2012-011: Draft Annex to ISPM 28:2007: Irradiation

Comm. no.	Para. no.	Comment type	Comment	Explanation	Language	Country
1.	G	Editorial	I support the document as it is and I have no comments		English	Uruguay
2.	G	Editorial	I support the document as it is and I have no comments		English	COSAVE
3.	G	Editorial	I support the document as it is and I have no comments		English	Canada
4.	G	Editorial	I support the document as it is and I have no comments		English	Lao People's Democratic Republic
5.	G	Editorial	I support the document as it is and I have no comments		English	Korea, Republic of
6.	G	Editorial	I support the document as it is and I have no comments		English	Guyana
7.	G	Editorial	I support the document as it is and I have no comments		English	Mexico
8.	G	Editorial	I support the document as it is and I have no comments		English	Ghana
9.	G	Editorial	I support the document as it is and I have no comments		English	New Zealand

Comm. no.	Para. no.	Comment type	Comment	Explanation	Language	Country
10.	G	Editorial	I support the document as it is and I have no comments		English	Nepal
11.	G	Editorial	I support the document as it is and I have no comments		English	Brazil
12.	G	Editorial	I support the document as it is and I have no comments		English	Lesotho
13.	G	Substantive	Radiation effects can vary at a species level and there is no indication in this protocol how the applicability of the proposed 231 Gy dosage was determined for the other 2 species: *Planococcus lilacinus* and *P. minor*	Other two species not supported by The et al 2012 reference	English	Australia
14.	G	Technical	The concluding sentence of the discussion in the The paper states that 'However, the effect of irradiation on *D. neobrevipes* on female adults at the estimated range needs to be carried out on large scale confirmatory tests'.	There is no indication in this draft protocol that such tests have occurred. In the absence of such large scale tests which could readily be conducted for this species, adoption of this standard should be delayed until those large scale tests are complete. Alternatively, it would be reasonable to set the minimum absorbed dose at the top of the range ie 250 Gy.	English	Australia
15.	1	Editorial	**Draft Annex to ISPM 28:2007: IRRADIATION TREATMENT FOR *DYSMICOCCUS NEOBREVIPES* ~~BEARDSLEY~~, *PLANOCOCCUS LILACINUS* ~~(COCKERELL)~~ AND *PLANOCOCCUS MINOR* ~~(MASKELL) (HEMIPTERA: PSEUDOCOCCIDAE)~~ (2012-011)**	For consistency with the treatments previously adopted.	English	EPPO
16.	1	Editorial	**Draft Annex to ISPM 28:2007: IRRADIATION TREATMENT FOR *DYSMICOCCUS NEOBREVIPES* ~~BEARDSLEY~~, *PLANOCOCCUS LILACINUS* ~~(COCKERELL)~~ AND *PLANOCOCCUS MINOR* ~~(MASKELL) (HEMIPTERA: PSEUDOCOCCIDAE)~~ (2012-011)**	For consistency with the treatments previously adopted.	English	Estonia, Algeria
17.	1	Editorial	**Draft Annex to ISPM 28:2007: IRRADIATION TREATMENT FOR *DYSMICOCCUS NEOBREVIPES* ~~BEARDSLEY~~, *PLANOCOCCUS LILACINUS* ~~(COCKERELL)~~ AND *PLANOCOCCUS MINOR* ~~(MASKELL) (HEMIPTERA: PSEUDOCOCCIDAE)~~ (2012-011)**	For consistency with the treatments previously adopted.	English	European Union
18.	1	Substantive	**Draft Annex to ISPM 28:2007: IRRADIATION FOR *DYSMICOCCUS NEOBREVIPES* BEARDSLEY, *PLANOCOCCUS LILACINUS* (COCKERELL) AND *PLANOCOCCUS***	1.Except Dysmicoccus neobrevipes, no any scientific experiment and data were be carried out for other two pests. 2. Only	English	China

Comm. no.	Para. no.	Comment type	Comment	Explanation	Language	Country
			***MINOR* (MASKELL) (HEMIPTERA: PSEUDOCOCCIDAE) (2012-011)** This standard can't be adopted because the scientific evidence is inadequate.	100 individuals insects in the experimental design of this paper as a sample were tested. So scientific evidence is inadequate for the amount of the sample is very little. 3.The irradiation dose in the paper is a data deduced from the experiment, which is not directly from the test. 4.The researcher of this paper is not sure the result of the experiment.		
