

**[1]DRAFT 2019 AND 2020 AMENDMENTS TO ISPM 5:
GLOSSARY OF PHYTOSANITARY TERMS (1994-001)**

[2]Publication history

[3](This is not an official part of the standard)

[4]Date of this document	[5]2020-06-08
[6]Document category	[7]Draft 2019 and 2020 Amendments to ISPM 5 (<i>Glossary of phytosanitary terms</i>) (1994-001)
[8]Current document stage	[9]To first consultation
[10]Major stages	<p>[11]CEPM (1994) added topic: 1994-001, Amendments to ISPM 5: Glossary of phytosanitary terms</p> <p>[12]2006-05 Standards Committee (SC) approved specification TP5</p> <p>[13]2012-10 Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG) revised specification</p> <p>[14]2012-11 SC revised and approved revised specification, revoking Specification 1</p> <p>[15]2018-12 TPG drafted text on “detection survey” (SC approved for first consultation in 2019)</p> <p>[16]2019-05 SC approved 2019 amendments to first consultation and they are included below</p> <p>[17]2019-11 TPG proposed 2020 amendments below</p> <p>[18]2020-04 SC revised the 2020 amendments via the Online Comment System (to replace the cancelled 2020-05 SC meeting) and approved the 2020 amendments for first consultation via e-decision (2020_eSC_May_17).</p>
[19]Notes	[20] Note to Secretariat formatting this paper: formatting in definitions and explanations (strikethrough, bold, italics) needs to remain.

[21]1 DELETIONS

[22]1.1 “incidence” (2018-010)

[23]A topic was submitted during the 2018 Call for topics for standards and implementation to revise the definition of the term “incidence” and define the term “prevalence”, as their meaning can be confused in epidemiological and phytosanitary context.

[24]The Standards Committee (SC) at its November 2018 meeting discussed the recommendation of the Task Force on Topics (TFT) and noted that the terms “incidence” and “prevalence” had been discussed in depth previously. Only “incidence” is defined in the Glossary and instead of revising that definition and defining “prevalence”, the SC proposed to delete “incidence” from the Glossary and to use the terms “incidence” and “prevalence” in their common dictionary sense in ISPMs. The SC therefore added the term “incidence” to the *List of topics for IPPC standards* and requested the Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG) consider deleting it from the Glossary.

[25]At its November 2019 meeting, the TPG analyzed previous work carried out by the TPG and decisions of SC and CPM since 1995, with regard to the term “incidence” and the linked Glossary terms “area of low pest prevalence” and “tolerance level”. The TPG recalled that the initial intention had been to define the term “prevalence” but, following a lengthy process of consideration and consultation on the terms “prevalence”, “incidence” and “tolerance”, the term and definition of “incidence” (as well as of “tolerance level”) had finally been adopted in 2009 and included in the Glossary rather than “prevalence”. The TPG discussed all relative merits of retaining “incidence” in the Glossary, replacing it by “prevalence”, or having both terms in the Glossary.

[26]The TPG also noted that the Annotated Glossary explains that the term “prevalence” is sometimes wrongly used in draft ISPMs to mean “incidence”, and that the use of the defined term “incidence” is preferred.

[27]Considering the extensive past discussions on the possible definitions of the terms “prevalence” and “incidence” and the divergent points of view expressed, the TPG confirmed that it is unlikely that an agreement could be reached on a revised Glossary definition of “incidence” and a new Glossary definition of “prevalence”. Recognizing the pragmatic direction set out by the SC, the TPG therefore agreed to propose that the term “incidence” be deleted from the Glossary, with no ink amendments to the definition of “tolerance level” (which refers to “incidence”), and that the words “incidence” and “prevalence” be used in ISPMs with their general, dictionary meaning. The TPG also noted that, if “incidence” is deleted, corresponding changes will be needed to the Annotated Glossary.

