

[Please Review document review. Review title: 2016 First consultation on 2016 Draft amendments to ISPM 5. Document title: 1994-001_2016_AmendmentsISPM5_En_2016-05-17_Combined.docx]

[1] **Draft 2016 amendments to ISPM 5: Glossary of phytosanitary terms (1994-001)**

[2] **Publication history**

[3] Date of this document	[4] 2016-05-16
[5] Document category	[6] Draft 2016 Amendments to ISPM 5 (<i>Glossary of phytosanitary terms</i>) (1994-001)
[7] Current document stage	[8] To first consultation (2016-07)
[9] Major stages	[10] CEPM (1994) added topic: 1994-001, Amendments to ISPM 5: Glossary of phytosanitary terms [11] 2006-05 Standards Committee (SC) approved specification TP5 [12] 2012-10 Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG) revised specification [13] 2012-11 SC revised and approved revised specification, revoking Specification 1 [14] 2014-12 TPG drafted text (for draft Amendments approved by SC in 2015-05) [15] 2015-05 SC reviewed and approved for consultation [16] 2015-12 TPG drafted text (for draft Amendments approved by SC in 2016-05) [17] 2016-05 SC approved for first consultation
[18] Notes	[19] Note to Secretariat formatting this paper: formatting in definitions and explanations (strikethrough, bold, italics) needs to remain.

[20] Members are asked to consider the following proposals for addition, revision and deletion of terms and definitions to ISPM 5 (*Glossary of Phytosanitary Terms*). A brief explanation is given for each proposal. For revision of terms and definitions, only the proposed changes are open for comment. For full details on the discussions related to the specific terms, please refer to the meeting reports on the [IPP](#).

[21] **1. ADDITION**

[22] **1.1 “exclusion (of a pest)” (2010-008)**

[23] In 2009, the Technical Panel for Fruit Flies (TPFF) developed a proposal for a definition of “exclusion” in the draft ISPM *Phytosanitary Procedures for Fruit Fly (*Tephritidae*) Management* (2005-010)¹. The term was added to the *List of topics for IPPC standards* by the Standards Committee (SC) in April 2010 based on a TPG proposal. The TPFF definition was reviewed and modified by the TPG in October 2010, reviewed by the SC in May 2011 and sent for member consultation in June 2011. In view of the comments received, in November 2011 the TPG suggested that “exclusion” should be reconsidered in association with “containment”, “suppression”, “eradication” and “control”. The TPG proposed revisions in the draft 2013 *Amendments to ISPM 5* to use “official measures” instead of “phytosanitary measures” in these definitions, because “phytosanitary measures” relates only to regulated pests (i.e. quarantine pests or regulated non-quarantine pests), and there is no need to restrict the definition of these terms to regulated pests. The SC in May 2013 agreed to send them for member consultation.

[25] The TPG reviewed member comments in 2014 and presented a recommendation to the SC May 2014 to withdraw the terms from the draft Amendments because it resulted from the member comments that contracting parties had different understandings of “phytosanitary measure”. The TPG had outlined two

[] _____

[24]¹ This draft was adopted by the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) in 2015 as Annex 3 to ISPM 26.

understandings: narrow which would include only measures established by the importing country (“official measures” would be used in the exporting country), and broad, which would include measures established by either the importing or the exporting country to manage pests regulated by the importing country. “Phytosanitary measures” should in any case be used only in relation with regulated pests only. The SC in May 2015 discussed the understanding of the term “phytosanitary measure” and did not agree which interpretation should be used.

[26]In their December 2015 meeting, the TPG discussed further the understanding of “phytosanitary measure” and the related terms. They reviewed the use of “phytosanitary measure” in the IPPC and in adopted ISPMs and noted that in some cases the term was used in the narrow understanding, in other cases it was used in the broad understanding, and that there were cases for which it could be argued which understanding was meant. Referring to the WTO Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS Agreement), some TPG members added that whilst “phytosanitary measures” in the preamble and Annex A (1) is used in the narrow understanding, in article 4 (Equivalence) it also refers to measures taken by the exporting country, consistently with the broad understanding. Besides, applying the narrow understanding to the SPS agreement may also mean that official measures other than phytosanitary measures may not need to be scientifically justified. The TPG discussed the possible impact of a decision to implement the narrow understanding and found that a number of Glossary definitions would need to be modified because they were actually used in ISPMs in the broad sense. The TPG did not agree on this issue and thus decided to not propose changes to the definitions of the terms “containment”, “control (of a pest)”, “eradication” and “suppression”.

