records may be incomplete, incorrect or of dubious value (e.g. host status based on the catch from a trap placed on in a fruit plant or based on infested, fallen or damaged fruit).
3. Important details may have been omitted, for example, cultivar and stage of maturity, physical condition of fruit at the time of collection or the orchard sanitary condition of the orchard.
 |  | IPPC Regional Workshop Caribbean English  | Pending  |
| [10]  | 35  | Editorial  | Three categories of host status (natural host, non-natural host and non-host) can be determined using the following steps, as also outlined in the flow chart (Figure 1):. | Replace the period with a colon since a list follows.  | IPPC Regional Workshop Caribbean English  | Pending  |
| [11]  | 36  | Editorial  | **A.** In cases where, the evidence from existing biological or historical information, the evidence is very clear that the fruit does not support allow infestation leading to the production of reproductive adults, no further surveys or field trials may be required and the fruit should be categorized as a non-host. | The sentence flows much better with the changes proposed.  | IPPC Regional Workshop Caribbean English  | Pending  |
| [12]  | 37  | Editorial  | **B.** In cases where, the evidence from existing biological and historical information, the evidence is very clear that the fruit supportsallows infestation leading to the production of reproductive adults, no further surveys or field trials may be required and the fruit should be categorized as a natural host. | The sentences flow better with the changes proposed.  | IPPC Regional Workshop Caribbean English  | Pending  |
| [13]  | 39  | Editorial  | **C1.** In cases where no infestation is found after conducting extensive larval and adult field surveillance, the fruit may be categorized as a non-host. | This change completes the sentence  | IPPC Regional Workshop Caribbean English  | Pending  |
| [14]  | 49  | Substantive  | If field trials are required, they should focus on the specific physiological condition cultivar and stage of maturity of the fruit and target fruit fly incidence over the entire growing area, relevant harvest and export periods. Any field trials should be replicated, statistically analysed, and the levels of confidence reported based on sample size so that data are verifiable and replicable. | The trials should focus on fruits destined for export during the relevant harvest and export periods.  | IPPC Regional Workshop Caribbean English  | Pending  |
| [15]  | 51  | Substantive  | 1. the identity of the plant species (including cultivars) and the target fruit fly species
2. the stage of maturity physiological condition of the fruit to be evaluated as a potential host
3. relevant information, literature and records regarding host status of the fruit and fruit fly species, including a critical review of such information
4. origin and rearing status of the fruit fly colony to be used in trials
5. known natural host species and cultivars to be used as controls in trials
6. separate trials for each fruit fly species for which determination of host status is required
7. separate trials for each cultivar of the fruit, only if cultivar differences are the purported source of host variability to fruit fly infestation.
 | 'Stage of maturity' is more specific than 'physiological condition'  | IPPC Regional Workshop Caribbean English  | Pending  |
| [16]  | 53  | Editorial  | Host status can be determined and designated based on confirmation of natural infestation during the harvest period (fruit sampling) without any field trials.  | The standard is to determine host status therefore the including 'designated' is not necessary.  | IPPC Regional Workshop Caribbean English  | Pending  |
| [17]  | 54  | Editorial  | Natural infestation samples should be representative of the range of production areas and environmental conditions, maturity stages and natural damage levels. Surveillance by fruit sampling is the most reliable method to determine natural host status because it:  | A list follows this paragraph and therefore a colon is necessary at the end.  | IPPC Regional Workshop Caribbean English  | Pending  |
| [18]  | 56  | Editorial  | However, disadvantages of the surveillance of natural infestation by fruit sampling include the facts that:  | Same explanation as for paragraph 54  | IPPC Regional Workshop Caribbean English  | Pending  |
| [19]  | 57  | Technical  | 1. variability in fruit fly behaviour is not completely known or controlled
2. variability in the fruit is not completely known or controlled.
