


## 2025 First consultation: 01 – 30 September 2025

### Compiled comments for - Draft specification: Revision of ISPM 12 (Phytosanitary certificates) (2023-020)

T (Type) - B = Bullet, C = Comment, P = Proposed Change, R = Rating

FAO sequential number	Para	Text	T	Comment
1	G	(General Comment)	C	<b>Costa Rica</b> Costa Rica supports the revision of ISPM 12 to update outdated information, facilitate the transition to electronic phytosanitary certificates, and address the needs mainly of the seed sector, where re-export and multi-destination shipments require clearer procedures. It also proposes that the standard include guidelines for managing partial consignments, in order to avoid duplication of certificates, ensure traceability, and maintain phytosanitary compliance at all times. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
2	G	(General Comment)	C	<b>Brazil</b> Brazil agrees with comments submitted through COSAVE <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
3	G	(General Comment)	C	<b>Argentina</b> Argentina endorses the COSAVE comments to this draft <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
4	G	(General Comment)	C	<b>Barbados</b> Barbados has no objections to the proposed review and endorses the comments submitted by CAHFSA. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
5	G	(General Comment)	C	<b>Antigua and Barbuda</b> Antigua and Barbuda endorses the comments submitted by its RPPO (CAHFSA). <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
6	G	(General Comment)	C	<b>Peru</b> Peru endorses the COSAVE comments <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
7	G	(General Comment)	C	<b>Guyana</b> Guyana supports the proposal as presented. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
8	G	(General Comment)	C	<b>Australia</b> Australia agrees with all of the comments submitted on this specification through the PPPO that were developed through our regional workshop. To avoid duplication of comments, we have not resubmitted them all here. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
9	G	(General Comment)	C	<b>China</b> China supports the drafting instructions, with two main points. First, phytosanitary certificates should take into account the coexistence of electronic and paper certificates. Electronic


				phytosanitary certificates should also take into account the existing ePhyto and other systems and should not be unique or exclusive. Second, given the importance of this work, it is recommended that the working group be expanded to approximately 10 members, with consideration given to the representation of developing countries. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
10	G	(General Comment)	C	<b>Italy</b> Italy endorses the EPPO comments to this draft <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
11	G	(General Comment)	C	<b>Paraguay</b> We support the comments from COSAVE. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
12	G	(General Comment)	C	<b>United Kingdom</b> The United Kingdom endorses most the EPPO comments to this draft, where we have alternative comments these are made on the relevant paragraph. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
13	G	(General Comment)	C	<b>Caribbean Agricultural Health and Food Safety Agency</b> Belize has no comments to the standard and supports the review of the standard. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
14	G	(General Comment)	C	<b>Caribbean Agricultural Health and Food Safety Agency</b> Jamaica supports the revision of this standard Jamaica supports the revision of this ISPM and look forward to the alignment of this standard with other ISPMs for greater consistency.  Jamaica proposes a clear distinction be made between the Inspection date and the issuance date. Also, proposing the implementation of Inspection date(s) to be captured in the tasks of the EWG <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
15	G	(General Comment)	C	 <b>Guyana</b> <b>Caribbean Agricultural Health and Food Safety Agency</b> Guyana supports the proposal as presented. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
16	G	(General Comment)	C	<b>Caribbean Agricultural Health and Food Safety Agency</b> Antigua and Barbuda supports this proposal to take into consideration rapid changes (technological and otherwise) taking place that may not have been considered - or not adequately catered for - by ISPM 12 in its current form. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
17	G	(General Comment)	C	<b>Japan</b> Paragraph 25 states that the revision needs to "separate requirements from implementation and guidance information". Japan requests that the revised standard be organized to make it easier to use for NPPO officers. If the guidance information and requirements are separated and

				difficult to refer both of them at the same time, it may cause additional work and errors when conducting import or export phytosanitary inspection. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
18	G	(General Comment)	C	<b>European Union</b> The EU and its 27 Member States endorse the EPPO comments to this draft. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
19	G	(General Comment)	C	<b>EPPO</b> EPPO believes that an important task of the EWG is to ensure that the Ephyto format is aligned with the phytosanitary certificate as outlined in the Convention and the revision should not include additional obligations, tasks and other issues which are outside of the scope of the convention. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
20	G	(General Comment)	C	<b>Malaysia</b> Malaysia supports the revision of ISPM 12 and the regional comments submitted by the APPPC <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
21	G	(General Comment)	C	<b>India</b> India agrees with the new draft specification for ISPM 12 and also added change which are written in the document. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
22	G	(General Comment)	C	<b>Thailand</b> 1. Thailand supports the draft specification for ISPM 12 revision, with a few suggestions included in the document. 2. Thailand supports the regional comments from the APPPC. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
23	G	(General Comment)	C	<b>Singapore</b> 1. Singapore supports the proposed revision of ISPM 12. 2. Singapore supports the regional comments from the APPPC. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
24	G	(General Comment)	C	<b>Uruguay</b> Uruguay supports COSAVE comments <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
25	G	(General Comment)	C	<b>IPPC Regional Workshop Africa</b> The proposed revision of ISPM 12 is supported. The transition to electronic phytosanitary certificates is timely and essential for improving the efficiency of international phytosanitary certification.  Clarification on the tasks of reviewing the ISPM is of utmost importance.  The revision of ISPM 12 holds critical importance for Seed industry, where consignments are frequently re-exported multiple times to meet diverse market requirements. In such complex trade flows, a single seed lot may require different official

			<p>additional phytosanitary declarations for multiple destination countries. While the current ISPM 12 does make provision for these scenarios, it does not fully address how such declarations should be added, verified, and transferred during re-export while maintaining legal validity, traceability, and compliance. It also allows exporters to provide this information without it being officially submitted by a National Plant Protection Organisation (NPPO).</p> <p>The updated standard will clarify procedures for incorporating multi-destination phytosanitary information, harmonise approaches between exporting and re-exporting NPPOs, and improve compatibility with the ePhyto system. This will reduce clearance delays, safeguard market access, and protect the quality and reputation of South African seed exports. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i></p>
26	G	(General Comment)	<p>C <b>IPPC Regional Workshop Africa</b> The revised draft should state measures and what step that the NPPO should take when it comes to re-export inspection. As well as provide tools/protocols a standardized verification protocol for all NPPOs to determine fraud phytosanitary certificates especially QR Codes and watermarking. <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i></p>
27	G	(General Comment)	<p>C <b>Philippines</b> It is important to highlight the need to make the features of electronic phytosanitary certificates (ePhyto) more consistent across countries. This includes using the same formats, required information, and security measures, so that systems can work together easily and certificates are trusted and understood internationally. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i></p>
28	G	(General Comment)	<p>C <b>New Zealand</b> 1. New Zealand supports the full revision of ISPM 12. 2. New Zealand supports the regional comments submitted by APPPC and PPPO. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i></p>
29	G	(General Comment)	<p>C <b>South Africa</b> The proposed revision of ISPM 12 is supported. The transition to electronic phytosanitary certificates is timely and essential for improving the efficiency of international phytosanitary certification.</p> <p>Clarification on the tasks of reviewing the ISPM is of utmost importance.</p> <p>The revision of ISPM 12 holds critical importance for South Africa's seed industry, where consignments are frequently re-exported multiple times to meet diverse market requirements. In such</p>