[27]The following explanatory points may be considered when reviewing the proposal for the term “exclusion (of a pest)”:

- [28]It is useful to add this term and its definition to the existing collection of “control”-related terms, which includes “containment”, “control (of a pest)”, “eradication” and “suppression”.
- [29]It is recommended to use “phytosanitary measures” rather than “official measures”. Although “official” might have been appropriate for such measures applied against pests within a country, the definitions of “containment”, “control (of a pest)”, “eradication” and “suppression” use “phytosanitary measures”, and it is not desirable to introduce inconsistency between all these definitions.
- [30]The term is qualified by “of a pest” so the word “exclusion” can still be used in its common meaning in other contexts, as is currently the case in various ISPMs (such as “excludes wood packaging material” in ISPM 15 (*Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade*), “exclude a certain area” in ISPM 22 (*Requirements for the establishment of areas of low pest prevalence*), exclusion of chemicals or equipment in ISPM 27 (*Diagnostic protocols for regulated pests*)). The use of a qualifier is also consistent with other glossary terms, such as “control”, “entry” and “establishment”.
- [31]The term “introduction” (i.e. “entry and establishment”) is used and not “entry”. A package of exclusion measures might include measures to prevent “establishment” in cases of transience or incursion.
- [32]Although the definition of “introduction” already refers (indirectly) to an area by using the term “entry”, the words “into an area” were added for clarification, as the concept of exclusion is linked to a defined area, whether a country or an area within a country or between several countries.
- [33]It was considered whether the wording “the application of measures in and around an area” should be used to be consistent with the definition of “containment” and to cover the case of a buffer zone. It is recognized that the definition of “exclusion” was originally developed to apply to pest free areas (PFAs) and areas of low pest prevalence (ALPPs) for fruit flies (in which case it is restricted to the application of measures “in and around an area”); however, exclusion also needs to be used in contexts other than fruit fly PFAs and ALPPs. “In and around an area” is not relevant in the common scenario in which the area under exclusion is a whole country, or when exclusion measures that benefit one country are applied in another country.

[34]Proposed addition

[35]exclusion (of a pest)	[36]Application of phytosanitary measures to prevent the introduction of a pest into an area.
----------------------------------	--

[37]2. REVISIONS**[38]2.1 “contaminating pest”, “contamination” (2012-001)**

[39]The term “contaminating pest” was added to the *List of topics for IPPC standards* by the Standards Committee (SC) in April 2012 based on a TPG proposal. Deletion of the term and definition was proposed in the draft 2013 *Amendments to ISPM 5*. However, at the 2013 member consultation, many IPPC members did not support this deletion, because they considered the term “contaminating pest” useful, especially to express the concept previously covered by the term “hitch-hiker pest” (deleted from the Glossary by CPM-7 in 2012). Thus they suggested not to delete the term “contaminating pest”, but rather to revise its definition.

[40]The TPG rediscussed the defined terms “contaminating pest” and “contamination” and their use in ISPMs at its meetings in February and December 2014.

[41]Revised definitions of “contaminating pest” and “contamination” were proposed by the TPG in December 2014 and reviewed by the SC in May 2015.

[42]The following points may be considered when reviewing the revision:**[43]For both terms:**

[44]If the definition of “contaminating pest” was deleted, the concept expressed by the term “hitch-hiker pest” would be partly lost; if the definition of “contamination” was deleted, the symmetry between the definitions of “infestation” and “contamination” would be lost, whereas the wording “infestation or contamination” is often used in ISPMs.

[45]This is the reason why it is proposed that both definitions are maintained, although duplication or considerable overlap between definitions should normally be avoided.

[46]For “contaminating pest”:

- [47]“carried by” was changed to “present in” to (i) align it with the definition for “contamination”; (ii) because “presence” more adequately focuses on the core meaning of the term, namely that a “contaminating pest” is present in an item, independently on whether this item may actually transport, move or convey the pest, and (iii) because “presence” sufficiently covers the concept of “hitch-hiker pests”.
- [48]“or on” was added to “present in” because, for example, a “contaminating pest” may be present in “or on” a container.
- [49]“storage place, conveyance or container” was added to not restrict the definition to a commodity, hereby conveying the concept of “hitch-hiker pest” better, and to align it with the definition of “contamination”.
- [50]“does not infest those plants or plant products” was simplified by using the object pronoun “them”.