19.	*3*	Editorial	~~Pour les étapes de la publication, veuillez vous référer à la version anglaise de la norme.~~	Harmoniser la présente norme en y incluant les étapes de la publication en langue française	Français	Gabon, Algeria, Congo, DR*
20.	*3*	Technical	Pour les étapes de la publication, veuillez vous référer à la version anglaise de la norme.	Harmoniser la présente norme en y incluant les étapes de la publication en langue française	Français	Burundi
21.	*3*	Translation	~~Pour les étapes de la publication, veuillez vous référer à la version anglaise de la norme.~~	Harmoniser la présente norme en y incluant les étapes de la publication en langue française	Français	Mauritania
22.	*5*	Editorial	This annex describes the irradiation treatment of fruits and vegetables to prevent the reproduction of adult females of *Dysmicoccus neobrevipes* ~~Beardsley,~~, *Planococcus lilacinus* ~~(Cockerell)~~ and *Planococcus minor* ~~(Maskell) (Hemiptera: Pseudococcidae)~~ at the stated efficacy level[1]. This treatment should be applied in accordance with the requirements outlined in ISPM 18:2003.	to add clarity - consistency with previously adopted and reformatted treatments.	English	EPPO, Algeria
23.	*5*	Editorial	This annex describes the irradiation treatment of fruits and vegetables to prevent the reproduction of adult females of *Dysmicoccus neobrevipes* ~~Beardsley,~~, *Planococcus lilacinus* ~~(Cockerell)~~ and *Planococcus minor* ~~(Maskell) (Hemiptera: Pseudococcidae)~~ at the stated efficacy level[1]. This treatment should be applied in accordance with the requirements outlined in ISPM 18:2003.	To add clarity - consistency with previously adopted and reformatted treatments.	English	European Union
24.	*5*	Technical	This annex describes the irradiation treatment of fruits and vegetables to prevent reproduction of adult females of *Dysmicoccus neobrevipes* Beardsley, ~~*Planococcus lilacinus* (Cockerell)~~ and *Planococcus minor* (Maskell) (Hemiptera: Pseudococcidae) at the stated efficacy level[1].	The cited reference, The et al 2012, only refers to D. neobrevipes and the extrapalation to the other species is not supported by this evidence. However, Ravuiwasa KT, Lu KH, et al. (2009). Effects of irradiation on Planococcus minor (Hemiptera: Pseudococcidae). J.	English	Australia

Comm. no.	Para. no.	Comment type	Comment	Explanation	Language	Country
				Econ. Entomol. 102 (5): 1774-80 show that the irradiation dose of 150-250 Gy sterilsed P. minor by inhibiting the hatching of its eggs to a new generation.		
