

Template for comments - Draft ISPMs for country consultation, 2010

DRAFT: SYSTEMS APPROACHES FOR PEST RISK MANAGEMENT OF FRUIT FLIES (TEPHRITIDAE)

See [instructions](#) on how to use this template at the end of the document. Following these will greatly facilitate the compilation of comments and the work of the Standards Committee.

1. Section	2. Paragraph number	3. sentence/row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment (Substantive, Editorial, Translation)	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
<i>GENERAL COMMENTS</i>					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The US would like to recommend this draft to be an Annex to ISPM 14, <i>The use of integrated measures in a systems approach for pest risk management</i>, rather than a stand alone standard. To use this standard, countries would have to reference to ISPM 14 anyway, so it makes more sense to keep them together. The document does not provide much guidance beyond what is already provided in ISPMs 10, 14, and 30. It pulls together key points from other standards and applies them to one program. It would be more relevant to focus this draft on low pest prevalence with more detail relevant to the Tephritidae family. There are missing principles that should be included: surveillance (e.g. it does not include 3 year survey information, it does not say that cutting gives more reliable information than trapping); common benchmarks (e.g. measure population, show population reduction along the way, temporary quarantine, fruit fly free windows); IPM option is not included (can be the basis of low pest prevalence). 	USA
TITLE						

1. Section	2. Para nber	3. sentence/ row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment (Substantive, Editorial, Translation)	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
Contents						
Introduction	[1]					
SCOPE	[2]					
SCOPE	[3]					
REFERENCES	[4]					
REFERENCES	[5]					
REFERENCES	[6]					
REFERENCES	[7]					
REFERENCES	[8]					
REFERENCES	[9]					
REFERENCES	[10]					
REFERENCES	[11]					
REFERENCES	[12]					
REFERENCES	[13]					
DEFINITIONS	[14]					
DEFINITIONS	[15]					
OUTLINE OF REQUIREMENTS	[16]					
OUTLINE OF REQUIREMENTS	[17]					
OUTLINE OF REQUIREMENTS	[18]	First line	Editorial	An important requirement for the establishment of an FF-SA is a low pest population level in the area...	Global change	USA
OUTLINE OF REQUIREMENTS	[19]					
OUTLINE OF REQUIREMENTS	[20]					
OUTLINE OF REQUIREMENTS	[21]					
BACKGROUND	[22]					

1. Section	2. Paragraph number	3. sentence/row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment (Substantive, Editorial, Translation)	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
BACKGROUND	[23]	1st sentence	substantive	Most fruit flies in the Tephritidae family are pests of economic importance affecting trade of hosts and their movement may pose a pest risk for endangered areas.	Not all fruit flies and not all Tephritids are pests of economic importance.	USA
BACKGROUND	[24]					
BACKGROUND	[25]					
BACKGROUND	[26]					
BACKGROUND	[27]					
BACKGROUND	[28]					
BACKGROUND	[29]					
BACKGROUND	[30]	Add indent at the end	Substantive	- <u>Decrease cost to growers and/or provide cost benefits for importers/consumers</u>	There may be direct and/or indirect economic benefits to the FF-SA.	USA
BACKGROUND	[31]					
BACKGROUND	[32]					
REQUIREMENTS	[33]					
1. General Requirements	[34]					
1.1. Pest risk analysis	[35]	section	Substantive	Suggest to streamline or delete this section if this draft is changed into an Annex to ISPM 14.	This section is repetitive. Information is already included in ISPM 14.	USA
1.1. Pest risk analysis	[36]					
1.1. Pest risk analysis	[37]					
1.1. Pest risk analysis	[38]					
1.1. Pest risk analysis	[39]					
1.1. Pest risk analysis	[40]					
1.1. Pest risk analysis	[41]	Para	Substantive	The area proposed for an FF-SA should be described and adequately documented <u>with particular attention to host prevalence and distribution of commercial production sites as well as host presence in backyard areas. The</u>	This is critical information for a PRA and to identify the appropriate pest risk mitigation measures.	USA