 | Cannot control the variability of the fruit.  | IPPC Regional Workshop Caribbean English  | Pending  |
| [20]  | 59  | Editorial  | The objective of host status field trials is to demonstrate host status of a specified fruit under specific defined conditions based on statistically valid data. Trials may include the use of field cages, fruit-bearing bagged branches and greenhouses (including glass, plastic and screen houses). | Grammatical and sentence construction.  | IPPC Regional Workshop Caribbean English  | Pending  |
| [21]  | 59  | Technical  | The objective of host status field trials is to determine demonstrate host status of a specified fruit under specific defined conditions based on statistically valid data. Trials may include field cage, fruit-bearing bagged branches and greenhouse (including glass, plastic and screen houses). | The objective is to 'determine' and not to 'demonstrate' host status.  | IPPC Regional Workshop Caribbean English  | Pending  |
| [22]  | 77  | Technical  | 1. verify that females are sexually mature, mated and exhibiting normal oviposition behaviour
2. indicate the level of infestation that may occur in a good natural host
3. indicate the time frame for development to the adult stage under the trial conditions in a good natural host
4. confirm that environmental conditions were appropriate for infestation and rearing
5. in the case of natural infestation samples, confirm that wild females were ovipositing in the area where the fruit is grown during the trial period.
 | Consistent with the definition of the standard which does not defines 'good natural host' but 'natural host'  | IPPC Regional Workshop Caribbean English  | Pending  |
| [23]  | 79  | Editorial  | For this standard, field trials include the use of  field cages, fruit-bearing bagged branches and greenhouses trials. Trials may be conducted in sequence. However, it may be more practical to conduct trials simultaneously while the fruit is available. Trials should be appropriate for the evaluation of the physiological condition(s) of the fruit as a potential host for fruit fly infestation. | Grammar and better sentence construction  | IPPC Regional Workshop Caribbean English  | Pending  |
| [24]  | 85  | Technical  | Fruit must be held in an insect-proof facility or container during the holding period under conditions that ensure pupal survival. Holding conditions that should be considered include, but are not limited to: | The conditions must be maintained undtil the holding period is completed.  | IPPC Regional Workshop Caribbean English  | Pending  |
| [25]  | 88  | Editorial  | 1. daily physical conditions (e.g. temperature, relative humidity) in the fruit holding facility, daily during the period of fruit holding | Improved sentence construction  | IPPC Regional Workshop Caribbean English  | Pending  |
| [26]  | 90  | Technical  | * The medium may be sieved at intervals before all larvae have left the fruit and at the end of the holding period (which varies with temperature and host status).
* The normal period of development for target fruit fly species should be determined from the controls and colony. At the end of the holding period, the fruit should be dissected before being discarded, to determine the presence of live and dead larvae or pupae remaining inside if larvae have had enough time to emerge. If live larvae are present, the fruit should be held until all mature larvae have exited or been removed.
* All or a subsample of pupae should be weighed and abnormalities (examples of abnormalities should be included)  recorded.
 | This is needed for clarification  | IPPC Regional Workshop Caribbean English  | Pending  |
| [27]  | 92  | Technical  | * All emerging adults should be identified to species and sex, and counted. Abnormalities should be recorded insert examples of abnormalities here).
 | Similar explanation as in paragraph 90.  | IPPC Regional Workshop Caribbean English  | Pending  |
| [28]  | 93  | Substantive  | 4. number of emerging adults able to reach sexual maturity and produce viable progeny ability to reproduce and produce reproductively viable progeny. | Measurable way to record data on the ability to reproduce.  | IPPC Regional Workshop Caribbean English  | Pending  |

**Appendix V**

**REVIEW COMMENTS: *Draft Annex to ISPM 26: Establishment of fruit fly quarantine areas within a pest free area in the event of an outbreak (2009-007)***

| **Comment no.**  | **Paragraph no.**  | **Comment type**  | **Comment**  | **Explanation**  | **Author**  | **Status**  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| [1]  | G  | Substantive  | The titles do not always reflect the contents of the relevant sectionsThroughout the document words are used for which no definition have been given or for which there is no definition in the Glossary (e.g. Safeguarding measures). In some cases undefined terms are used instead of defined terms or terms for which there are definitions in the Glossary. The Annex does not provide sufficient guidance, More detals are required in the entire document. | There needs to be congruity between the titles and the relevant sections New words or terms need to be defined or use words or terms that are already in the Glossary. More detailed guidance is need in the Annex in general  | IPPC Regional Workshop Caribbean English  | Pending  |