25.	7	Editorial	**Name of treatment**Irradiation treatment *for Dysmicoccus neobrevipes* ~~Beardsley~~, *Planococcus lilacinus* ~~(Cockerell)~~ and *Planococcus minor* ~~(Maskell) (Hemiptera: Pseudococcidae)~~	Consistency with treatments previously adopted.	English	EPPO
26.	7	Editorial	**Name of treatment**Irradiation treatment *for Dysmicoccus neobrevipes* ~~Beardsley~~, *Planococcus lilacinus* ~~(Cockerell)~~ and *Planococcus minor* ~~(Maskell) (Hemiptera: Pseudococcidae)~~	Consistency with treatments previously adopted.	English	European Union
27.	7	Editorial	**Name of treatment**Irradiation treatment *for Dysmicoccus neobrevipes* ~~Beardsley~~, *Planococcus lilacinus* ~~(Cockerell)~~ and *Planococcus minor* ~~(Maskell) (Hemiptera: Pseudococcidae)~~	Consistency with treatments previously adopted.	English	Algeria
28.	7	Technical	**Name of treatment**Irradiation *for Dysmicoccus neobrevipes* Beardsley, ~~*Planococcus lilacinus* (Cockerell) and *Planococcus minor* (Maskell)~~ (Hemiptera: Pseudococcidae)	No supporting evidence was provided for these two species and they should be removed.	English	Australia
29.	10	Editorial	**Target pests** *Dysmicoccus neobrevipes* Beardsley, *Planococcus lilacinus* (Cockerell) and *Planococcus minor* (Maskell) (Hemiptera: Pseudococcidae)	There are three target pests, not only one, and consistency with [11]: "Target regulated articles" (plural).	English	EPPO
30.	10	Editorial	**Target pests** *Dysmicoccus neobrevipes* Beardsley, *Planococcus lilacinus* (Cockerell) and *Planococcus minor* (Maskell) (Hemiptera: Pseudococcidae)	There are three target pests, not only one, and consistency with [11]: "Target regulated articles" (plural).	English	European Union
31.	10	Editorial	**Target pests** *Dysmicoccus neobrevipes* Beardsley, *Planococcus lilacinus* (Cockerell) and *Planococcus minor* (Maskell) (Hemiptera: Pseudococcidae)	There are three target pests, not only one, and consistency with [11]: "Target regulated articles" (plural).	English	Algeria
32.	10	Substantive	**Target pests***Dysmicoccus neobrevipes* ~~Beardsley~~, *Planococcus lilacinus* ~~(Cockerell)~~ and *Planococcus minor* ~~(Maskell) (Hemiptera: Pseudococcidae)~~	For consistency with the treatments previously adopted.	English	Algeria
33.	10	Technical	**Target pest***Dysmicoccus neobrevipes* Beardsley, ~~*Planococcus lilacinus* (Cockerell) and *Planococcus minor* (Maskell)~~ (Hemiptera: Pseudococcidae)	No supporting evidence was provided to substantiate the treatment for these two pests.	English	Australia
34.	10	Technical	**Target pests***Dysmicoccus neobrevipes* ~~Beardsley~~, *Planococcus lilacinus* ~~(Cockerell)~~ and *Planococcus minor* ~~(Maskell) (Hemiptera: Pseudococcidae)~~	For consistency with the treatments previously adopted.	English	Algeria

Comm. no.	Para. no.	Comment type	Comment	Explanation	Language	Country
35.	*10*	Translation	**Target pests***Dysmicoccus neobrevipes* ~~Beardsley~~, *Planococcus lilacinus* ~~(Cockerell)~~ and *Planococcus minor* ~~(Maskell) (Hemiptera: Pseudococcidae)~~	For consistency with the treatments previously adopted.	English	Algeria
36.	*13*	Editorial	Minimum absorbed dose of 231 Gy to prevent the reproduction of adult females of *Dysmicoccus neobrevipes*, *Planococcus lilacinus* and *Planococcus minor*.	Consistency with treatments previously adopted.	English	EPPO
37.	*13*	Editorial	Minimum absorbed dose of 231 Gy to prevent the reproduction of adult females of *Dysmicoccus neobrevipes*, *Planococcus lilacinus* and *Planococcus minor*.	Consistency with treatments previously adopted.	English	European Union
38.	*13*	Editorial	Minimum absorbed dose of 231 Gy to prevent the reproduction of adult females of *Dysmicoccus neobrevipes*, *Planococcus lilacinus* and *Planococcus minor*.	Consistency with treatments previously adopted.	English	Algeria