1. Section	2. Paragraph number	3. sentence/row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment (Substantive, Editorial, Translation)	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
				information should include secondary or alternate hosts.		
1.1. Pest risk analysis	[42]					
1.1. Pest risk analysis	[43]					
1.2 Documentation and record-keeping	[44]	Section	Substantive		Suggest this section could be incorporated with minor edits to ISPM 14 in the future. It is relevant to all systems approaches and it is applicable to other pests besides fruit flies.	USA
1.2 Documentation and record-keeping	[45]	Last sentence	Substantive	Documents should be maintained for at least 24 <u>36</u> months and made available to the NPPOs of the importing contracting parties upon request.	Three years is the standard for many countries. Three years of data is the minimum amount of time needed to show trends in populations (population levels can be different depending on weather patterns, landscapes, etc.), and should be changed to reflect what is commonly accepted worldwide.	USA
1.2 Documentation and record-keeping	[46]	First indent	Substantive	- pest risk analysis and risk management plan based on it	The risk management plan should always be part of the documentation for an FF-SA, along with the PRA.	USA
		Second indent	substantive	- operational procedures developed to establish and maintain the FF-SA, including traceability.	This important information is missing in the document.	USA
		Add indent at the end	substantive	- trapping results	An exporting NPPO should expect to verify trapping results whenever requested by the importing NPPO.	USA
1.3 Supervision	[47]					
1.3 Supervision	[48]	Add sentence at the end	substantive	NPPOs should identify when a FF-SA is being set up.	This should be done for traceability purposes. Information needs to be recorded (i.e. area proposed).	USA
1.3 Supervision	[49]	Para	substantive	Compliance with the FF-SA should be verified by the NPPO of the exporting contracting party should be verified provide oversight of compliance with the FF-SA, through supervision and review	The document should identify who specifically is providing direct oversight of the program, as in ISPM 30, where it is stated that the NPPO should evaluate and audit the program to ensure low pest	USA

1. Section	2. Paragraph number	3. sentence/row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment (Substantive, Editorial, Translation)	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
				of documentation and operational procedures. Supervision <u>Verification</u> can also be done by the NPPO of the importing contracting party. <u>Supervision activities should be as outlined in Section 1.4 of ISPM 30.</u>	prevalence. This paragraph makes it sound like monitoring compliance is done by producers, with NPPO verification. The NPPO of importing country does not supervise but verifies compliance. We suggest to develop a subsection to expand on supervision of activities. This information should be consistent with ISPM 30.	
2. Specific Requirements	[50]					
2.1 Establishment of an FF-SA	[51]	title	substantive	Establishment of an FF-SA <u>at a suitable population level</u>	The document needs to show that there may be different population levels expected depending on the host (e.g. peaches and stone fruit). Countries would need to look at wild host flora present near production areas like backyards, refuges, around orchards. NPPOs would need to consider density of traps in center vs. outskirts of field, the time of the year, and other factors.	USA
2.1 Establishment of an FF-SA	[52]	First sentence	Substantive	Establishment of an FF-SA should <u>at an appropriate level of protection</u> requires consultation and cooperation between the NPPOs of the exporting and importing contracting parties.	Sentence is easier to understand, and more technically justifiable.	USA
2.1 Establishment of an FF-SA	[53]	Second sentence	substantive	The <u>appropriate</u> number and combination of the appropriate measures should be determined <u>selected and their efficacy agreed upon</u> by the <u>importing and exporting</u> contracting parties involved.	Second sentences in para (53) and (54) are very similar. Merged both sentences information into one.	USA
		Third sentence	substantive	Measures chosen should be <u>scientifically sound and operationally feasible</u> . cost-effective and the least trade restrictive. <u>Aspects of operational feasibility include cost-effectiveness of the measures to be applied while seeking to impose the least restrictive measures necessary to mitigate risk.</u>	Proposed measures must be scientifically valid. Sentence has been expanded for more clarity.	USA

