

[PleaseReview document review. Review title: 2018 First Consultation: Draft 2018 amendments to ISPM 5 (1994-001). Document title: 1994-001\_Draft 2018\_AmendmentsISPM5\_En\_2018-05-18.docx]

[1]**DRAFT 2018 AMENDMENTS TO ISPM 5:  
GLOSSARY OF PHYTOSANITARY TERMS (1994-001)**

[2]**Publication history**

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

[4] <b>Date of this document</b>	[5]2018-05-17
[6] <b>Document category</b>	[7]Draft 2018 Amendments to ISPM 5 ( <i>Glossary of phytosanitary terms</i> ) (1994-001)
[8] <b>Current document stage</b>	[9]To first consultation (2018-07)
[10] <b>Major stages</b>	[11]CEPM (1994) added topic: 1994-001, Amendments to ISPM 5: Glossary of phytosanitary terms [12]2006-05 Standards Committee (SC) approved specification TP5 [13]2012-10 Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG) revised specification [14]2012-11 SC revised and approved revised specification, revoking Specification 1 [15]2017-12 TPG drafted text [16]2018-05 SC discussed draft
[17] <b>Notes</b>	[18]Note to Secretariat formatting this paper: formatting in definitions and explanations (strikethrough, bold, italics) needs to remain.

[19]IPPC Official contact points are asked to consider the following proposals for deletion and revision 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 comments. For full details on the discussions related to the specific terms, please refer to the meeting reports on the [IPP](#).

[20]**1. DELETIONS**

[21]**1.1 “commodity class” (2015-013)**

[22]The term “commodity class” (2015-013) was added to the *List of topics for IPPC standards* by the Standards Committee (SC) in November 2015, because difficulties related to the understanding of its Glossary definition had been identified. The SC asked the Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG) to review this term in light of the discussions on the concept of a commodity standard and commodity classes within the context of ePhyto and consider deletion.

[23]In December 2016, the TPG discussed the term “commodity class”. They felt that the definition for “commodity class” was not useful and that it might be suitable to delete it from the Glossary. The TPG agreed to analyze how the term had been used in standards and suggested that the various Glossary terms defining different commodity classes also be reviewed to determine if their definitions added value or rather created difficulties.

[24]In May 2017, the SC confirmed that the TPG should consider the term “commodity class” (2015-013) and its possible deletion. The SC removed the pending status of the term “cut flowers and branches (as a commodity class)” (2012-007) and added the following terms to the *List of topics for IPPC standards*: “bulbs and tubers (as a commodity class)” (2017-001), “fruits and vegetables (as a commodity class)” (2017-003), “grain (as a commodity class)” (2017-004), “plants in vitro (as a

commodity class)” (2017-006), “seeds (as a commodity class)” (2017-007) and “wood (as a commodity class)” (2017-009).

[25]In their December 2017 meeting, the TPG discussed the term “commodity class” as well as the above listed Glossary terms defining different commodity classes.

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

- [27]The current Glossary definition of “commodity class” refers to “similar commodities that can be considered together in phytosanitary regulations”. This could be interpreted as meaning that the same requirements should be established for all commodities within a commodity class. However, the grouping of commodities based on an *a priori* perceived similar pest risk has proven to be unrealistic in that it conflicts with the actual specific requirements that may be set for individual commodities within a commodity class. Thus, the Glossary definition of “commodity class” and the categorization of specific commodities into commodity classes has caused confusion for the IPPC community when developing commodity standards.
- [28]Grouping commodities into a higher level of commodity classes and defining this hierarchy in the Glossary is not useful for the development of standards, because the scope of an individual standard should define which commodities are covered by the standard. Furthermore, commodity classes’ definitions often created confusion and did not provide clarity and support for the drafting of commodity standards.
- [29]Harmonization of product descriptions is needed for the development of the ePhyto project, but the current Glossary terms related to commodity classes are not helpful for that work. The term “commodity class” is not used within the context of the ongoing work on ePhyto: Appendix 1 to ISPM 12 on *Electronic phytosanitary certificates, information on standard XML schemas and exchange mechanisms* and the related links on the IPPC website only refer to “commodity” and “product description”, and not to “commodity class”.
- [30]Not having a definition for “commodity class” in the Glossary would not prevent countries from considering similar commodities together in phytosanitary regulations, whenever technically justified.
- [31]“Commodity class” is used as a qualifier in several Glossary terms (e.g. “seeds (as a commodity class)”) and is used in several adopted ISPMs. Ink amendments to adopted ISPMs removing “commodity class” could be easily applied without affecting the meaning of those standards. According to the TPG’s review, most ink amendments could be carried out by deleting “commodity class” or replacing it with “commodity”.