| [2]  | 7  | Technical  | A fruit fly outbreak detected in a fruit fly-pest free area (FF-PFA) may pose a risk for those importing countries where the fruit fly species is considered a regulated pest. Phytosanitary actions for quarantine purposes are needed because movements of regulated articles from and through quarantine areas pose a risk of spreading the target fruit fly species.  | Phytosanitary actions are for quarantine purposes and therefore the statement 'for quarantine purposes' is not necessary.  | IPPC Regional Workshop Caribbean English  | Pending  |
| [3]  | 11  | Editorial  | Phytosanitary measures associated with the quarantine area should cover the stages of production, transportation, processing,  packing, processing, storing, trade within the area, and shipping. The phytosanitary actions should remain in force until eradication is declared. | In the stages of production, processing occurs before packing. The last sentence is deleted because the same thought is expressed in paragraph 13  | IPPC Regional Workshop Caribbean English  | Pending  |
| [4]  | 13  | Technical  | Owing to the temporary nature of a quarantine area within an FF-PFA, the phytosanitary measures are also temporary and should be withdrawn once the eradication of the outbreak has been declared.(ISPM 26:2006, Section 2.4.2 | This is necessary for clarification and guidance.  | IPPC Regional Workshop Caribbean English  | Pending  |
| [5]  | 23  | Substantive  | Each stage of the production chain (e.g. growing, packing, transporting, shipping) may lead to fruit fly spread from the quarantine area into the FF-PFA. Appropriate phytosanitary actionsmeasures should be applied to mitigate this risk to the surrounding FF-PFA and to the importing country.  | The title of the section is 'actions' and not 'measures'  | IPPC Regional Workshop Caribbean English  | Pending  |
| [6]  | 24  | Substantive  | Any movement of regulated articles from these areas should follow the phytosanitary regulations established by the NPPO of the exporting country.  | This is already covered in paragraph29  | IPPC Regional Workshop Caribbean English  | Pending  |
| [7]  | 25  | Substantive  | Phytosanitary measures already accepted in endemic fruit fly infested areas may also be implemented in the quarantine area. Phytosanitary actions in each stage of the production chain are described in the following sections:  | An introductory sentence is necessary for clarification since Sections 2.1-2.8 are stages of the production process.  | IPPC Regional Workshop Caribbean English  | Pending  |
| [8]  | 30  | Editorial  | Regulated articles should be moved underin safeguarded conditions and with the necessary documentation to certify the origin and destination. Verification of secure transport arrangements may be done using various methods including NPPO audits.  | Grammar  | IPPC Regional Workshop Caribbean English  | Pending  |
| [9]  | 32  | Substantive  | Packing facilities may be either within or outside the quarantine area. Facilities should be registered with the NPPO of the exporting country. The facility may pack regulated articles grown in or outside the quarantine area. Safeguarding mMeasures should be taken into account in each case to maintain  phytosanitary security of the articles . The NPPO of the exporting country should approve the methods of disposal of rejected produce from the quarantine area to reduce the risk of spread of the pest.  | The concept of safeguarding is not defined.  | IPPC Regional Workshop Caribbean English  | Pending  |
| [10]  | 34  | Editorial  | For facilities packing plant products produce grown exclusively within the quarantine area, safeguarding measures are required at the facility to prevent the spread of the target fruit fly species.  | For consistency with the other paragraphs  | IPPC Regional Workshop Caribbean English  | Pending  |
| [11]  | 38  | Technical  | In the case of packing facilities located within the FF-PFA but outside the quarantine area, the main objective is to protect the FF-PFA from the target fruit fly species. It is essential to ensure physical isolation through insect-proofed packaging and separate storage of different consignments or lots within the facility (ISPM 34:2010).  | ISPM 34 refers to post entry quarantine and therefore is not applicable in this case  | IPPC Regional Workshop Caribbean English  | Pending  |
