<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>Starting Line Number (e.g. 17)</th>
<th>Ending Line Number (e.g. 23)</th>
<th>Clause/Subclause (e.g. 3.1)</th>
<th>Type of comment¹</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Proposed change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GHC</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Ge</td>
<td></td>
<td>A limited pool of experts have been used to develop this IWSFG PAS 1. It cannot be considered to be &quot;global consensus&quot;. This paragraph needs to be <strong>re-written</strong> to reflect this. A lot of the work has been abstracted from the INDA / EDANA Guidelines documents and</td>
<td><strong>Remove or rephrase the statement</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHC</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Ge</td>
<td></td>
<td>The sentence starting &quot;The group expects - - -&quot; needs to be re-phrased. As written it implies that manufacturers and distributors are not socially responsible or environmentally</td>
<td><strong>Remove or rephrase the statement</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHC</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>Te</td>
<td></td>
<td>FOG is not relevant to this PAS</td>
<td><strong>Remove the lines.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHC</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>Ge</td>
<td></td>
<td>Is the note relevant to the PAS? &quot;Criteria for recognition as a flushable product&quot;.</td>
<td><strong>Remove lines</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHC</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>Te</td>
<td></td>
<td>Delete the word distributor</td>
<td><strong>A manufacturer -may wish to identify as being flushable.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHC</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>Te</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rephrase to clarify what the scope of this document.</td>
<td><strong>Toilet paper is out of scope in this document.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHC</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>Te</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Change &quot;should&quot; to &quot;must.&quot;</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHC</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>te</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Change &quot;should&quot; to &quot;must&quot;</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHC</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>Table</td>
<td>Te</td>
<td></td>
<td>It is unclear how the IWSFG views the TAPPI 401 fibre analysis method. Why is the TAPPI method under Environmental and Health Protection, and how is it to be used?</td>
<td><strong>Clarify position in 7.1.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHC</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>Te</td>
<td></td>
<td>The INDA /EDANA Code of Practice for labeling does not address how a “flushable” product should be labelled.</td>
<td><strong>Remove 6.4.1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The text in the 2nd draft is different from the language used in FG504 from the INDA/EDANA 3rd ed Guidance document.

Change the language in 7.4 to reflect the test method INDA/EDANA 2013 FG504