				<p>complex trade flows, a single seed lot may require different official additional phytosanitary declarations for multiple destination countries. While the current ISPM 12 does make provision for these scenarios, it does not fully address how such declarations should be added, verified, and transferred during re-export while maintaining legal validity, traceability, and compliance. It also allows exporters to provide this information without it being officially submitted by a National Plant Protection Organisation (NPPO).</p> <p>The updated standard will clarify procedures for incorporating multi-destination phytosanitary information, harmonise approaches between exporting and re-exporting NPPOs, and improve compatibility with the ePhyto system. This will reduce clearance delays, safeguard market access, and protect the quality and reputation of South African seed exports. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i></p>
30	G	(General Comment)	C	<p><b>Argentina</b> Argentina apoya los comentarios del COSAVE sobre este proyecto <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i></p>
31	G	(General Comment)	C	<p><b>Panama</b> Panamá está de acuerdo con: 1. la tarea de garantizar una mayor claridad, que facilite una mejor implementación de la norma. 2. la actualización de los requisitos de seguridad para la detección de certificados fraudulentos; no obstante, que sea considerada la capacidad de implementación por las partes contratantes. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i></p>
32	G	(General Comment)	C	<p><b>Guatemala</b> Armonizar la transición de papel a digital e implementar el uso de e-phyto. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i></p>
33	G	(General Comment)	C	<p><b>Mali</b> La révision est nécessaire pour harmoniser les pratiques en matière de validité des certificats. Le Mali soutient cette révision <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i></p>
34	G	(General Comment)	C	<p><b>Congo</b> la République du Congo est pour la révision, mais elle voudrait que les raisons qui poussent à la révision soient spécifiées ici. Quand on parcourt la section "justification de la révision" les raisons énumérées n'expriment pas de façon claire le problème ou les problèmes à résoudre. exemple: -le 1er tiret de cette section dit ceci: "faire valoir la simplicité d'utilisation de la norme auprès des parties contractantes": la phrase ne montre pas ce qui rend difficile l'utilisation cette NIMP. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i></p>

35	G	(General Comment)	C	<b>Cote d'Ivoire</b> La révision s'avère nécessaire. Le projet de texte peut être adopté. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
36	G	(General Comment)	C	<b>Gabon</b> Nous validons la révision de la NIMP 12 car plusieurs points doivent être revus. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
37	1	<b>DRAFT SPECIFICATION FOR ISPM: Revision of ISPM 12 (Phytosanitary certificates) (2023-020)</b>	C	<b>Russian Federation</b> General Comment: The Russian Federation would like to formally endorse the EPPO comments submitted via the IPPC Online Comment System <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
38	1	<b>DRAFT SPECIFICATION FOR ISPM: Revision of ISPM 12 (Phytosanitary certificates) (2023-020)</b>	C	<b>Tunisia</b> Tunisia endorses NEPP's comments on this draft <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
39	1	<b>DRAFT SPECIFICATION FOR ISPM: Revision of ISPM 12 (Phytosanitary certificates) (2023-020)</b>	C	<b>NEPP</b> The review should take into account the challenges faced by developing countries in transitioning to electronic certificates. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
40	1	<b>DRAFT SPECIFICATION FOR ISPM: Revision of ISPM 12 (Phytosanitary certificates) (2023-020)</b>	C	<b>Malawi</b> We support the Draft specification <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
41	1	<b>PROJET DE SPÉCIFICATION POUR UNE NIMP: Révision de la NIMP 12 (Certificats phytosanitaires) (2023-020)</b>	C	<b>Cameroon</b> Le Cameroun supporte cette révision. Elle est opportune et permettra de consolider et harmoniser un ensemble de pratiques notamment, la validité des certificats, les pièces jointes, les certificats électroniques, les signatures dans les certificats phytosanitaires électroniques, les pièces jointes, etc. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
42	3	This is not an official part of the specification and it will be modified by the IPPC Secretariat after approval.	P	<b>Nepal</b> <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
43	7	<del>Draft specification for an ISPM</del> <u>International Standard for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPM)</u>	P	<b>Colombia</b> COMMENT AND EXPLANATION: The meaning of an acronym must be in capital letters, the first letter of each word. <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
44	7	Proyecto de especificación para una Norma <del>internacional-Internacional</del> para <del>medidas fitosanitarias-Medidas Fitosanitarias</del> (NIMF)	P	<b>OIRSA</b> <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
45	7	Proyecto de especificación para una Norma <del>internacional-Internacional</del> para <del>medidas fitosanitarias-Medidas Fitosanitarias</del> (NIMF)	P	<b>Colombia</b> COMENTARIO Y EXPLICACIÓN: El significado de una sigla debe ir en letra mayúscula la primera letra de cada palabra. <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
46	22	A focused revision of ISPM 12 (Phytosanitary certificates) was recently undertaken in relation to re-export and the revised ISPM was adopted by the Sixteenth Session of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures in 2022.	P	<b>Canada</b> The phytosanitary certificate is already harmonized as it is in the text of the IPPC; additional suggested text provides clarity for the

		However, this revision did not address other issues that could further assist with the harmonization <a href="#">for the preparation and issuance</a> of phytosanitary certificates. A revision of ISPM 12 is therefore needed to:		rationale of this revision. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
47	24	clarify and update requirements to reflect current operational processes of national plant protection organizations (NPPOs) and support the maintenance and harmonization of paper certificates during the transition to electronic phytosanitary certificates (ePhytos);	C	<b>Belarus</b> We consider it is necessary to clarify the requirements for electronic phytosanitary certificates issued through the ePhyto system addressed to countries not connected to ePhyto <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
48	24	clarify and update requirements to reflect current operational processes of national plant protection organizations (NPPOs) and support the maintenance and harmonization of paper certificates during the transition to electronic phytosanitary certificates (ePhytos);	C	<b>United Kingdom</b> The United Kingdom endorses the EPPO comment #73 but adds the following clarification. It is important to clarify that a document downloaded from the ePhyto cannot be considered as a Phytosanitary Certificate unless it complies with the requirements in ISPM 12, for example it should be based on the model certificates in the IPPC, should be signed and dated, it should not be assumed that all countries will accept the use of QR codes in-lieu of signatures.  We stress that although the intention is for all contracting parties to eventual use ePhyto this is unlikely to be the case for the foreseeable future, as such it is not appropriate to base the revision of this ISPM on the concept of transition from paper PCs to ePhyto. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
49	24	clarify and update requirements to reflect current operational processes of national plant protection organizations (NPPOs) and support the maintenance and harmonization of paper certificates <del>during the transition to</del> <u>and</u> electronic phytosanitary certificates (ePhytos);	P	 <b>Belarus</b> <b>EPPO</b> We consider it is necessary to clarify the status of electronic phytosanitary certificates issued through the ePhyto system and addressed to countries not connected to ePhyto. There is a need to clarify that certificates printed from ePhyto are not valid phytosanitary certificates.  Paper phytosanitary certificates will still need to be issued in certain circumstances, e.g. travellers with personal consignments. We propose deleting 'during transition' to make it clearer. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
50	24	clarify and update requirements to reflect current operational processes of national plant protection organizations (NPPOs) and support the maintenance and harmonization of paper <u>and and digital</u> certificates during the transition to electronic phytosanitary certificates (ePhytos);	P	<b>Eswatini</b>  <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
51	25	<del>separate requirements from implementation and guidance information; and</del>	P	<b>EPPO</b> We disagree with starting separate requirements from guidance information, without having proper conclusions and outputs from the on-going discussion on 'Rethinking ISPMs'. No consensus has been found on whether ISPMs should only include what are considered as 'requirements'.