| [12]  | 39  | Editorial  | Separate areas for reception, processing and dispatch are required to maintain segregation of the productsproduce.  | For consistency  | IPPC Regional Workshop Caribbean English  | Pending  |
| [13]  | 40  | Editorial  | Monitoring for the target fruit fly species should be conducted at the facility and adjacent areas to ensure FF-PFA status while the quarantine area is in force (Appendix 1 (2011) of ISPM 26:2006).  | 'Areas' instead of 'area' - grammatical  | IPPC Regional Workshop Caribbean English  | Pending  |
| [14]  | 42  | Editorial  | Cold storage or other storage facilities may be located within or outside the quarantine area. Such Facilities usually normally provide some phytosanitary security. adequate safeguarding. However, some additional considerations should be taken into account.  | To improve the sentence construction.  | IPPC Regional Workshop Caribbean English  | Pending  |
| [15]  | 54  | Substantive  | **2.7 Shipping for export Phytosanitary Certification** | The original title does not adequately describe the paragraphs under it.  | IPPC Regional Workshop Caribbean English  | Pending  |
| [16]  | 55  | Editorial  | Inspection for phytosanitary certification of regulated articles originating in the quarantine area may occur at airports or seaports. It should be conducted in a facility approved by the NPPO of the exporting country to ensure the phytosanitary integrity of the consignment and to prevent the spread of the pest.  | Phytosanitary certification includes inspection.  | IPPC Regional Workshop Caribbean English  | Pending  |
| [17]  | 56  | Technical  | Plant products should be packed using with material that ensure phytosanitary security. safeguarded material.  | 'safeguarded material' is replaced as there is no indication of what this phrase mean.  | IPPC Regional Workshop Caribbean English  | Pending  |
| [18]  | 58  | Technical  | Regulated articles being sold within the quarantine area are at risk of infestation if exposed prior to being sold (i.e. on display in an open air market). Such regulated articles should be safeguarded while on display, transported  and being stored.  | Risk can also be present during transportation therefore the produce needs to be safeguarded.  | IPPC Regional Workshop Caribbean English  | Pending  |
| [19]  | 61  | Substantive  | **4. Removal of the quarantine status within the FF-PFA** |  | IPPC Regional Workshop Caribbean English  | Pending  |
| [20]  | 61  | Technical  | **4. Removal of the quarantine area  status within the FF-PFA** | 'Quarantine status' is not defined in the Glossary. What is being removed is the 'Quarantine Area Status'  | IPPC Regional Workshop Caribbean English  | Pending  |
| [21]  | 63  | Technical  | Removal of the quarantine area status and reinstatement of FF-PFA status should coincide with a declaration of eradication. This declaration of eradication is based on no further detections of the target fruit fly species for a period determined by the biology of the species and prevailing environmental conditions as confirmed by surveillance (ISPM 26:2006). Phytosanitary measures for FF-PFAs should be reinstated.  | Same as in Paragraph 61  | IPPC Regional Workshop Caribbean English  | Pending  |
| [22]  | 65  | Editorial  | **CDFA** (California Department of Food and Agriculture).2001. Exotic fruit fly regulatory response manual. Sacramento (CA), CDFA, USDA (available at <http://www.cdfa.ca.gov/plant/pe/EFFRRM/fruit_fly_manual.html>, last accessed May 2012). **ISPM 4**. 1995. *Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas*. Rome, IPPC, FAO. **ISPM 5**. *Glossary of phytosanitary terms*. Rome, IPPC, FAO. **ISPM 8.** 1998. *Determination of pest status in an area*. Rome, IPPC, FAO. **ISPM 26.** 2006. *Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)*. [Includes Appendix 1: *Fruit fly trapping* (2011).] Rome, IPPC, FAO. **ISPM 34**. 2010. *Design and operation of post-entry quarantine stations for plants*. Rome, IPPC, FAO. **SAG** (Servicio Agrícola y Ganadero). 2007. Procedimiento para la implementacion de medidas fitosanitarias de cuarentena ante la detección de un brote de mosca del mediterráneo, *Ceratitis capitata* (Wiedemann).**USDA** (United States Department of Agriculture). 2003. Mediterranean fruit fly action plan. Washington, DC, USDA (available at <http://www.aphis.usda.gov/import_export/plants/manuals/emergency/downloads/medfly_action_plan.pdf>, last accessed May 2012). —— 2010. Emergency response manual. Washington, DC, USDA (available at <http://www.aphis.usda.gov/import_export/plants/manuals/emergency/downloads/epm.pdf>, last accessed May 2012).  | Reference to ISPM 34 was deleted earlier in the document since this standard does not deal with post-entry quarantine.  | IPPC Regional Workshop Caribbean English  | Pending  |