39.	*13*	Substantive	Minimum absorbed dose 231 Gy to prevent reproduction of adult females of *Dysmicoccus neobrevipes*, *Planococcus lilacinus* and *Planococcus minor*. Information on the reason why 231 Gy was adopted as minimum absorbed dose should be described.	The, D.T. et al. (2012), which paper is referred to in this draft, concluded dose range between 200 and 250Gy might be efficient to sterilize Dysmicoccus neobrevipes. Ravuiwasa et al. (2009) concluded 150-250Gy is the most optimal dosage to sterilize all stages of Planococcus minor. The reason why 231 Gy was adopted as minimum absorbed dose should be clarified.	English	Japan
40.	*13*	Technical	Minimum absorbed dose 231 Gy to prevent reproduction of adult females of *Dysmicoccus neobrevipes*, *Planococcus lilacinus* and *Planococcus minor*.	The minimum absorbed dose of 231 Gy is for Dysmicoccus neobrevipes only. There is no determined doses for Planococcus lilacinus and Planococcus minor yet.	English	Thailand
41.	*13*	Technical	Minimum absorbed dose 250~~231~~ Gy to prevent reproduction of adult females of *Dysmicoccus neobrevipes*, *Planococcus lilacinus* and *Planococcus minor*.	although the cited reference (The et al 2012) conculded that the dose range between 200 and 250 Gy might be efficient to sterilise for D. neobrevipes, the authors also cautioned that this effect needs to be confirmed on large scale tests. In the absence of large scale tests, it would be reasonable to set the minimum absorbed dose to the top of the range ie 250 Gy	English	Australia

Comm. no.	Para. no.	Comment type	Comment	Explanation	Language	Country
42.	*14*	Substantive	Efficacy and confidence level of the treatment is $ED_{99.99023}$ at the 95% confidence level.Treatment should be applied in accordance with the requirements of ISPM 18:2003, Guidelines for the use of irradiation as a phytosanitary measure. This irradiation treatment should not be applied to fruit and vegetables stored in modified atmospheres.	This sentence should be moved from paragraph 17 for consistency with other adopted treatments. It is a requirement.	English	EPPO, Algeria
43.	*14*	Substantive	Efficacy and confidence level of the treatment is $ED_{99.99023}$ at the 95% confidence level. Treatment should be applied in accordance with the requirements of ISPM 18:2003, Guidelines for the use of irradiation as a phytosanitary measure. This irradiation treatment should not be applied to fruit and vegetables stored in modified atmospheres.	This sentence should be moved from paragraph 17 for consistency with other adopted treatments. It is a requirement.	English	European Union
44.	*15*	Substantive	**Other relevant information** Information on assessment of treatment schedule for *Planococcus lilacicinus* should be described in “Other relevant information”.	The, D.T. et al (2012), which paper is referred to in this draft, describes the treatment test for only Dysmicoccus neobrevipes. The reason for the decision that treatment schedule of Planococcus minor can be the same as the schedule of Dysmicoccus neobrevipes should be described.	English	Japan
45.	*16*	Editorial	Because irradiation may not result in outright mortality, inspectors may encounter live larvae ~~and/~~or adults of *Dysmicoccus neobrevipes* or *Planococcus lilacinus* or *Planococcus minor* during the inspection process. This does not imply a failure of the treatment.	1) "Since irradiation..." is the wording used in previously adopted treatments. 2) Use of "and/or" in ISPMs. 3) Consistency with treatments previously adopted.	English	EPPO
46.	*16*	Editorial	Because irradiation may not result in outright mortality, inspectors may encounter live larvae ~~and/~~or adults of *Dysmicoccus neobrevipes* or *Planococcus lilacinus* or *Planococcus minor* during the inspection process. This does not imply a failure of the treatment.	1) "Since irradiation..." is the wording used in previously adopted treatments. 2) Use of "and/or" in ISPMs. 3) Consistency with treatments previously adopted.	English	European Union
47.	*16*	Editorial	Étant donné que l’irradiation pourrait ~~peut~~ ne pas avoir un effet létal radical, les inspecteurs phytosanitaires pourraient ~~peuvent~~ trouver des larves et/ou des adultes vivants au cours de l’inspection. On ne peut pas, le cas échéant, en déduire que le traitement ait échoué.	Formulation plus claire.	Français	Gabon, Algeria, Congo, DR*