				Category : SUBSTANTIVE
52	26	<del>provide clear requirements for contracting parties on the following scenarios:</del>	P	<b>Japan</b> The reasons are as follows: (i) Adding requirements on the scenarios [27] and [28] may require consideration, including amendments to the Annexes of the IPPC text. However, adding these requirements are not high priority issues, and there is no need to make changes. (ii) When multiple inspections have occurred, it may be difficult to harmonize inspections date records because countries may recognize the inspection dates of multiple inspections in different ways (e.g., recording the entire duration of a multi-day inspection, or recording the last day of a multi-day inspection). Category : SUBSTANTIVE
53	27	<del>re-export of products after an extended period in secure storage, and</del>	P	<b>Japan</b> The same reason as [26] Category : SUBSTANTIVE
54	28	inclusion of inspection dates on phytosanitary certificates when multiple inspections have occurred.	C	<b>Belarus</b> We consider it unnecessary to include inspection dates in the phytosanitary certificate as a general practice. We propose that inspection dates be recorded in the phytosanitary certificate only in exceptional cases (in accordance with point 4 of ISPM 12) Category : TECHNICAL
55	28	<del>inclusion of inspection dates on phytosanitary certificates when multiple inspections have occurred.</del>	P	<b>Japan</b> The same reason as [26] Category : SUBSTANTIVE
56	28	<u>When required by an importing country, clarify which inclusion of inspection dates should be included on phytosanitary certificates when multiple inspections have occurred.</u>	P	<b>EPPO</b> We consider it unnecessary to systematically include inspection dates in the phytosanitary certificate as a general practice. This introduces unnecessary constraints without adding value to the certification process. See our proposal for the wording of this paragraph. Category : TECHNICAL
57	28	<del>inclusion of inspection dates on phytosanitary certificates when multiple inspections have occurred.</del>	P	<b>Colombia</b> COMMENT AND EXPLANATION: It is necessary to have that the visits are carried out by other technical areas and depending on the phytosanitary requirement, there can be several visits and it is considered that including all the dates affects more time for the certification process in the Ports, Airports and Border Passes (PAPF). In addition, it is understood that if it is certified, it is because the requirements demanded by the country of destination are met. Category : TECHNICAL
58	28	la inclusión de las fechas de inspección en los certificados fitosanitarios cuando se han realizado múltiples inspecciones.	C	<b>OIRSA</b> Este ítem se refiere a un aspecto de reexportación ?? ampliar o clarificar el párrafo. Category : TECHNICAL
59	28	la inclusión de las fechas de inspección en los certificados fitosanitarios cuando se	C	<b>IPPC Regional Workshop Latin America</b> Este ítem se refiere a un aspecto de reexportación ?? ampliar o




		han realizado múltiples inspecciones.		clarificar el párrafo. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
60	28	<u>COMENTARIO Y EXPLICACIÓN: Es necesario tener que las visitas las realizan otras áreas técnicas y dependiendo del requisito fitosanitario, pueden ser varias visitas y se considera que incluir todas las fechas incide en más tiempo para el proceso de certificación en los Puertos, Aeropuertos o Pasos terrestres de Frontera. Además, se entiende que si se certifica es porque el envío cumple con los requisitos exigidos por el país de destino. la inclusión de las fechas de inspección en los certificados fitosanitarios cuando se han realizado múltiples inspecciones.</u>	P	<b>Colombia</b>  <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
61	30	The revision of ISPM 12 should be a complete <u>revision review</u> to update and modernize the standard. <del>All revisions are within the scope.</del> Potential revisions include, but are not limited to: updating out-of-date information; clarifying some aspects of re-export requirements; clarifying what additional phytosanitary information may be included on phytosanitary certificates; clarifying the options for issuing phytosanitary certificates in paper or electronic form; and separating requirements from implementation and guidance material to provide contracting parties with a standard that is clear and easy to use.	P	<b>Canada</b> Improve readability <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
62	30	The revision of ISPM 12 should be a complete revision to update and modernize the standard. All revisions are within the scope. Potential revisions include, but are not limited to: updating out-of-date information; clarifying some aspects of re-export requirements; clarifying what additional phytosanitary information may be included on phytosanitary certificates; clarifying the options for issuing phytosanitary certificates in paper or electronic form; and separating requirements from implementation and guidance material to provide contracting parties with a standard that is clear and easy to use.	C	<b>United Kingdom</b> It is important for the EWG to consider if additional phytosanitary information should be included on a PC. However it is imperative that this is limited to only phytosanitary information, for example (as in the current version) statements or attachments related to CITES, letters of credit, bills of lading should continue to NOT be considered part of a Phytosanitary Certificate. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
63	30	The revision of ISPM 12 should be a complete revision to update and modernize the standard. All revisions are within the scope. Potential revisions include, but are not limited to: updating out-of-date information; clarifying some aspects of re-export requirements; clarifying what additional phytosanitary information may be included on phytosanitary certificates; clarifying the options for issuing phytosanitary certificates in paper or electronic form; and separating requirements from implementation and guidance material to provide contracting parties with a standard that is clear and easy to use.	C	<b>United Kingdom</b> This is an important task for the EWG. The EWG should devote sufficient time to allow for the identification and separation of guidance material from requirements/obligations. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
64	30	The revision of ISPM 12 should <del>be a complete revision to</del> update and modernize the standard. <del>All revisions are within the scope. Potential revisions include, but are not limited to:</del> <u>This revision should cover</u> updating out-of-date information; clarifying some aspects of re-export requirements; clarifying what additional phytosanitary information may be included on phytosanitary certificates; clarifying	P	<b>EPPO</b> Simplified English for the first two sentences.  EPPO recommends that the 'scope' is aligned with the 'tasks' listed in the specification and revised as below – the scope currently includes concepts which are not mentioned in the tasks.

		the options for issuing phytosanitary certificates in paper or electronic form; <del>and separating requirements from implementation and guidance material to provide contracting parties with a standard that is clear and easy to use.</del>		As for paragraph 25, we disagree with starting to separate requirements from guidance information, without having proper conclusions and outputs from the on-going discussion on 'Rethinking ISPMs'.. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
65	30	The revision of ISPM 12 should be a complete revision to update and modernize the standard. <del>All revisions are within the scope. Potential revisions include</del> <u>The revision includes</u> , but <del>are-is</del> not limited to: updating out-of-date information; clarifying some aspects of re-export requirements; clarifying what additional phytosanitary information may be included on phytosanitary certificates; clarifying the options for issuing phytosanitary certificates in paper or electronic form; and separating requirements from implementation and guidance material to provide contracting parties with a standard that is clear and easy to use.	P	<b>COSAVE</b> The specification is for a complete revision of ISPM 12 that includes "updating out of date information, clarifying some .....", obviously all within the scope of ISPM 12 <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
66	30	<del>The revision of ISPM 12 should be a complete revision to update and modernize the standard. All revisions are within the scope. Potential revisions include, but are not limited to: updating out of date information; clarifying some aspects of re-export requirements; clarifying what additional phytosanitary information may be included on phytosanitary certificates; clarifying the options for issuing phytosanitary certificates in paper or electronic form; and separating requirements from implementation and guidance material to provide contracting parties with a standard that is clear and easy to use.</del> <u>The revision of ISPM 12 is a comprehensive revision aimed at modernising the standard and facilitating the transition to electronic phytosanitary certificates, while maintaining compatibility with paper-based systems during the transition period.</u>	P	<b>Colombia</b> COMMENT AND EXPLANATION: There is conceptual redundancy between the description of the "Scope" and the specific "Tasks". Both sections address similar elements such as updating outdated information and clarifying requirements, which may lead to confusion about the differentiation between the general scope and the specific activities of the EWG. Therefore, it would be necessary to reorganize this paragraph to focus on the general conceptual scope. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
67	30	<u>La revisión de la NIMF 12 constituye una revisión integral orientada a modernizar la norma y facilitar la transición hacia certificados fitosanitarios electrónicos, manteniendo la compatibilidad con sistemas en papel durante el período de transición.. La revisión incluye, entre otras, las siguientes: la actualización de la información obsoleta; la aclaración de algunos aspectos de los requisitos de reexportación; la aclaración de la información fitosanitaria adicional que podrá incluirse en los certificados fitosanitarios; la aclaración de las opciones de expedición de certificados fitosanitarios en papel o en forma electrónica; y la separación entre los requisitos y el material de aplicación y de orientación a fin de ofrecer a las partes contratantes una norma clara y fácil de utilizar.</u> <del>La revisión de la NIMF 12 debería ser una revisión completa con el fin de actualizar y modernizar la norma. Todas las revisiones se enmarcan dentro del ámbito. Las posibles revisiones incluyen, entre otras, las siguientes: la actualización de la información obsoleta; la aclaración de algunos aspectos de los requisitos de reexportación; la aclaración de</del>	P	<b>IPPC Regional Workshop Latin America</b> La especificación es para una revisión completa que incluye entre otras cosas la actualización de información obsoleta, aclaración etc. Obviamente todas dentro del ámbito de la NIMF 12  COMENTARIO Y EXPLICACIÓN: Existe redundancia conceptual entre la descripción del "Ámbito" y las "Tareas" específicas. Ambas secciones abordan elementos similares como, lo que puede generar confusión sobre la diferenciación entre el alcance general y las actividades específicas del GTE. Por lo anterior, sería necesario reorganizar este párrafo para enfocarse en el alcance conceptual general. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>