1. Section	2. Paragraph number	3. sentence/row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment (Substantive, Editorial, Translation)	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
2.1 Establishment of an FF-SA	[54]	Second sentence	Substantive	Delete	Merged with para (53) to avoid repetition.	USA
2.1 Establishment of an FF-SA	[55]	Para	Substantive	Based on the place and time of their application, there are three <u>five</u> stages where measures can be applied from production of the host within the exporting country to its distribution within the importing country. These <u>Stages are include:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>pre-planting</u> - pre-harvest and at harvest - <u>harvest</u> - post-harvest and shipping handling - entry <u>transportation</u> and distribution 	Stages should be aligned with information in ISPM 14.	USA
2.1.1 Pre-harvest and at harvest	[56]	title	Substantive	delete	For consistency with ISPM 14 and comments on para (55)	USA
2.1.1 Pre-harvest and at harvest	[57]	Para	Substantive	Delete and replace with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Measures to prevent fruit flies infestation may include:</u> 1. <u>Pre-planting</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>managing alternate hosts</u> - <u>using resistant varieties</u> - <u>selecting planting sites</u> - <u>sanitation</u> 2. <u>Pre-harvest</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>trapping</u> - <u>host availability (e.g. wild hosts)</u> - <u>managing to low pest prevalence (ISPM 30)</u> - <u>buffer zones</u> - <u>surveillance using trapping</u> - <u>sanitation</u> - <u>cutting alternate hosts</u> - <u>controls (including SIT, chemical treatments, IPM (physical, cultural, beneficial (ISPM 30)</u> - <u>certified producers</u> 	These methods are not necessarily included in ISPM 14 but are more specific to fruit flies, making this document more relevant. It provides more useful information for NPPOs.	USA

1. Section	2. Paragraph number	3. sentence/row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment (Substantive, Editorial, Translation)	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3. <u>Harvest</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>surveillance</u> - <u>fruit cutting</u> - <u>harvest windows</u> - <u>managing to low pest prevalence (ISPM 30)</u> - <u>fruit maturity/conditional host status/non host status</u> - <u>sanitation</u> - <u>safeguarding</u> - <u>field selection of fruit (no fallen fruit)</u> - <u>culling in packinghouses</u> 4. <u>Post-harvest and handling</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>sanitation</u> - <u>safeguarding</u> - <u>treatments/fruit handling</u> - <u>sampling/inspection/fruit cutting</u> - <u>official phytosanitary inspection certification</u> - <u>certified facilities</u> - <u>traceability of lots</u> - <u>trapping (in packing houses)</u> 5. <u>Transportation and distribution</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>shipping method</u> - <u>safeguarding</u> - <u>treatment (prior/during)</u> - <u>inspection</u> - <u>distribution -limited geographically (points of entry)/seasonally, north/south</u> 		
2.1.1.1 Low level of pest population	[58]	title	editorial	<u>2.1.1</u> Low level of pest population		USA.
2.1.1.1 Low level of pest population	[59]					
2.1.1.1 Low level of pest population	[60]	First bullet under third	substantive	- fruit stripping	Need to be more specific. Is this after crop is done and harvested?	USA

1. Section	2. Paragraph number	3. sentence/row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment (Substantive, Editorial, Translation)	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
		indent				
2.1.1.2 Fruit fly free places of production and fruit fly free production sites	[61]	title	editorial	2.1.2 Fruit fly free places of production and fruit fly free production sites		USA
2.1.1.2 Fruit fly free places of production and fruit fly free production sites	[62]					
2.1.1.2 Fruit fly free places of production and fruit fly free production sites	[63]					
2.1.1.2 Fruit fly free places of production and fruit fly free production sites	[64]					
2.1.1.3 Status of the host	[65]	title Section	editorial Substantive	2.1.3 Status of the host	Host/non-host mindset needs to change. Otherwise, we risk fruit flies breeding in plants that were considered non-host previously.	USA USA
2.1.1.3 Status of the host	[66]	Add para at the end	substantive		Suggest to add host fruit information and explain poor hosts. This information is important, relevant to the document, and it is not currently included in ISPM 14.	USA
2.1.2 Post-harvest and shipping	[67]	title	substantive	delete	Consistent with ISPM 14 and comments on para (55).	USA
2.1.2 Post-harvest and shipping	[68]	Para	substantive	delete	Consistent with ISPM 14 and comments on para (57).	USA
2.1.2.1 Post-harvest measures	[69]	Title	Substantive	delete	Consistent with ISPM 14 and comments on para (55).	USA
2.1.2.1 Post-harvest measures	[70]	para	Substantive	delete	Consistent with ISPM 14 and comments on para (57).	USA
2.1.2.1 Post-harvest measures	[71]	para	substantive	delete	Consistent with ISPM 14 and comments on para (57).	USA