48.	*16*	Editorial	Étant donné que l’irradiation pourrait ~~peut~~ ne pas avoir un effet létal radical, les inspecteurs phytosanitaires pourraient ~~peuvent~~ trouver des larves et/ou des adultes vivants au cours de l’inspection. On ne peut pas, le cas échéant, en déduire que le traitement ait échoué.	Formulation plus claire.	Français	Burundi

Comm. no.	Para. no.	Comment type	Comment	Explanation	Language	Country
49.	16	Substantive	Because irradiation may not result in outright mortality, inspectors may encounter live immaturesÂ ~~larvae~~ and/or adults during the inspection process. This does not imply a failure of the treatment.	More appropriate terminology	English	United States of America
50.	16	Translation	Étant donné que l'irradiation pourait~~eut~~ ne pas avoir un effet létal radical, les inspecteurs phytosanitaires pouraient ~~peuvent~~ trouver des larves et/ou des adultes vivants au cours de l'inspection. On ne peut pas, le cas échéant, en déduire que le traitement ait échoué.	Formulation plus claire.	Français	Mauritania
51.	17	Technical	~~Treatment should be applied in accordance with the requirements of ISPM 18:2003, *Guidelines for the use of irradiation as a phytosanitary measure*.~~	This sentence is in the section "Treatment schedule" for treatments previously adopted.	English	EPPO, Algeria
52.	17	Technical	~~Treatment should be applied in accordance with the requirements of ISPM 18:2003, *Guidelines for the use of irradiation as a phytosanitary measure*.~~	This sentence is in the section "Treatment schedule" for treatments previously adopted.	English	European Union
53.	18	Editorial	This irradiation treatment should not be applied to fruits and vegetables stored in modified atmospheres.	Suggests that "fruit" should be in plural form to emphasize different kind of fruits	English	Malaysia
54.	18	Substantive	~~This irradiation treatment should not be applied to fruit and vegetables stored in modified atmospheres.~~	This sentence should be moved to the section "treatment schedule"	English	EPPO, Algeria
55.	18	Substantive	~~This irradiation treatment should not be applied to fruit and vegetables stored in modified atmospheres.~~	This sentence should be moved to the section "treatment schedule"	English	European Union
56.	19	Editorial	This schedule was based on the work of The *et al.* (2012).	we think there is an absent of the auther name in this paragraph	English	Jordan
57.	19	Editorial	This treatment schedule was based on the work of The *et al.* (2012).	Consistency with [12].	English	EPPO
58.	19	Editorial	This treatment schedule was based on the work of The *et al.* (2012).	Consistency with [12].	English	European Union
59.	19	Editorial	This treatment schedule was based on the work of The *et al.* (2012).	Consistency with [12].	English	Algeria

Comm. no.	Para. no.	Comment type	Comment	Explanation	Language	Country
60.	19	Substantive	~~This schedule was based on the work of The *et*Â *al.* (2012).~~ This schedule was based on the work of Doan, T.T. et al 2012. In this paper a minimum absorbed dose of 200 Gy prevented reproduction by adult females of *Dysmincoccus neobrevipes* and development to the next generation from all immature stages. A subsequent large scale confirmatory test showed that there was no reproduction at a maximum dose of 231 Gy. Further tests also showed that the other two species were more radiosusceptable than *Dysminococcus neobrevipes*. Very little data is available for other members of the Pseudococcidae and all papers are listed in the References. In each case a dose near to or less than 200 Gy was sufficient to ensure no reproduction providing additional confidence in the proposed dose.	TPPT suggestion, taken on by the US.	English	United States of America
61.	19	Substantive	This schedule was based on the work of The *et al.* (2012).	No, The et al only provided data on D. neobrevipes and also stated that large scale tests were needed to confirm the rates.	English	Australia