		<del>la información fitosanitaria adicional que podrá incluirse en los certificados fitosanitarios; la aclaración de las opciones de expedición de certificados fitosanitarios en papel o en forma electrónica; y la separación entre los requisitos y el material de aplicación y de orientación a fin de ofrecer a las partes contratantes una norma clara y fácil de utilizar.</del>		
68	30	<del>La revisión de la NIMF 12 debería ser una revisión completa con el fin de actualizar y modernizar la norma. Todas las revisiones se enmarcan dentro del ámbito. Las posibles revisiones incluyen, entre otras, las siguientes: la actualización de la información obsoleta; la aclaración de algunos aspectos de los requisitos de reexportación; la aclaración de la información fitosanitaria adicional que podrá incluirse en los certificados fitosanitarios; la aclaración de las opciones de expedición de certificados fitosanitarios en papel o en forma electrónica; y la separación entre los requisitos y el material de aplicación y de orientación a fin de ofrecer a las partes contratantes una norma clara y fácil de utilizar.</del> La revisión de la NIMF 12 constituye una revisión integral orientada a modernizar la norma y facilitar la transición hacia certificados fitosanitarios electrónicos, manteniendo la compatibilidad con sistemas en papel durante el período de transición.	P	<b>Colombia</b> COMENTARIO Y EXPLICACIÓN: Existe redundancia conceptual entre la descripción del "Ámbito" y las "Tareas" específicas. Ambas secciones abordan elementos similares como, lo que puede generar confusión sobre la diferenciación entre el alcance general y las actividades específicas del GTE. Por lo anterior, sería necesario reorganizar este párrafo para enfocarse en el alcance conceptual general. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
69	30	La révision de la NIMP 12 devrait être <b>une révision complète afin de mettre à jour et de moderniser la norme.</b> Toutes les révisions entrent dans le champ d'application. Les révisions potentielles concernent, entre autres, les points suivants: actualiser les informations, préciser certains aspects des exigences en matière de réexportation, indiquer quelles sont les informations phytosanitaires supplémentaires qui peuvent figurer sur les certificats phytosanitaires, préciser les modalités de délivrance des certificats phytosanitaires sur papier ou par voie électronique et distinguer les exigences des informations relatives à la mise en œuvre et aux éléments d'orientation afin de fournir aux parties contractantes une norme claire et facile d'utilisation.	C	<b>IPPC Regional Workshop Africa</b> Excellente idée compte tenu de la nouvelle technologie de certification <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
70	32	The purpose of the revision of ISPM 12 is to enhance implementation of, and compliance with, the standard to support international trade, the harmonization of phytosanitary certificates in paper and electronic form, and the transition to phytosanitary certificates in electronic form.	C	<b>Senegal</b> Je pense qu'il faut une autre mise en cohérence avec les autres normes notamment NIMP 5 – Glossaire, NIMP 7, NIMP 20 NIMP 38 mais prendre compte de E-Phyto pour une meilleure harmonisation des certificats <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
71	32	The purpose of the revision of ISPM 12 is to enhance implementation of, and compliance with, the standard to support international <del>trade</del> <b>trade of plant, plant products and regulated articles</b> , the harmonization of phytosanitary certificates in paper and electronic form, and <b>facilitate and encourage</b> the transition to phytosanitary certificates in electronic form.	P	<b>NEPPO</b> <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
72	32	The purpose of the revision of ISPM 12 is to enhance implementation <del>of</del> <b>of ISPM</b>	P	<b>United States of America</b> The phrase 'enhance implementation' is vague. Specify how

		<u>12 by promoting harmonized certification practices, supporting NPPO capacity development, and facilitating electronic certification. This revision aims to improve compliance with, with the standard to support international trade, the harmonization of phytosanitary certificates in paper and electronic form, and the transition to phytosanitary certificates in electronic form.</u>		enhancement will be achieved. <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
73	32	The purpose of the revision of ISPM 12 is to enhance implementation of, and compliance with, the standard to support <u>and facilitate</u> international trade, the harmonization of phytosanitary certificates in paper and electronic form, and the transition to phytosanitary certificates in electronic form.	P	<b>Egypt</b> <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
74	32	<del>La finalidad de la revisión de la NIMP 12 es mejorar la aplicación y el cumplimiento de la norma en apoyo del comercio internacional, la armonización de los certificados fitosanitarios en papel y en forma electrónica y la transición hacia el uso de certificados fitosanitarios en forma electrónica. La revisión de la NIMP 12 tiene como finalidad fortalecer su aplicación y cumplimiento, apoyando el comercio internacional mediante la armonización de los certificados fitosanitarios tanto en formato impreso como electrónico, facilitando la transición hacia el uso generalizado de certificados fitosanitarios electrónicos e incorporando mecanismos de seguridad —como códigos QR, marcas de agua o sistemas de verificación con luz ultravioleta— para reducir el riesgo de falsificación.</del>	P	<b>Guatemala</b> vale la pena agregar los mecanismos de seguridad para evitar la falsificación de documentos en físico <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
75	32	L'objectif de la révision de la NIMP 12 est <del>d'améliorer la d'améliorer sa mise en œuvre et le respect de la norme-œuvre</del> , afin de <del>soutenir les échanges internationaux, soutenir</del> l'harmonisation des certificats phytosanitaires sur support papier et <del>en</del> version électronique et <u>d'accélérer</u> le passage <del>à des aux</del> certificats phytosanitaires électroniques.	P	<b>Congo</b> les échanges internationaux ne sont pas seulement soutenus par la NIMP 12, il y en a d'autres, tels que la NIMP 23. En plus, la facilitation des échanges ne constitue pas une conséquence, c'est un but que veulent atteindre les parties contractantes <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
76	33	<b>Tasks</b>	C	<b>Belarus</b> We consider it necessary to revise the wording of point 2.2. The previous formulation of this point in ISPM 12 was more appropriate (text in Russian). In particular, we propose to revert to the following wording in the first paragraph of the aforementioned point: "...и должна проводиться только в НОКЗР страны, выдавшей заменяемый фитосанитарный сертификат". <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
77	34	<u>The expert working group (EWG) should undertake the following tasks:</u>	C	<b>China</b> Promote the unification of encoding rules for phytosanitary certificate numbers among countries. Promote the unification of encoding rules for phytosanitary certificate numbers among countries. ISPM12 (International Standard for Phytosanitary Measures No. 12) only requires that each exported phytosanitary certificate must have a unique identification number that allows traceability to the consignment for auditing and record-keeping purposes. However, it does not mandate uniform encoding rules across countries. This has proven insufficient for current electronic certificate management systems. During subsequent use,