1. Section	2. Paragraph number	3. sentence/row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment (Substantive, Editorial, Translation)	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
2.1.2.1 Post-harvest measures	[72]	para	substantive	delete	Consistent with ISPM 14 and comments on para (57).	USA
2.1.2.2 Post-harvest treatments	[73]	title	substantive	delete	Consistent with ISPM 14 and comments on para (55).	USA
2.1.2.2 Post-harvest treatments	[74]	para	substantive	delete	Consistent with ISPM 14 and comments on para (57).	USA
2.1.3 Entry and distribution	[75]	title	substantive	delete	Consistent with ISPM 14 and comments on para (55).	USA
2.1.3 Entry and distribution	[76]	para	substantive	delete	Consistent with ISPM 14 and comments on para (57).	USA
2.2 Maintenance of a fruit fly systems approach	[77]					
2.2 Maintenance of a fruit fly systems approach	[78]	Para	Substantive	Operational procedures should must be required. Such procedures may take the form of a written document (work plan, protocol, etc.) outlining the specific activities as part of a bilateral arrangement between the NPPOs of the importing and exporting contracting parties.	This is not an expectation but a need for traceability purposes.	USA
2.2 Maintenance of a fruit fly systems approach	[79]	4th indent 4th bullet	Substantive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Procedures that allow traceability 	Traceability should be part of the operational procedures.	USA
2.2 Maintenance of a fruit fly systems approach	[80]					
2.2 Maintenance of a fruit fly systems approach	[81]	Para Add new para	Substantive Substantive	<p>The NPPO should monitor of the exporting contracting party should provide oversight of all stages and control points of <u>the FF-SA</u>, verifying compliance with the operational procedures and implementing corrective actions, as appropriate and <u>as outlined in ISPM 30</u>.</p> <p>Move paragraphs (84) and (85) here.</p>	<p>Consistent with comment on para (49).</p> <p>This information does not fit in the non-compliance section because it occurs before non-compliance. Both paragraphs deal with maintenance so it should be moved</p>	USA USA

1. Section	2. Paragraph number	3. sentence/row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment (Substantive, Editorial, Translation)	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
		New subsection	Substantive	<p>2.3 Ongoing verification of the systems approach Move para (95) here. Add new sentence at the end of para: It should be noted a country does not have to reinstate the FF-SA automatically, over and over again.</p>	<p>at the end of section 2.2.</p> <p>This section does not deal with non-compliance. It is more related to the specific requirements of the systems approach and would be better suited as a subsection under 2.</p>	USA
		New section	substantive	<p>3. Non-compliance Move para (87), (89), (91), and (93) here. Add new para after (87): There are major and minor non-compliances. NPPOs must agree to corrective measures and to reinstate after non-conformities are in compliance again, based on review of the importing country. Additional information regarding non-compliance can be found in ISPM 30.</p>	<p>This is an integral part of systems approach. Non-compliance should be a separate section. It may be useful to include a reference to additional information on non-conformance (found in ISPM 30). It is not a foregone conclusion that a program will just start up again. This needs to be stated more specifically within the document.</p>	USA
ANNEX 1	[82]	Sentence	Substantive	delete	This is a relevant part of the document and should be part of the text, not as an Annex. In addition, if this draft becomes an Annex to IPSP 14, it can not be maintained as an Annex.	USA
ANNEX 1	[83]	Title	Substantive	delete	Move this whole section into the text.	USA
ANNEX 1	[84]	Para	Substantive	Move to the end of section 2.2, after para (81)	This information does not fit in the non-compliance section because it occurs before non-compliance.	USA
ANNEX 1	[85]	Para	Substantive	Move to the end of section 2.2, after para (84)	This information does not fit in the non-compliance section because it occurs before non-compliance.	USA
1. Non-compliance	[86]	Title, add new section 3	substantive	Move to new section 3 in the text.	This is an integral part of systems approach. Non-compliance should be a separate section.	USA
1. Non-compliance	[87]	Para	Substantive	<p>Move under new section 3, with following modification:</p> <p>Non-compliance involves incorrect</p>	This is an integral part of systems approach. Non-compliance should be a separate section.	USA