62.	21	Substantive	~~**The, D.T., Khanh, N.T., Lang, V.T.K., Chung, C.V., An, T.T.T. & Thi, N.H.**~~Â Â Doan,T.T., Nguyen,T.K., Vo,T.K.L., Cao,V.C., Tran,T.T.A., and Nguyen,H.H.T.Â 2012. Effects of gamma irradiation on different stages of mealybug *Dysmicoccus neobrevipes* (Hemiptera: Pseudococcidae). *Radiation Physics and Chemistry*, 81: 97â€“100.	TPPT suggestion taken on by the US: Correct author list should be Doan,T.T., Nguyen,T.K., Vo,T.K.L., Cao,V.C., Tran,T.T.A., and Nguyen,H.H.T.	English	United States of America
63.	21	Substantive	**The, D.T., Khanh, N.T., Lang, V.T.K., Chung, C.V., An, T.T.T. & Thi, N.H.** 2012. Effects of gamma irradiation on different stages of mealybug *Dysmicoccus neobrevipes* (Hemiptera: Pseudococcidae). *Radiation Physics and Chemistry*, 81: 97–100. Ravuiwasa KT, Lu KH, et al. (2009). Effects of irradiation on Planococcus minor (Hemiptera: Pseudococcidae). J. Econ. Entomol. 102 (5): 1774-80	If P. minor is to be retained in this treatment, this reference needs to be added	English	Australia
64.	21	Substantive	**The, D.T., Khanh, N.T., Lang, V.T.K., Chung, C.V., An, T.T.T. & Thi, N.H.** 2012. Effects of gamma irradiation on different stages of mealybug *Dysmicoccus neobrevipes* (Hemiptera: Pseudococcidae). *Radiation Physics and Chemistry*, 81: 97–100. Ravuiwasa K. T. et al. (2009)* referred in The, D.T. et al.(2012) describing the treatment test for Planococcus minor should be added as a reference of this draft. (*Ravuiwasa K. T. et al (2009). Effect of Irradiation on Planococcus minor. Journal of Economic Entomology 102(5): 1774-1780.)	The, D.T. et al (2012), which paper is referred to in this draft, describes the treatment test for only Dysmicoccus neobrevipes. It is necessary to describe the reason why treatment schedule of Planococcus minor can be the same as the schedule of Dysmicoccus neobrevipes.	English	Japan

Comm. no.	Para. no.	Comment type	Comment	Explanation	Language	Country
65.	*22*	Substantive	**Footnote 1** The scope of phytosanitary treatments does not include issues related to pesticide registration or other domestic requirements for **contracting partiesâ€™**approval of treatmentsfor use in its territory.~~**IPPC adopted**~~ Treatments **adopted by the CPM may** ~~also do~~ not provide information on specific effects on human health or food safety, which should be addressed using domestic procedures prior to **contracting parties approving** ~~approval of~~ a treatmentfor use in its territory. In addition, potential effects of treatments on product quality are considered for some host commodities before their international adoption. However, evaluation of any effects of a treatment on the quality of commodities may require additional consideration. There is no obligation for a contracting party to approve, register or adopt the treatments for use in its territory.	It is preferable not to change the footnote. (i.e. keep the version that was used in previous accepted phytosanitary treatments). If the current wording is retained, the additions are required to prevent the confusion between the adoption of a treatment by the CPM and the adoption of a treatment by a country for use in its territory. The proposed changes are consistent with the last sentence of this paragraph.	English	EPPO, Algeria
66.	*22*	Substantive	**Footnote 1** The scope of phytosanitary treatments does not include issues related to pesticide registration or other domestic requirements for **contracting parties'**approval of treatments for use in its territory.~~**IPPC adopted**~~ Treatments **adopted by the CPM may** ~~also do~~ not provide information on specific effects on human health or food safety, which should be addressed using domestic procedures prior to **contracting parties approving** ~~approval of~~ a treatment for use in its territory. In addition, potential effects of treatments on product quality are considered for some host commodities before their international adoption. However, evaluation of any effects of a treatment on the quality of commodities may require additional consideration. There is no obligation for a contracting party to approve, register or adopt the treatments for use in its territory.	It is preferable to keep the footnote wording as it was used in previously accepted phytosanitary treatments. If the wording modified by the text in bold is retained, the additions are required to prevent the confusion between the adoption of a treatment by the CPM and the adoption of a treatment by a country for use in its territory. The proposed changes are consistent with the last sentence of this paragraph.	English	European Union