				<p>especially in pandemic-related reporting, it has been observed that some countries use a mix of letters, punctuation marks, and other symbols in their certificate numbers, while others employ two sets of identifiers. This issue is particularly prevalent in handwritten certificates, often leading to confusion and errors during data entry. It is recommended to promote the standardization of phytosanitary certificate number encoding rules through the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC). For instance, import-export phytosanitary certificate numbers could be defined as "Year + Three-letter Country Code + Fixed Digits" (e.g., 2025CHN000001) or "Year + World Port Code + Fixed Digits." This would significantly facilitate the standardized use of phytosanitary certificates at ports, enable automated electronic transmission, support automatic recognition, comparison, and verification of certificates.</p> <p><i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i></p>
78	34	The expert working group (EWG) should undertake the following tasks: <a href="#">New task: Review the text of ISPM 12 to update out-of-date information</a>	P	<p><b>COSAVE</b></p> <p>New task: a first general task added</p> <p><i>Category : TECHNICAL</i></p>
79	34	El Grupo de trabajo de expertos (GTE) debería acometer las siguientes tareas: <a href="#">Nueva tarea: Examinar la NIMF 12 para actualizar la información obsoleta</a>	P	<p><b>IPPC Regional Workshop Latin America</b></p> <p>Se agrega como tarea general al GTE</p> <p><i>Category : TECHNICAL</i></p>
80	34	El Grupo de trabajo de expertos (GTE) debería acometer las siguientes tareas:	C	<p><b>Ecuador</b></p> <p>En casos donde el producto no haya sido inspeccionado recientemente por la ONPF reexportadora, o cuando ha estado almacenado por largo tiempo, sería útil contar con directrices sobre si debe realizarse una nueva inspección, bajo qué condiciones y con qué respaldo documental.</p> <p>Ingresar nueva tarea: Incluir directrices claras sobre inspección previa al embarque en reexportación.</p> <p><i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i></p>
81	34	El Grupo de trabajo de expertos (GTE) debería acometer las siguientes tareas:	C	<p><b>Ecuador</b></p> <p>Para facilitar la transición al ePhyto y asegurar la aceptación mutua entre países, sería útil proponer lineamientos sobre cómo validar equivalencias entre formatos (por ejemplo, un ePhyto impreso que conserve validez ante una ONPF importadora).</p> <p>Ingresar nueva tarea: Establecer criterios para el reconocimiento mutuo entre certificados en papel y electrónicos</p> <p><i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i></p>
82	35	Review requirements for phytosanitary certificates for re-export to <del>ensure better</del> <a href="#">improve</a> clarity and consistency, including certificates for the re-export of regulated articles that may have been securely stored for an extended period.	P	<p><b>Canada</b></p> <p>Improves clarity</p> <p><i>Category : EDITORIAL</i></p>
83	35	Review requirements for phytosanitary certificates for re-export to ensure better clarity and consistency, including certificates for the re-export of regulated articles	P	<p><b>United States of America</b></p> <p>Harmonizing this guidance among NPPOs would be helpful</p> <p><i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i></p>

		that may have been securely stored for an extended period. <a href="#">New task: Provide guidance on issuing re-export certificates when an error by the first issuing country is identified.</a>		
84	35	Review requirements for phytosanitary certificates for re-export to ensure better clarity and consistency, <del>including certificates in particular those</del> for <del>the re-export of</del> regulated articles that may have been <del>securely</del> stored for an extended period.	P	<b>EPPO</b> Simplified English for clarity and avoid confusion. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
85	35	Review requirements for phytosanitary certificates for re-export to ensure better clarity and consistency, including certificates for the re-export of regulated articles that may have been securely stored for an extended period.	C	<b>Thailand</b> Thailand would like to suggest that the description of secure storage be clarified clearer, as well as the categories of commodities that fall under long-term storage and re-export scenarios. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
86	35	Review requirements for phytosanitary certificates for re-export to ensure better clarity and consistency, including certificates for the re-export of regulated articles that may have been securely stored for an extended period.	C	<b>Philippines</b> The Philippines recommends that the revision of ISPM 12 take into account several important elements related to phytosanitary certificates. First, the guidelines should clearly define the extended timeframe allowed for the re-export of regulated articles, along with any related conditions. It should also emphasize the importance of including both the issue date and the inspection date on the phytosanitary certificate, as these are vital for proper tracking and compliance checks. In addition, the revision may consider providing a clear definition of the validity period of an issued phytosanitary certificate to avoid uncertainty in its acceptance. Finally, it would be beneficial to require both the gross and net weight of shipments to be indicated, as this would enhance accuracy and facilitate trade verification. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
87	35	Review requirements for phytosanitary certificates for re-export to ensure better clarity and consistency, including certificates for the re-export of regulated articles that may have been securely stored for an extended period.	C	<b>Kuwait</b> Some plant species are listed under CITES, and the CITES Certificate is approved by some countries as a replacement of the Phytosanitary Certificate. This matter should be addressed with details in ISPM 12. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
88	35	Review requirements for phytosanitary certificates for re-export to ensure better clarity and consistency, including certificates for the re-export of regulated articles that may have been securely stored for an extended period. <a href="#">New task: Review considerations for issuing a phytosanitary certificate for export in certain re-export cases (for example when country of re-export does not require a PC but country of final destination does require one)</a>	P	 <b>Costa Rica</b> <b>COSAVE</b> These cases occur in trade, and ISPM 12 does not provide specific guidelines. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
89	35	Review requirements for phytosanitary certificates for re-export to ensure better clarity and consistency, including certificates for the re-export of regulated articles that may have been securely stored for an extended period.	C	<b>Egypt</b> The EWG should clarify the "extended period" for instance up to 6 month or one year , in addition to consideration of different commodities ( eg. Wood , Grains ..etc ) <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>



90	35	Examinar los requisitos para los certificados fitosanitarios de reexportación a fin de garantizar una mayor claridad y coherencia, en particular los certificados para la reexportación de los artículos reglamentados que puedan haberse almacenado de forma segura durante un período prolongado.	C	<b>Panama</b> La redacción no aclara el tiempo, las condiciones de almacenamiento de forma segura ni quien los determina. ¿Existen antecedentes sobre casos en que hayan presentado inconformidades respecto a almacenamientos de este tipo? <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
91	35	Examinar los requisitos para los certificados fitosanitarios de reexportación a fin de garantizar una mayor claridad y coherencia, en particular los certificados para la reexportación de los artículos reglamentados que puedan haberse almacenado de forma segura durante un período prolongado. <u>(2) Examinar las consideraciones para la expedición de certificados fitosanitarios de exportación en algunos casos de re-exportación (por ejemplo cuando el país de re-exportación no requiere un Certificado Fitosanitario pero el país de destino final si lo requiere</u>	P	<b>IPPC Regional Workshop Latin America</b> Estos casos se presentan en el comercio y la NIMF 12 no brinda directrices específicas <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
92	36	Review the security and authentication requirements for phytosanitary certificates (e.g. security of wet and printed signatures, identifying fraudulent and invalid certificates, the use of QR codes and other online validation tools) and update the requirements as necessary.	P	<b>Caribbean Agricultural Health and Food Safety Agency</b> Insert a third task requiring the inclusion of the shipping container seal number, where applicable, as an additional declaration following inspection for export and re-export, as a means to maintain phytosanitary integrity of a shipment. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
93	36	Review the security and authentication requirements for phytosanitary certificates (e.g. security of wet and printed signatures, identifying fraudulent and invalid certificates, the use of QR codes and other online validation tools) and update the requirements as necessary.	C	<b>NEPPO</b> Provide guidance on actions to be taken if a certificate is confirmed as invalid (e.g., referring to non-compliance notifications - ISPM 13). <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
94	36	Review the security and authentication requirements for phytosanitary certificates (e.g. security of wet and printed signatures, identifying fraudulent and invalid certificates, the use of QR codes and other online validation tools) and update the requirements as necessary. <u>New task : Provide emergency measures in the event of a shutdown of the Ephyto exchange system due to maintenance or other reasons</u>	P	<b>NEPPO</b>  <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
95	36	Review the security and authentication requirements for phytosanitary certificates (e.g. security of wet and printed signatures, identifying fraudulent and invalid certificates, the use of QR codes and other online validation <del>tools</del> tools, placing a <u>sample of the phytosanitary certificate's format on the IPP</u> ) and update the requirements as necessary.	P	<b>Japan</b> The existing ISPM 12 encourages contracting parties to place a sample of phytosanitary certificate's format on the IPP, but many countries have not posted the latest format on the IPP. If the latest format are placed on the IPP, it would be easier to verify phytosanitary certificates for importing countries. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
96	36	Review the security and authentication requirements for phytosanitary certificates (e.g. security of wet and printed signatures, identifying fraudulent and invalid certificates, the use of QR codes and other online validation <del>tools</del> ) and update the <del>requirements as necessary</del> tools).	P	<b>Japan</b> Japan considers it more important to transition from paper phytosanitary certificates to ePhyto to ensure security than to update requirement on security and authentication for phytosanitary certificates. If highly technical requirements are set on authentication for phytosanitary certificates, such as an "online authentication system using QR codes," it may be necessary to revise the system for issuing phytosanitary certificates, which