[28]The following explanatory points may be considered when reviewing the proposal for the deletion of the term “incidence”:

- [29]The current Glossary definition of “incidence”, although fitting well with the use of the term in plant protection, corresponds to the epidemiological definition of “prevalence” as used in human and animal health. For example, *TERMIUM Plus* defines the two terms as following for the subject field “Statistics; Epidemiology; General Medicine, Hygiene and Health”:
 - [30]incidence: The number of new cases of a disease or condition in a population at risk over a given period, usually one year;
 - [31]prevalence: The number of people in a population with a specific disease or condition at a given time, usually expressed as a proportion of the number of affected people to the total population;
- [32]The general meaning of “incidence” in conventional dictionaries is consistent with its Glossary definition that simply makes the term more specific to plant protection;
- [33]The term “incidence” can therefore be removed from the Glossary, and the terms “prevalence” and “incidence” used in their general sense.

[34]***Proposed deletion***

[35] incidence (of a pest)	[36]Proportion or number of units in which a pest is present in a sample, consignment , field or other defined population [CPM, 2009]
---	--

[37]2. REVISIONS

[38]2.1 “emergency action” (2018-044)

[39]At its December 2018 meeting, the TPG, while considering the comments received from first consultation on the proposed revised definition of the term “treatment” (2017-008), discussed how the term “emergency action” would apply for a new, non-yet regulated, pest discovered for instance in an imported consignment.

[40]The TPG had considered it appropriate that such situations could be managed by the national plant protection organisations (NPPO) taking “emergency action” but had noted that, since the definition of “emergency action” refers back to “phytosanitary action” and therefore to the implementation of a “phytosanitary measure”, it currently applies only to regulated pests.

[41]Recalling that Article VII.6 of the IPPC states that “nothing in this Article shall prevent any contracting party from taking appropriate emergency action on the detection of a pest posing a potential threat to its territories or the report of such a detection”, the TPG had considered that the text of the Convention justifies NPPOs taking action on any pest posing “a potential threat”, including non-regulated pests. The TPG had therefore concluded that the definition of “emergency action” probably needed to be revised to cover non-regulated pests and in May 2019 the SC had agreed to add this term to the *List of topics for IPPC standards*.

[42]At its November 2019 meeting, the TPG analysed the use of the terms “emergency action” and “phytosanitary action” in adopted ISPMs, and proposed that the definition of “emergency action” be revised. The TPG also agreed on some minor amendments to Note 10 of the Annotated Glossary, to include mention of phytosanitary actions to help distinguish them from emergency actions.

[43]The following explanatory points may be considered when reviewing the proposal for the revision of the definition of “emergency action”:

- [44]There is a need for replacing “phytosanitary” with “official” in the current wording “phytosanitary action”, to clarify that an emergency action can target both regulated and non-regulated pests, and at the same time retain the notion that any emergency action should be taken under the authority of the NPPO;
- [45]In the definition, replacing “action” with “operation” is proposed for consistency with the definition of “phytosanitary action”, which is defined in the Glossary as “an official operation, such as inspection, testing, surveillance or treatment, undertaken to implement phytosanitary measures”;
- [46]With the revision, the distinction is clarified as to how the terms “phytosanitary action” and “emergency action” should be used appropriately, namely:
 - [47]the term “phytosanitary action” for operations undertaken to implement phytosanitary measures (e.g. in case of non-compliance of a consignment with phytosanitary import requirements);
 - [48]the term “emergency action” for operations undertaken in new or unexpected phytosanitary situations, such as the detection in an imported consignment of a pest not previously assessed.

- [49]The proposed revision of the definition of “emergency action” would not necessitate any ink amendments in adopted ISPMs because it is consistent with the current use of the term.

[50]*Current definition*

[51] emergency action	[52]A prompt phytosanitary action undertaken in a new or unexpected phytosanitary situation [ICPM, 2001]
------------------------------	---

[53]*Proposed revision*

[54] emergency action	[55]A prompt phytosanitary <u>official</u> action operation undertaken in a new or unexpected phytosanitary situation
------------------------------	--

2.2 [56]“clearance (of a consignment)” (2018-045)

[57]At its meeting in December 2018, the TPG had noted that the Glossary definition of “clearance (of a consignment)” is not clear as to whether “clearance” is the *result* of an “inspection” or the *process* of a particular type of inspection. The TPG therefore recommended to revise the definition of “clearance” to explicitly refer to the process of verifying a consignment’s compliance with phytosanitary regulations, and not to the authorization of the import or export of a consignment. Otherwise “clearance (of a consignment)” would be redundant and almost synonymous with “release (of a consignment)”, which is defined in the Glossary as “authorization of entry after clearance”.