[32]**Proposed deletion**

[33]commodity class	[34]A category of similar <b>commodities</b> that can be considered together in <b>phytosanitary regulations</b> [FAO, 1990]
---------------------	--

[35]**1.2 “bulbs and tubers (as a commodity class)” (2017-001)**

[36]In addition to the background information provided in section 1.1 for “commodity class” (2015-013), the following specific explanatory points may be considered when reviewing the proposal for the deletion of the term “bulbs and tubers (as a commodity class)”:

- [37]The Glossary term “bulbs and tubers (as a commodity class)” is used inconsistently in adopted ISPMs and not always according to its Glossary definition. Some ISPMs use “bulbs and tubers” while others use the words separately; some ISPMs use “bulbs” or “tubers” in association with other commodities, such as in “bulbs, tubers and rhizomes” or “bulbs and rhizomes”, whereas the Glossary definition for “bulbs and tubers (as a commodity class)” includes rhizomes.

- [38]The Glossary term “bulbs and tubers (as a commodity class)” being defined as ‘for planting’ has not been used consistently in ISPMs with that exclusive meaning, as some bulbs and tubers (in the botanical sense) can be used for consumption and not for planting. As such, the definition has proven too artificial to be useful and does not improve understanding and implementation of ISPMs. Rather, where bulbs or tubers are mentioned in standards, their intended use should be specified in the context, if so needed.
- [39]The use of the words “bulbs” and “tubers” in their broad, common sense is appropriate and well understood in all current ISPM contexts.
- [40]The deletion of the term “bulbs and tubers (as a commodity class)” from the Glossary would not require any ink amendments.

[41]**Proposed deletion**

[42]bulbs and tubers (as a commodity class)	[43]Dormant underground parts of <b>plants</b> intended for <b>planting</b> (includes corms and rhizomes) [FAO, 1990; revised ICPM, 2001]
---	---

[44]1.3 “cut flowers and branches (as a commodity class)” (2012-007)

[45]In addition to the background information provided in section 1.1 for “commodity class” (2015-013), the following specific explanatory points may be considered when reviewing the proposal for the deletion of the term “cut flowers and branches (as a commodity class)”:

- [46]The current Glossary term “cut flowers and branches (as a commodity class)” is not consistent with the scope of the draft ISPM on *International movement of cut flowers and foliage* (2008-005), which currently excludes woody foliage. There is no need for a Glossary definition to clarify what a standard should cover, as this should be defined by the scope of the standard.
- [47]The Glossary term “cut flowers and branches (as a commodity class)” does not have any specific meaning in the phytosanitary context. It is making explicit the intended use of cut flowers and branches (i.e. “for decorative use and not for planting”) and their state (i.e. “fresh”), but this is also clear from the common meaning of the term.
- [48]The use of the words “cut flowers” or “cut flowers and branches” in their common sense is appropriate and well understood in all ISPM contexts where they are used.
- [49]The deletion of the term “cut flowers and branches (as a commodity class)” from the Glossary would not require any ink amendments.

[50]**Proposed deletion**

[51]cut flowers and branches (as a commodity class)*	[52]Fresh parts of <b>plants</b> intended for decorative use and not for <b>planting</b> [FAO, 1990; revised ICPM, 2001]
--	--

[53]1.4 “fruits and vegetables (as a commodity class)” (2017-003)

[54]In addition to the background information provided in section 1.1 for “commodity class” (2015-013), the following specific explanatory points may be considered when reviewing the proposal for the deletion of the term “fruits and vegetables (as a commodity class)”:

- [55]The Glossary term “fruits and vegetables (as a commodity class)” does not have any specific meaning in the phytosanitary context. It is making explicit the intended use of fruits and vegetables (i.e. “for consumption and processing and not for planting”) and their state (i.e. “fresh”), but this is also clear from the common meaning of the term.

- [56]The use of the words “fruits” and “vegetables” in their common sense is appropriate and well understood in all ISPM contexts where they are used.
- [57]The deletion of the term “fruits and vegetables (as a commodity class)” from the Glossary would not require any ink amendments.