				could impose a significant burden on contracting parties. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
97	36	Review the security and authentication requirements for phytosanitary certificates (e.g. security of wet and printed signatures, identifying fraudulent and invalid certificates, the use of <del>QR-2D</del> codes and other online validation tools) and update the requirements as necessary.	P	<b>Japan</b> QR Code is a registered trademark of DENSO WAVE Inc. and propose replacing "QR code" with "2D code" from the perspective of legal compliance. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
98	36	Review the security and authentication requirements for phytosanitary certificates ( <del>e.g. security of wet and printed signatures, identifying fraudulent and invalid certificates, the use of QR codes and other online validation tools</del> ) and update the requirements as necessary.	P	<b>EPPO</b> The examples create more confusion than help. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
99	36	Review the security and authentication requirements for phytosanitary certificates (e.g. security of wet and printed signatures, identifying fraudulent and invalid certificates, the use of QR codes and other online validation tools) and update the requirements <u>on a regular basis</u> as necessary.	P	<b>Egypt</b> <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
100	36	Review the security and authentication requirements for phytosanitary certificates (e.g. security of wet and printed signatures, <u>stamps</u> , identifying fraudulent and invalid certificates, the use of QR codes and other online validation tools) and update the requirements as necessary.	P	<b>Egypt</b> <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
101	37	Consider whether additional information is required regarding the duration of validity of phytosanitary certificates and certified copies.	C	<b>Belarus</b> We support the establishment of validity periods for phytosanitary certificates <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
102	37	Consider whether additional information is required regarding the duration of validity of phytosanitary certificates and certified copies. <u>(4) Review and clarify the circumstances under which phytosanitary certificates can be replaced, based on current experience;</u>	P	<b>NEPPO</b> <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
103	37	Consider whether additional information is required regarding the duration of validity of phytosanitary certificates and certified copies.	C	<b>Japan</b> Japan proposes not to require the duration of validity of phytosanitary certificates and their certified copies as additional information. The period that plants can become contaminated with pests in the importing country after issuance of the phytosanitary certificates depends on the type of plants, storage method and so on. For this reason, it is difficult to set the duration of validity based on scientific evidence and require the duration for all commodities as the requirement of the ISPM. If necessary, it would be better to provide examples of duration of validity for specific commodities, such as seeds, rather than setting requirements. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
104	37	Consider whether additional information is required regarding the duration of validity of phytosanitary certificates and certified copies. <u>Consider the inclusion of</u>	P	<b>Canada</b> <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>



		<a href="#">additional guideline on the inclusion of inspection date(s) on the phytosanitary certificate.</a>		
105	37	Consider whether additional information is required regarding the <b>duration of validity</b> of phytosanitary certificates and certified copies.	C	<p><b>Canada</b> Duration of validity is typically associated with the certificate issuance date.</p> <p>Canada requests to consider the inclusion of a requirement for the addition of an inspection date on the phytosanitary certificate. There has been an increase in the use of inspection dates on phytosanitary certificates globally, as either an expectation or requirement. One inspection date may not adequately reflect measures put in place to mitigate phytosanitary risk, and, there may be a number of inspections performed on various dates to meet the requirements of a country of import. Further, an inspection date does not always reflect transitory or logistical constraints or realities for exporters.</p> <p>If an inspection date is requested, could there be a discussion or consideration for the use of a compliance date or 'quarantine inspection completion date' instead, which may more adequately reflect a date of completion of procedures that confirm the phytosanitary requirements of the country of import have been met. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i></p>
106	37	Consider <del>whether additional information if more guidance</del> is required regarding the duration of validity of phytosanitary certificates and certified copies. <a href="#">New(38) Review the use of additional declarations and the use of standard lay-out/wording of additional declarations where appropriate.</a>	P	<p><b>EPPO</b> 1) Simplified English.</p> <p>2) We suggest to add a new important task. EPPO recommends that the 'scope' is aligned with the 'tasks' listed – we believe that scope includes concepts which are not mentioned in the tasks. Therefore EPPO suggest adding new task. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i></p>
107	37	Consider whether additional information is required regarding the duration of validity of phytosanitary certificates and certified copies.	C	<p><b>Thailand</b> Thailand would like to suggest that a call for information from contracting parties regarding the duration of the PC's validity may be required. Including an example of a situation that requires specifying the duration of validity of the PC, as well as the advantage and obstacle when it is used, will be important in considering this issue. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i></p>
108	37	Consider whether additional information is required regarding the duration of validity of phytosanitary certificates and certified copies. <a href="#">{(4) } (New task) Consider how exporting and importing NPPOs should manage certification in cases of partial consignment release, including procedures for amending or reissuing certificates to maintain traceability and compliance</a>	P	<p><b>New Zealand</b> Propose an additional task for the EWG to consider how exporting and importing NPPOs should manage certification in cases of partial consignment release, including procedures for amending or reissuing certificates to maintain traceability and compliance.</p> <p>When a consignment is partially released due to non-compliance, importing NPPOs have sometimes cleared the compliant portion</p>

				using the original phytosanitary certificate without requesting a revised certificate from the exporting NPPO. If the exporter then wishes to redirect the held portion to another market, issuing a new certificate could result in two certificates referencing the same consignment. This creates a risk of duplicate certification and confusion. Therefore, there is a need for ISPM 12 to provide clear guidance on how exporting and importing NPPOs should manage certification in cases of partial consignment release, including procedures for amending or reissuing certificates to maintain traceability and compliance. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
109	37	Consider whether additional information is required regarding the duration of validity of phytosanitary certificates and certified copies.	C	<b>Oman</b> Add a field in the phytosanitary certificate to specify its validity period, as determined by each importing country <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
110	37	se demander si des informations supplémentaires sont nécessaires concernant la durée de validité des certificats phytosanitaires et des copies certifiées;	C	<b>Cameroon</b> Compte tenu de la diversité des pratiques observée en matière de validité des certificats phytosanitaires, le Cameroun estime qu'il est impératif de procéder à une harmonisation qui pourrait s'appliquer à des catégories telles que les produits secs, les produits frais, les produits transformés de différentes catégories de risque. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
111	37	se demander si des informations supplémentaires sont nécessaires concernant la durée de validité des certificats phytosanitaires et des copies certifiées;	C	<b>IPPC Regional Workshop Africa</b> Il n'y a pas seulement sur la durée de validité des certificats qu'il faut des informations supplémentaires, nous avons aussi des besoins sur le numéro de Bill of Lading, le type de mesures phytosanitaires notamment le séchage à l'air du bois <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
112	37	se demander si des informations supplémentaires sont nécessaires concernant la durée de validité des certificats phytosanitaires et des copies certifiées;	C	<b>Gabon</b> Nous sommes vraiment d'accord avec ce point car il n'y a pas que la durée de validité des certificats phytosanitaires, nous avons aussi besoin des informations sur le Bill of Lading, sur la mesure phytosanitaire liée au bois notamment le séchage à l'air <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
113	38	<del>Revise</del> <del>Revise, review</del> and update the requirements for phytosanitary certificates to better reflect the ongoing transition to ePhyto, considering that NPPOs use phytosanitary certificates in paper and in electronic form (e.g. requirements for management of attachments in the different formats);	P	<b>Australia</b> Would be useful to consider whether Task 4 [38] could incorporate a review - or if a new task could be considered - to develop a standardised approach to what is considered an ePhyto (or eCert) and what that means for phytosanitary certificates issued out of electronic systems but not sent via XML (government to government). Very few phytosanitary certificates are issued on physical security paper in 2025 and many countries have moved towards electronic issuance of certificates with only a PDF output. There can be confusion where certificates are issued in ePhyto as automatically sending to the country of import, even where an ePhyto exchange has not been established. Only a select few countries have an established eCert exchange for import