[58]In May 2019, the SC therefore added “clearance (of a consignment)” to the *List of topics for IPPC standards* for a possible revision.

[59]The TPG at its November 2019 meeting analyzed definitions of Glossary terms linked to “clearance”, dictionary definitions of “clearance”, and the use of the term in adopted ISPMs. During the discussion, the TPG agreed to revise the definition to clarify that clearance is a process, and noted it should be applicable for export and import.

[60]The following explanatory points may be considered when reviewing the proposal for the revision of the definition of “clearance (of a consignment)”:

- [61]“Verification of” is proposed to be replaced by “process of verifying” to explicitly state that clearance is the *process* and not the *result* of the process of verifying compliance with phytosanitary regulations;
- [62]The addition of “official” to “process” emphasizes that clearance of consignments is the responsibility of NPPOs;
- [63]There is no need to specify by which means or methods (e.g. inspection, test, etc.) the process of clearance may be undertaken;
- [64]There is no need to specify that the process of clearance may actually lead to the release or interception of a consignment at import, or to the issuance or declined issuance of a phytosanitary certificate for export;
- [65]The proposed revision of the definition of “clearance (of consignment)” would not necessitate any ink amendments in adopted ISPMs because it is consistent with the current use of the term.

[66] *Current definition*

[67] Clearance (of a consignment)	[68] Verification of compliance with phytosanitary regulations [FAO, 1995]
--	---

[69] *Proposed revision*

[70] Clearance (of a consignment)	[71] Verification Official process of <u>verifying</u> compliance with phytosanitary regulations
--	---

2.3 [72] “detection survey” (consequential to 2015-013 “survey”)

[73] The Glossary term “survey” was added to the List of Topics for IPPC Standards by the Standards Committee (SC) in May 2013, for the Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG) to consider whether the concept of “absence” should be included in its definition. TPG 2016-05 proposed in the draft 2017 Amendments a revision to the definition of “survey”, which was in accordance with the draft revision of ISPM 6, the use of the term in other ISPMs and the three types of surveys defined in the Glossary. During their review of first consultation comments, SC-7 2018-05 noted that the determination of absence of a pest is not part of the definition of “detection survey”. The SC-7 asked the TPG to consider whether the definition of “detection survey” should be amended, by ink amendment, to include “or absence”.

[74] The TPG discussed the term “detection survey” in their December 2018 meeting. The following explanatory points may be considered when reviewing the proposal for the revision of its definition:

- [75] “Detection survey” is used in several instances throughout ISPMs when referring to determining or verifying absence of a pest.
- [76] The objective of a detection survey is to determine whether a pest is present, meaning that presence and absence are equally possible outcomes of a detection survey and it can thus be used to determine that a pest is absent.
- [77] “If” in the definition already expresses the concept of absence, but without being as explicit as in the definitions of “survey”, “delimiting survey” and “surveillance”. It is therefore suggested to replace the conditional “if” by the addition of “or absence”.
- [78] It is proposed to include in the definition “in an area, place of production or production site” to be consistent with the definition of “survey” and to improve clarity.
- [79] The proposed revised definition of “detection survey” adequately reflects the use of the term in adopted ISPMs.

- [80] *Current definition*

[81] Detection survey	[82] Survey conducted in an area to determine if pests are present [FAO, 1990; revised FAO, 1995]
------------------------------	--

- [83] *Proposed revision*

[84] Detection survey	[85] Survey conducted to determine <u>presence or absence</u> of pests in an area, place of production or production site [FAO, 1990; revised FAO, 1995]
------------------------------	---

[86]