67.	*22*	Translation	**Footnote 1** Le champ d'application des traitements phytosanitaires ne comprend pas les questions liées à l'homologation de pesticides ni d'autres exigences nationales relatives à l'approbation des traitements **par les parties contractantes**.Les traitements adoptés par la **CMP** ~~**CIPV**~~ **pourraient** ~~**euvent**~~ ne pas fournir ~~non plus~~ d'informations sur des aspects spécifiques concernant la santé humaine ou la sécurité sanitaire des aliments, qui devraient être traités à l'échelle nationale préalablement à l'approbation d'un traitement **par les parties contractantes**. En outre, les effets potentiels des traitements sur la qualité des produits sont pris en compte pour certaines marchandises hôtes avant leur adoption internationale. Quoi qu'il en soit, l'évaluation des éventuels effets d'un traitement sur la qualité des marchandises pourrait ~~eut~~ nécessiter un examen complémentaire. Il n'est fait aucune obligation aux parties contractantes d'approuver, homologuer ou adopter lesdits traitements en vue de les appliquer sur leur territoire.	Davantage de clarté et précision	Français	Mauritania
68.	*22*	Translation	**Footnote 1** Le champ d'application des traitements phytosanitaires ne comprend pas les questions liées à l'homologation de pesticides ni d'autres exigences nationales relatives à l'approbation des traitements **par les parties contractantes**.Les	Davantage de clarté et précision	Français	Gabon, Congo, DR*

Comm. no.	Para. no.	Comment type	Comment	Explanation	Language	Country
			traitements adoptés par la **CMP ~~CIPV~~** **pourraient**~~**peuvent**~~ ne pas fournir ~~non plus~~ d'informations sur des aspects spécifiques concernant la santé humaine ou la sécurité sanitaire des aliments, qui devraient être traités à l'échelle nationale préalablement à l'approbation d'un traitement **par les parties contractantes**. En outre, les effets potentiels des traitements sur la qualité des produits sont pris en compte pour certaines marchandises hôtes avant leur adoption internationale. Quoi qu'il en soit, l'évaluation des éventuels effets d'un traitement sur la qualité des marchandises pourrait ~~peut~~ nécessiter un examen complémentaire. Il n'est fait aucune obligation aux parties contractantes d'approuver, homologuer ou adopter lesdits traitements en vue de les appliquer sur leur territoire.			
69.	*22*	Translation	**Footnote 1** Le champ d'application des traitements phytosanitaires ne comprend pas les questions liées à l'homologation de pesticides ni d'autres exigences nationales relatives à l'approbation des traitements **par les parties contractantes**.Les traitements adoptés par la **CMP ~~CIPV~~** pourraient ~~**peuvent**~~ ne pas fournir ~~non plus~~ d'informations sur des aspects spécifiques concernant la santé humaine ou la sécurité sanitaire des aliments, qui devraient être traités à l'échelle nationale préalablement à l'approbation d'un traitement **par les parties contractantes**. En outre, les effets potentiels des traitements sur la qualité des produits sont pris en compte pour certaines marchandises hôtes avant leur adoption internationale. Quoi qu'il en soit, l'évaluation des éventuels effets d'un traitement sur la qualité des marchandises pourrait ~~peut~~ nécessiter un examen complémentaire. Il n'est fait aucune obligation aux parties contractantes d'approuver, homologuer ou adopter lesdits traitements en vue de les appliquer sur leur territoire.	Davantage de clarté et précision	Français	Burundi