			clearances with Australia, meaning all other phytosanitary certificates issued by other NPPOs fall into the physical, paper certificate category. However, there is currently no guidance on how to manage electronic signatures or electronic certificates when not received via XML in ISPM 12. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
114	38	Revise and update the requirements for phytosanitary certificates to better reflect the ongoing transition to ePhytos, considering that NPPOs use phytosanitary certificates in paper and in electronic form (e.g. requirements for management of attachments in the different formats);	<p>C <b>China</b></p> <p>The ePhyto Solution system, currently promoted by IPPC as the primary electronic phytosanitary certification platform, requires clarification regarding its status within ISPMs—specifically, whether it holds exclusive recognition.</p> <p>Given our specific circumstances that currently China is in the testing phase without ePhyto exchanging, and GACC is actively developing our autonomous eCert system, suggestions are as follows:</p> <p>IPPC should consider the diverse practical realities of contracting parties when formulating electronic phytosanitary certificate policies. This includes:</p> <p>1. Infrastructure disparities: Many developing countries face prolonged challenges in electricity supply, internet accessibility, and network stability, necessitating the co-existence of paper certificates.</p> <p>2. Legal autonomy: National legal systems vary significantly. The blanket terminology of "transitioning to ePhytos" implicitly treats ePhyto as the sole electronic system, which may not align with sovereign needs. As the electronic phytosanitary certificate system currently promoted by IPPC, the positioning of the ePhyto system within the ISPM standard framework needs to be clarified - the issue of whether it has exclusive validity. Based on China's current operational reality (where China is still in the testing phase of the ePhyto system and has not yet formally implemented cross-border certificate exchange), we suggest that IPPC should fully consider the following key factors when revising and reviewing relevant standards for electronic plant quarantine certificates:</p> <p>1. the differences in technical infrastructure: The objective realities that are widespread in developing countries, such as unstable power supply and limited network access conditions, may not meet the operational requirements of a purely electronic certificate system. If ePhyto is taken for granted as the sole solution, it essentially deprives these countries of their equal qualification to participate in international trade.</p> <p>2. the compatibility issue of the legal system: There are significant differences in electronic signature legislation and cross-border data transmission regulations among countries. The expression "transition to ePhytos" in the current draft implies a tendency to take the ePhyto system as the sole standard for electronic plant quarantine certificates. This presupposition not only contradicts the principle of respecting the sovereignty of the contracting parties in IPPC but also contradicts China's strategic</p>


				direction of promoting a controllable electronic certificate system. 3. Specific Suggestions: the ISPM 12 amendment should clearly define the non-exclusive status of the ePhyto system, recognize the right of each contracting party to independently develop electronic certificate systems of thier own, establish a multi-system mutual recognition mechanism, ensure equivalence among different electronic certificate systems, and reserve the right of contracting parties, including technologically underdeveloped countries, to independently use paper certificates. In the standard text, IPPC should use the expression "Electronic Phytosanitary Certificate System" instead of "ePhyto Solution System". <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
115	38	Revise and update the requirements for phytosanitary certificates to better reflect the ongoing transition to ePhytos, considering that NPPOs use phytosanitary certificates in paper and in electronic form (e.g. requirements for management of attachments in the different formats); <u>New Task: Consider the types of acceptable verbiage/ inputs/ information that could be placed in the additional declarations section</u> <u>New Task: Consider whether time limit requirements stated throughout ISPM 12 are relevant.</u>	P	<b>United States of America</b> First new task: For harmonization purposes and also to streamline ISPM 12 and its annexes and appendixes Second new task: time limits should be based on factors that are under the direct control of the NPPO <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
116	38	Revise and update the requirements <del>for to align</del> phytosanitary certificates to better reflect <del>the ongoing transition to ePhytos, considering that</del> NPPOs use <u>of</u> phytosanitary certificates in paper and in electronic form (e.g. requirements for management of attachments in the different <del>formats</del> ) <u>formats and situations where both a paper and ePhyto are required for a consignment</u> );	P	<b>EPPO</b> We have simplified the text to improve clarity, removing the wording 'ongoing transition' which creates confusion (see comment for paragraph 24) and we have added a relevant example of a situation to consider. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
117	38	Revisar y actualizar los requisitos para los certificados fitosanitarios con miras a reflejar mejor la transición en curso hacia el uso de ePhyto, teniendo en cuenta que las ONPF utilizan certificados fitosanitarios en papel y en forma electrónica (por ejemplo, los requisitos para la gestión de documentos adjuntos en distintos formatos).	C	<b>Honduras</b> Estandarizar plantillas para certificados fitosanitarios electrónicos <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
118	39	Review Appendix 1 of ISPM 12 to ensure that <u>information on</u> ePhytos are up-to-date <del>and will remain so in the future.</del>	P	<b>Canada</b> Improves readability and clarity <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
119	39	Review Appendix 1 of ISPM 12 to ensure that ePhytos are up-to-date and will remain so in the future. <u>New task: Consider removing annex 2 of ISPM 12, the Model phytosanitary certificate for re-export and incorporating it into Annex 1, model phytosanitary certificate for export</u>	P	<b>United States of America</b> This will make ePhyto development significantly faster and less expensive. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
120	39	Review Appendix 1 of ISPM 12 to ensure that ePhytos are up-to-date and will remain so in the future. <u>New task: Consider including provisions for a contingency planning when the information system used for generating e-phytos is suspended due to maintenance or unexpected system failure</u>	P	<b>COSAVE</b> It is considered necessary to incorporate guidance on this in ISPM 12 <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>

121	39	Examinar el Apéndice 1 de la NIMF 12 para velar por que los ePhyto estén actualizados y sigan estándolo en el futuro. <u>Nueva tarea: Considerar incluir disposiciones para un plan de contingencia cuando el sistema de información utilizado para generar los e-phytos se interrumpe debido a tareas de mantenimiento o fallas imprevistas del sistema</u>	P	<b>IPPC Regional Workshop Latin America</b> Se entiende necesario incorporar estos aspectos en la NIMF 12 <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
122	39	Examinar el Apéndice 1 de la NIMF 12 para <del>velar por</del> <u>verificar</u> que los ePhyto estén actualizados y sigan estándolo en el futuro.	P	<b>Honduras</b> <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
123	39	passer en revue l'appendice 1 de la NIMP 12 afin de s'assurer que les certificats phytosanitaires électroniques sont à jour et qu'ils le resteront;	C	<b>IPPC Regional Workshop Africa</b> Nouvelle tâche : Envisager d'inclure des dispositions pour des plans d'urgence lorsque le ou l'un des système(s) d'information (s) utilisé(s) pour générer les e-phytos est suspendu en raison d'une maintenance ou d'une panne inattendue <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
124	39	passer en revue l'appendice 1 de la NIMP 12 afin de s'assurer que les certificats phytosanitaires électroniques sont à jour et qu'ils le resteront;	C	<b>Cameroon</b> Nouvelle tâche : Envisager d'inclure des dispositions pour des plans d'urgence lorsque le ou l'un des système(s) d'information (s) utilisé(s) pour générer les e-phytos est suspendu en raison d'une maintenance ou d'une panne inattendue. Certaines parties contractantes ont négocié et signé les plans de contingence, pour traiter de la gestion des certificats, lorsque les systèmes d'information ne sont pas disponibles. Il vaut mieux encadrer cette pratique dans le cadre de cette révision <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
125	40	<del>Review the text of ISPM 12, including its annexes and appendices, and identify which sections or parts thereof, if any, could be moved to implementation material. Advise whether any updates to these sections (or parts) would be required.</del>	P	<b>EPPO</b> 1) In line with the comment already made for paragraph 25. 2) We disagree with starting separate requirements from guidance information, without having proper conclusions and outputs from the on-going discussion on 'Rethinking ISPMs'. No consensus has been found on whether ISPMs should only include what are considered as 'requirements'. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
126	40	Examinar el texto de la NIMF 12, en particular sus anexos y apéndices, y determinar qué secciones, o qué partes de ellas, de haberlas, podrían <del>transferirse</del> <u>beneficiar</u> al material de aplicación. Indicar si habría que actualizar alguna de estas secciones, o partes de ellas.	P	<b>Honduras</b> <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
127	41	<del>Consider whether the revised standard could affect in a specific way (positively or negatively) the protection of biodiversity and the environment. If this is the case, the impact should be identified, addressed and clarified in the draft standard.</del>	P	<b>EPPO</b> We suggest removing this task. This is a general recommendation used in all ISPMs.  However, if it is decided to be kept, a plain text alternative could be: "Consider how the revised standard might affect biodiversity and the environment, and clearly explain any impacts in the draft." <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>