[51]For “contamination”:

- [52]“pest was modified to “contaminating pest” to increase clarity of the definition by cross referring to this Glossary term, whose definition includes mention of “infestation”.
- [53]“other” was deleted, as it implied that pests are regulated articles, which is incorrect.
- [54]“the unintended presence of” was added in relation to regulated articles to clarify the difference between “presence of a contaminating pest”, where presence is always accidental, and “presence of a regulated article”, where presence is often intentional (as a commodity) and can only be considered as a contamination when the regulated article is unintentionally present. By adding the

proposed wording, it is clearly expressed that both pests and regulated articles are present unintentionally.

- [55]“or on” was added to “present in” because, for example, a “contaminating pest” may be present in “or on” a container.
- [56]“not constituting an infestation” and “(see infestation)” were deleted because this concept is covered in the definition of “contaminating pest” by the term “infest” (now bolded to cross-refer to the definition of “infestation”).

[57]Original definitions

[58]contaminating pest	[59]A pest that is carried by a commodity and, in the case of plants and plant products , does not infest those plants or plant products [CEPM, 1996; revised CEPM, 1999]
[60]contamination	[61]Presence in a commodity , storage place, conveyance or container, of pests or other regulated articles , not constituting an infestation (see infestation) [CEPM, 1997; revised CEPM, 1999]

[62]Proposed revisions

[63]contaminating pest	[64]A pest that is carried by <u>present in or on</u> a commodity , storage place, conveyance or container, and <u>that</u> , in the case of plants and plant products , does not infest these <u>plants or plant products</u>
[65]contamination	[66]Presence <u>of</u> pests <u>a</u> contaminating pest or other <u>unintended presence of</u> <u>a</u> regulated articles in <u>or on</u> a commodity , storage place, conveyance or container not constituting an infestation (see infestation)

[67]2.2“endangered area” (2014-009)

[68]The term “endangered area” was first added to the List of topics for IPPC standards by the SC April 2012 (with the topic number 2012-002) based on a TPG November 2011 proposal. In October 2012, the TPG recommended the term be deleted from the draft 2012 *Amendments to ISPM 5*. SC May 2013 agreed and removed the term from the *List of topics for IPPC standards*. However, the General IPPC Survey 2012–2013 undertaken by the Implementation Review and Support System (IRSS) and shared with CPM-9 (2014) indicated evidence of misinterpretation of the term, and therefore the SC May 2014 reinstated “endangered area” (2014-009) to the *List of topics for IPPC standards*. A revised definition was proposed by the TPG in December 2014 and reviewed by the SC in May 2015.

[69]The following points may be considered when reviewing the revision:

- [70]the General IPPC Survey 2012-2013 showed that some countries understood the term to mean an environmentally protected area in the ecological conservation sense. In the IPPC context, “endangered area” is used only in relation to PRA. The proposed definition now clearly states that the term refers to a PRA area.
- [71]“ecological factors” were changed to “abiotic and biotic conditions” in order to de-emphasize the same misconception. The wording “abiotic and biotic” adequately covers the intended meaning in the framework of the definition.
- [72]“the area” was changed to “that area” so that it is clear reference is made to the PRA area mentioned earlier in the definition.
- [73]“Part or all” was added in line with ISPM 11 (*Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests*), to clarify that the endangered area is not necessarily the whole PRA area, but often is only a portion of it.

[74]Original definition

[75]endangered area	[76]An area where ecological factors favour the establishment of a pest whose presence in the area will result in economically important loss [FAO, 1995]
---------------------	---

[77]Proposed revision

[78]endangered area	[79]An Part or all of the PRA area where <u>abiotic and biotic conditions</u> ecological factors favour the establishment of a pest whose presence in <u>that</u> the area will result in economically important loss
----------------------------	--

[80]2.3“quarantine” (2015-002)

[81]The Glossary term “quarantine” was added to the *List of topics for IPPC Standards* by the SC in May 2015 based on a TPG proposal. The TPG reviewed the term in their December 2015 meeting and discussed whether the purposes “observation and research” should be kept in the definition.