1. Section	2. Paragraph number	3. sentence/row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment (Substantive, Editorial, Translation)	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
				implementation of the FF-SA operational procedures. Non-compliance may occur in one or more of the stages of the FF-SA (pre-planting, pre-harvest, and harvest, post-harvest and shipping <u>handling, or entry transportation</u> and distribution). It is important to identify in which stage or stages the non-compliance has occurred.	For consistency with comments on para (55).	
1.1 Non-compliance at the pre-harvest and harvest stage	[88]	Title	substantive	delete	For consistency with last comment on para (81)	USA
1.1 Non-compliance at the pre-harvest and harvest stage	[89]	Para	Substantive	Move under new section 3, after para (87), with the following modifications: In cases of non-compliance of operational procedures at <u>the pre-planting, pre-harvest or harvest stages</u> , the relevant site, place or area involved in the FF-SA may be suspended until the non-compliance has been rectified.	This is an integral part of systems approach. Non-compliance should be a separate section. For consistency with comments on para (55).	USA
1.2 Non-compliance at the post-harvest and shipping stage	[90]	Title	Substantive	delete	For consistency with last comment on para (81)	USA
1.2 Non-compliance at the post-harvest and shipping stage	[91]	Para	Substantive	Move under new section 3, after para (89) with the following modifications: In cases of non-compliance of operational procedures at the post-harvest and shipping <u>handling, or transportation and distribution</u> stages, the relevant stakeholders involved with treatment, packing or shipping under an FF-SA may be suspended until the non-compliance has been rectified.	This is an integral part of systems approach. Non-compliance should be a separate section. For consistency with comments on para (55).	USA
1.3 Non-compliance at entry and distribution	[92]	Title	Substantive	Delete	For consistency with last comment on para (81)	USA

1. Section	2. Paragraph number	3. sentence/row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment (Substantive, Editorial, Translation)	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
1.3 Non-compliance at entry and distribution	[93]	Para	Substantive	Move under new section 3, after para (91)	This is an integral part of systems approach. Non-compliance should be a separate section.	USA
2. Ongoing verification of the systems approach	[94]	title	substantive	Move to new subsection 2.3	This section does not deal with non-compliance. They are more related to the specific requirements of the systems approach and would be better suited as a subsection under 2.	USA
2. Ongoing verification of the systems approach	[95]	para	substantive	Move under new subsection 2.3	This section does not deal with non-compliance. They are more related to the specific requirements of the systems approach and would be better suited as a subsection under 2.	USA

INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE USE OF THE TEMPLATE

A template is provided to facilitate the submission and compilation of member comments. The instructions have been modified since last year; please review both the instructions and the examples. Paragraph numbers have been included in the draft standards, and each paragraph has a row in the template with the corresponding number. It is important to be accurate in allocating comments to paragraphs, since the compilation of comments will be done automatically and only based on paragraph numbers.

To facilitate compilation of comments and the work of the Standards Committee, please apply the following and refer to the table of examples below:

- do not add or delete columns, and do not change their width or formatting of the actual table.
- ensure that all comments refer to the appropriate section of the text and paragraph number.
- if proposals are made to add, delete or move paragraphs to the text of the standard, subsequent comments should continue to refer to the paragraph numbers used in the draft standard sent for consultation.
- only one type of comment should be made in each row of the template; when more than one type of comment needs to be made on the same paragraph, **insert a new row**, include all appropriate information (including paragraph number) and fill in your comment. **Do not use automatic numbering.**
- ensure that all cells of the row are completed when a comment is made.
- use formatting to indicate proposed additions (e.g. underline) and deletions (e.g. ~~striketrough~~), not tracked changes of the Word processor
- only include those sentences from the draft standard to display the suggested modifications. Do not include paragraphs or sentences for which no modifications are suggested.
- to provide a comment on a footnote, please enter it in a row with the number of the paragraph with which the footnote is associated.
- delete the rows of the template in which no comments are made.