128	41	Consider whether the revised standard could affect in a specific way (positively or negatively) the protection of biodiversity and the environment. If this is the case, the impact should be <del>identified, addressed-identified</del> and clarified in the draft standard.	P	<b>IPPC Regional Workshop Africa</b> Proposal for deletion of "addressed" as there will not be an action upon identification and clarification. The task of the Expert Working Group should only be to identify and clarify. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
129	41	Consider whether the revised standard could affect in a specific way (positively or negatively) the protection of biodiversity and the environment. If this is the case, the impact should be <del>identified, addressed-identified</del> and clarified in the draft standard.	P	<b>South Africa</b> Proposal for deletion of "addressed" as there will not be an action upon identification and clarification. The task of the Expert Working Group should only be to identify and clarify. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
130	42	Review all references to ISPM 12 in other ISPMs to ensure that they are still relevant and propose consequential changes if necessary. Review all references to other ISPMs in ISPM 12 and amend as necessary.	C	<b>United States of America</b> Recommend cross-referencing ISPM 7 and ISPM 20 to ensure consistent terminology and avoid conflicting interpretations of certification procedures. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
131	43	Consider implementation of the revised standard by contracting parties and identify potential operational and technical implementation issues. Provide information and possible recommendations on these issues to the Standards Committee.	C	<b>China</b> new task: Promote the unification of encoding rules for phytosanitary certificate numbers among countries.  Promote the unification of encoding rules for phytosanitary certificate numbers among countries. ISPM12 (International Standard for Phytosanitary Measures No. 12) only requires that each exported phytosanitary certificate must have a unique identification number that allows traceability to the consignment for auditing and record-keeping purposes. However, it does not mandate uniform encoding rules across countries. This has proven insufficient for current electronic certificate management systems. During subsequent use, especially in pandemic-related reporting, it has been observed that some countries use a mix of letters, punctuation marks, and other symbols in their certificate numbers, while others employ two sets of identifiers. This issue is particularly prevalent in handwritten certificates, often leading to confusion and errors during data entry. It is recommended to promote the standardization of phytosanitary certificate number encoding rules through the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC). For instance, import-export phytosanitary certificate numbers could be defined as "Year + Three-letter Country Code + Fixed Digits" (e.g., 2025CHN000001) or "Year + World Port Code + Fixed Digits." This would significantly facilitate the standardized use of phytosanitary certificates at ports, enable automated electronic transmission, support automatic recognition, comparison, and verification of certificates. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
132	43	Consider implementation of the revised standard by contracting parties and identify potential operational and technical implementation issues. Provide information and possible recommendations on these issues to the Standards Committee. <u>New task : Define the dates to be indicated on the Ephyto: Inspection date and validation or</u>	P	<b>NEPPO</b>  <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>



		<u>issue date and clearly mention the date to be taken into consideration</u>		
133	43	Consider implementation of the revised standard by contracting parties and identify potential operational and technical implementation issues. Provide information and possible recommendations on these issues to the Standards Committee. <u>(10)</u> <u>Consider review the contingency plan in case ePhyto system failure (e.g. IPPC ePhyto Hub failure or ePhyto system failure of importing or exporting countries).</u>	P	<b>Korea, Republic of</b> Korea proposes an additional task for the EWG to consider review the contingency plan in case ePhyto system failure (e.g. IPPC ePhyto Hub failure or ePhyto system failure of importing or exporting countries).  As the number of countries exchanging ePhyto is expected to gradually expand, Korea think it is necessary to review a contingency plan to minimize trade delays due to system failures <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
134	43	Consider <del>implementation of the revised standard by how</del> contracting parties <del>and will apply the revised standard,</del> identify <del>potential operational and practical or technical implementation issues</del> challenges and suggest solutions <del>to the Standards Committee</del> Provide information and possible recommendations on these issues to the Standards Committee.	P	<b>EPPO</b> Simplified English and improved clarity.  Also please note that an important issue that might benefit from more IPPC guidance (in the standard or in a guide) is how to use botanical names on certificates and to discuss whether some form of harmonisation would be possible. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
135	43	Consider implementation of the revised standard by contracting parties and identify potential operational and technical implementation issues. Provide information and possible recommendations on these issues to the Standards Committee.	C	<b>India</b> {10} Consider incorporating the maximum time period in which re export can be done based on the perishability of the commodity. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
136	43	Considerar la aplicación de la norma revisada por las partes contratantes y determinar los posibles problemas operacionales y técnicos de la aplicación. Facilitar información y formular posibles recomendaciones sobre estos problemas al Comité de Normas.	C	<b>IPPC Regional Workshop Latin America</b> Para facilitar la transición al ePhyto y asegurar la aceptación mutua entre países, sería útil proponer lineamientos sobre cómo validar equivalencias entre formatos (por ejemplo, un ePhyto impreso que conserve validez ante una ONPF importadora).  Establecer criterios para el reconocimiento mutuo entre certificados fitosanitarios en papel y electrónicos (ePhyto), mediante la elaboración de lineamientos que permitan validar equivalencias entre formatos, de modo que un ePhyto impreso conserve validez ante una ONPF importadora y que, en los casos en que aún no sea posible realizar el intercambio electrónico, se definan pautas claras para la aceptación de certificados digitales como equivalentes al formato en papel, asegurando así la continuidad del comercio y la confianza entre países durante la transición al ePhyto. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
137	43	Considerar la aplicación de la norma revisada por las partes contratantes y determinar los posibles problemas operacionales y técnicos de la aplicación. Facilitar información y formular posibles recomendaciones sobre estos problemas al Comité de Normas <u>a través de la creación de un manual y en listar los errores y problemas mas comunes qu esta pueda presentar.</u>	P	<b>Guatemala</b>  <b>Honduras</b> De acuerdo con la sugerencia de Guatemala <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
138	45	Members with collective knowledge of, and experience <del>in, regulating and</del>	P	<b>Canada</b>

		<del>implementing in</del> phytosanitary <del>regulation and</del> certification (both paper and electronic) related to the import, export and re-export of regulated articles.		The suggested text provides better understanding of the expertise being sought. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
139	45	<del>Members with collective knowledge of, and experience in, regulating and implementing phytosanitary certification (both paper and electronic) related to the import, export and re-export of regulated articles. Members with collective knowledge and experience in issuance, regulating and implementing the phytosanitary certificates (both paper and electronic), and phytosanitary certification related to the export and re-export of regulated articles.</del>	P	<b>NEPPO</b> <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
140	45	Miembros <u>de las ONPF</u> con conocimientos y experiencia colectivos en la reglamentación y aplicación de certificados fitosanitarios (tanto en papel como en forma electrónica) relacionados con la importación, la exportación y la reexportación de artículos reglamentados.	P	<b>IPPC Regional Workshop Latin America</b> <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
141	47	Five to seven members.	C	 <b>Costa Rica</b> <b>Egypt</b> At least one representative from each region has to be represented <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
142	48	<del>In addition, up to two technical experts from the ePhyto Steering Group should be invited to attend as invited experts.</del>	P	<b>EPPO</b> Why? <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
143	48	Además, se debería invitar a asistir en calidad de expertos a un máximo de dos expertos técnicos del Grupo directivo de ePhyto.	C	<b>Guatemala</b> ademas del grupo Directivo de ePhyto, seria bueno tambien replicar e incluir expertos usuarios donde ya esta establecido la herramienta tanto de modo Generico como ya anidado en Hardware en su versión completa. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
144	49	A member of the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC) should <del>also be invited to</del> attend as an <del>invited</del> expert or an IC representative.	P	<b>EPPO</b> EPPO believe it is important that a member of the IC attend either as an expert or as an IC representative. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
145	59	Participants and interested parties are encouraged to submit discussion papers <u>addressing technical or policy aspects of phytosanitary certification, including electronic certificates (ePhytos)</u> to the IPPC Secretariat ( <a href="mailto:ippc@fao.org">ippc@fao.org</a> ) for consideration by the EWG.	P	<b>United States of America</b> Specifies the scope and relevance for submissions. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>