[82]The following explanatory points may be considered when reviewing the definition:

- [83]It is current practice that observation and research may be carried out in quarantine stations on pests and beneficial organisms. In order to not exclude such practice, the term “quarantine” should therefore cover the official confinement of biological control agents and other beneficial organisms, which is intended to ensure that they will have minimal negative effects after release and would require observation and research. Thus, official confinement may be carried out for observation and research on pests or beneficial organisms which are not included under “regulated articles”, and it is proposed to add text in the definition to clarify this.
- [84]It is proposed to remove “further” in the definition because there may be cases where initial inspection, testing or treatment has not been carried out before the regulated article is placed in quarantine.

[85]Current definition

[86]quarantine	[87]Official confinement of regulated articles for observation and research or for further inspection, testing or treatment [FAO, 1990; revised FAO, 1995; CEPM, 1999]
-----------------------	--

[88]Proposed revision

[89]quarantine	[90]Official confinement of regulated articles for observation and research or for further inspection, testing or treatment, or of pests or beneficial organisms for observation or research [FAO, 1990; revised FAO, 1995; CEPM, 1999]
-----------------------	--

[91]2.4 “test” (2015-003), “visual examination” (2013-010)

[92]The term “visual examination” was added to the *List of topics for IPPC standards* by the SC in May 2013, based on a TPG proposal. A revised definition was proposed by the TPG in February 2014 and approved for member consultation by the SC in May 2014. At their December 2014 meeting, the TPG discussed whether “visual examination”, “testing” and “inspection” should be reviewed in combination, as suggested by a member comment. The TPG found that the issue might arise from the definition of “test” and invited the SC to add the term to the *List of topics for IPPC standards*. In May 2015, the SC added the term “test” to the *List of topics for IPPC standards*, and the SC-7 withdrew “visual examination” from the 2014 *draft Amendments to ISPM 5* (1994-001) so that definitions of “visual examination”, “testing”, and “inspection” could be considered by the TPG together to ensure they are consistent and useful. In November 2015, the SC added the term “inspection” (2015-012) to the *List of topics for IPPC standards*. The TPG reviewed the terms “test”, “visual examination” and “inspection” in their December 2015 meeting.

[93]The following explanatory points may be considered when reviewing the definitions:

- [94]The current definition of “inspection” is clear and useful and reflects appropriately the concept described in ISPM 23 (*Guidelines for inspection*). The term therefore should not be revised.
- [95]The definition of “test” clearly separates such methods from “visual examination”. However, the definition does not exclude that “visual examination” may be done before or after testing. In the proposed revision of “test”, the mention “of plants, plant products, or other regulated articles”

is added to clearly indicate that “inspection” and “testing” are two different methods on the same hierarchical level.

- [96]The definition of “visual examination” should describe the process of visual examination, but not its purpose (“to detect pests or contaminants without testing or processing”). The purpose is covered in the definition of “inspection”. Both definitions are needed with “visual examination” simply describing the process, whilst “inspection” describes its application in the phytosanitary context (i.e. it is official and to determine if pests are present or to determine compliance with phytosanitary regulations). The original wording in the definition of visual examination was also confusing (as contamination covers both pests and regulated articles). Although “processing” is often necessary and more elaborate prior to “testing”, some simple processing (e.g. dyeing) may also be carried out prior to visual examination, so need not to be mentioned. “Without testing” was also deleted because it does not add clarification, and the contrast to “testing” is already well covered under the definition of “test”.
- [97]ISPM 23 states that certain tools may be used in conjunction with the inspection process. The simple use of a microscope can be considered part of the inspection process, and should be maintained in the definition of “visual examination” for clarification.
- [98]Collecting and sending samples to a laboratory for the verification of the pest’s identity may be combined with the inspection process, independent if the verification is made visually or by testing.
- [99]The current definition of “inspection” and the proposed revisions for “test” and “visual examination” adequately reflect the uses in adopted ISPMs. The definitions are general; any particular requirements that would differ from those described in the definitions should be clarified in the ISPM text.