Specific guidelines for each column in the template and examples of comments

General comments apply to the entirety of the standard. Comments on specific sections of the standard can be provided as described below.

1. Section

- This gives the titles of sections as they appear in the draft, plus a row for general comments. To propose changes to section titles, include new wording in the "proposed rewording" column.

2. Paragraph number (Para nber)

- To propose a new paragraph, add a row and qualify the paragraph number with a letter (e.g. 12a, to indicate that the new paragraph follows paragraph 12).
- To propose to move a paragraph, indicate the new location in the "proposed rewording" column (e.g. move paragraph 51 to after paragraph 47). **Do not alter the paragraph numbers.**

3. Sentence/row/indent, etc.

- Clearly identify the specific place in the paragraph, such as sentence, row of a table, indent, etc, where the comment applies (e.g. sentence 2, indent 5, row 2, footnote 3, figure 15, etc). Table rows have been also numbered similar to the paragraphs
- The text as circulated for consultation should be used as a basis for counting sentences, bullet points, etc. Please do not refer to page or line numbers as these may vary depending on the word processor used or language version of the draft.

4. Type of comment

Indicate whether the type of comment refers to one of the three choices: substantive, editorial, or translation. Please only use these keywords: Substantive, Editorial, Translation.

- substantive comments include technical comments. They take into account conceptual changes, addition of new aspects or ideas, scientific corrections and technical adjustments.
- editorial comments clarify or simplify the text without changing the meaning. This includes spelling or grammatical corrections, suggestions of different but equivalent words, and simplification of sentence structure.
- translation comments correct points that are considered to be inaccurately translated into another language version of the text.

5. Proposed rewording

Suggestions to change the text should always include proposed rewording. Modifications to the original text should be clearly identifiable (i.e. text that is added or deleted should appear in a distinct way from unchanged text). For example, text added can be underlined and text deleted can be ~~striked through~~ (with colours as appropriate). Tracked changes should not be used.

6. Explanation

Detailed explanations should give justification for the comment made and should be sufficient for the Standard Committee to understand the intention of the comment and the proposed rewording.

7. Country

- There should be only one name in this column.
- The country name should be indicated in every row for which a comment is made. The country name should be that of the country submitting the comments.
- Comments made on behalf of an organization (such as an RPPO) should include only the organization name, and not the names of the member countries.

Examples of comments using the template

1. Section	2. Para nber	3. Sentence/ row/indent, etc.	4. Type of comment (Substantive, Editorial, Translation) only	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation	7. Country
BACKGROUND	[9]	Sentence 1	Substantive	The main purpose of the IPPC is to protect <u>plants secure common and effective actions to prevent the spread and introduction of pests of plants and plant products</u>	To be consistent with the text of the IPPC.	COUNTRY NAME
BACKGROUND	[9]	Sentence 2	Editorial	In doing so, contracting parties undertake the promotion of appropriate measures for the control of <u>regulated</u> pests.	The scope of the IPPC addresses regulated pests.	COUNTRY NAME
BACKGROUND	[17]	Sentence 4	Editorial	Thus <u>Additionally</u> , while pursuing the	Clearer wording	COUNTRY NAME
1.4 Supervision activities	[26]	Sentence 3	Substantive	The FF-ALPP programme, including regulatory control <u>domestic regulation</u>	The term regulatory control is unclear and text should use specific terms clarifying what is meant.	COUNTRY NAME
1.4 Supervision activities	[32]	New 2nd indent	Substantive	- operation of surveillance procedures - fruit sampling - surveillance capability	Fruit sampling is necessary as part of surveillance	COUNTRY NAME
1.6 Tolerance level	[44a]	After para 44	Substantive	add new paragraph after 44: <u>For quarantine pests the tolerance level generally equals zero. Setting the level of detection to zero implies that all units of the consignment must be included in the sample. Hence, for quarantine pests, a detection level that is as small as technically possible approaches the zero tolerance level.</u>	to explain the particular situation for quarantine pests	COUNTRY NAME
3. Phytosanitary Risk Categories and Measures	[61]	Whole para	Editorial	Move para 61 to after para 47	More appropriate location.	COUNTRY NAME