[100]Current definitions

[101]test	[102]Official examination, other than visual, to determine if pests are present or to identify pests [FAO, 1990]
[103]visual examination	[104]The physical examination of plants, plant products , or other regulated articles using the unaided eye, lens, stereoscope or microscope to detect pests or contaminants without testing or processing [ISPM 23]

[105]Proposed revisions

[106]test	[107]Official examination of plants, plant products , or other regulated articles , other than visual, to determine if pests are present or to identify pests [FAO, 1990]
[108]visual examination	[109]The physical examination of plants, plant products , or other regulated articles using the unaided eye, lens, stereoscope or microscope to detect pests or contaminants without testing or processing [ISPM 23]

[110]3. DELETIONS

[111]3.1 “kiln-drying” (2013-006)

[112]The term “kiln-drying” was added to the *List of topics for IPPC standards* by the SC May 2013 based on a TPG proposal. The TPG February 2014 proposed a revised definition in the draft 2014 *Amendments to ISPM 5*, which was not accepted by the SC May 2014. There was agreement that kiln-drying is an industrial process but diverging views on whether a definition was needed and, if so, whether the term should be defined specifically for the phytosanitary context. Deletion of “*kiln-drying*” was proposed by the TPG in December 2014 and reviewed by the SC in May 2015. The following explanatory points may be considered:

- [113]kiln-drying is an industrial process without a specific IPPC meaning. It is used for various purposes in the wood industry, not only to comply with phytosanitary import requirements, but to meet quality requirements.

- [114]Where the process is used as a phytosanitary measure, it is a heat treatment method which should conform with a required heating schedule. For example, in the case of ISPM 15, kiln-drying only qualifies as a phytosanitary measure when it satisfies the requirement that the core temperature reaches a minimum temperature of 56° C for a minimum duration of 30 continuous minutes. In that case, it will be referred to as a heat treatment (code HT) and not as kiln-drying.
- [115]In the current Glossary definition, “or humidity control” is incorrect as there is always humidity control.
- [116]There is no particular need for the term to be defined in the phytosanitary context. It is noted that the draft ISPM on the *International movement of wood* (2006-029) explains kiln-drying in a phytosanitary context, which will serve as a sufficient reference to the term. In ISPM 15, the requirements are clearly explained.

[117]**Proposed deletion**

[118] kiln-drying	[119]A process in which wood is dried in a closed chamber using heat and/or humidity control to achieve a required moisture content [ISPM 15]
--------------------------	--

[120]**3.2. “pre-clearance” (2013-016)**

[121]When reviewing the draft ISPM *Phytosanitary pre-import clearance* (2005-003) in their May 2013 meeting, the SC added the revision of the term “pre-clearance” to the *List of topics for IPPC standards* with a pending status because the term was causing confusion. At the May 2015 meeting, the SC approved the draft appendix to ISPM 20 (*Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system*) on *Arrangements for verification of compliance of consignments by the importing country in the exporting country* (2005-003) for member consultation, in which the term “pre-clearance” is not used. The SC agreed to remove the pending status of the term and asked the TPG to consider it in the context of the term “clearance (of a consignment)”. The TPG reviewed it in their December 2015 meeting and proposed the deletion of the term “pre-clearance” (2013-016).

[122]The following explanatory points may be considered:

- [123]The current definition of “pre-clearance” is not in accordance with the Convention as it indicates that phytosanitary certification can be performed by or under the regular supervision of the national plant protection organization of the country of destination.
- [124]“Pre-clearance” is currently used in many different countries with very different meanings. It does not seem possible to revise the definition to adequately reflect all the various meanings of the term allowing for international harmonization and agreement. The term “pre-clearance” is only used three times in ISPM 20 and is not used in the draft appendix to ISPM 20 on *Arrangements for verification of compliance of consignments by the importing country in the exporting country* (2005-003), which was submitted to member consultation in 2015. Thus, the deletion of term from the Glossary appears to be the best solution as its current definition is incorrect.
- [125]Ink amendments to ISPM 20 might be considered at a later stage to reflect the concept outlined in the draft appendix to ISPM 20, once fully clarified and if deemed appropriate.
- [126]The deletion of the term “pre-clearance” would not affect the meaning of “clearance (of a consignment)” which is considered to be clear.

[127]**Proposed deletion**

[128] pre-clearance	[129] Phytosanitary certification and/or clearance in the country of origin , performed by or under the regular supervision of the national plant protection organization of the country of destination [FAO, 1990; revised FAO, 1995]
----------------------------	--

[130]