[58]**Proposed deletion**

[59] <b>fruits and vegetables</b> (as a <b>commodity class</b> )	[60] <b>Fresh</b> parts of <b>plants</b> intended for consumption or processing and not for <b>planting</b> [FAO, 1990; revised ICPM, 2001]
---	---

[61]**1.5 “plants *in vitro* (as a commodity class)” (2017-006)**

[62]In addition to the background information provided in section 1.1 for “commodity class” (2015-013), the following specific explanatory points may be considered when reviewing the proposal for the deletion of the term “plants *in vitro* (as a commodity class)”:

- [63]The Glossary term “plants *in vitro* (as a commodity class)” does not have any specific meaning in the phytosanitary context.
- [64]“Plants *in vitro*” is only used in ISPM 32 (*Categorization of commodities according to their pest risk*) and ISPM 33 (*Pest free potato (Solanum spp.) micropropagative material and minitubers for international trade*) and the common understanding of “plants *in vitro*” is appropriate in those contexts.
- [65]The deletion of the term “plants *in vitro* (as a commodity class)” from the Glossary would not require any ink amendments.

[66]**Proposed deletion**

[67] <b>plants <i>in vitro</i></b> (as a <b>commodity class</b> )*	[68] <b>Plants</b> growing in an aseptic medium in a closed container [FAO, 1990; revised CEPM, 1999; ICPM, 2002; formerly “plants in tissue culture”]
--	--

[69]**2. REVISIONS**

[70]**2.1 “seeds (as a commodity class)” (2017-007), “grain (as a commodity class)” (2017-004)**

[71]See background information provided in section 1.1 for “commodity class” (2015-013).

[72]The following explanatory points may be considered when reviewing the proposals for the revision of “seeds (as a commodity class)” and “grain (as a commodity class)”:

- [73]The terms “seeds” and “grain” and their definitions should remain in the Glossary, because they are essential to explain the difference between these commodities in a phytosanitary context. While the Glossary definitions of “seeds” and “grain” both refer to “seeds (in the botanical sense)”, they distinguish “seeds” in the Glossary sense from “grain” in the Glossary sense by stating that their intended use is different, “seeds” being for planting and “grain” being for processing or consumption, but not for planting.
- [74]“Seeds” is used in several ISPMs and CPM recommendations, either according to its Glossary definition or in its botanical sense. The scope of ISPM 38 (*International movement of seeds*) is consistent with the Glossary definition for “seeds” and this definition did not create any challenge during the development of this standard.
- [75]“Grain” is used consistently in several ISPMs according to its Glossary definition: for consumption or processing, but not for planting. Also in the draft ISPM on the *International movement of grain* (2008-007), the use of the term “grain” is consistent with its Glossary

definition, even if the current scope of the draft standard is restricted to only three particular types of grain commodities (cereals, oilseeds and pulses).

- [76]Because the term “commodity class” is proposed for deletion from the Glossary (see section 1.1), it would be confusing to use “as a commodity class” as a qualifier to the terms “seeds” and “grain”. However, having a qualifier for the Glossary term “seeds” is needed to distinguish the Glossary term from seeds in its botanical sense (i.e. a propagating organ formed in the sexual reproductive cycle of plants) or even from seeds in its agricultural broad sense (including not only true seeds, but also vegetative plant parts which may be sown e.g. seed potatoes). Since grouping commodities into higher levels and defining this hierarchy in the Glossary is not useful, it is proposed to use the qualifier “as a commodity” instead of “as commodity class” to allow for the use of “seeds” in its botanical or agricultural broad sense where necessary. For consistency, the qualifier “as a commodity” should also be used for the Glossary term “grain”.

[77]**Current definitions**

[78] <b>seeds</b> (as a <b>commodity class</b> )	[79]Seeds (in the botanical sense) for <b>planting</b> [FAO, 1990; revised ICPM, 2001; CPM, 2016]
[80] <b>grain</b> (as a <b>commodity class</b> )	[81]Seeds (in the botanical sense) for processing or consumption, but not for <b>planting</b> [FAO, 1990; revised ICPM, 2001; CPM, 2016]

[82]**Proposed revisions**

[83] <b>seeds</b> (as a <b>commodity class</b> )	[84]Seeds (in the botanical sense) for <b>planting</b> [FAO, 1990; revised ICPM, 2001; CPM, 2016]
[85] <b>grain</b> (as a <b>commodity class</b> )	[86]Seeds (in the botanical sense) for processing or consumption, but not for <b>planting</b> [FAO, 1990; revised ICPM, 2001; CPM, 2016]

[87]**2.2 “wood (as a commodity class)” (2017-009)**

[88]See background information provided in section 1.1 for “commodity class” (2015-013).

[89]The following explanatory points may be considered when reviewing the proposal for the revision of “wood (as a commodity class)”:

- [90]Although wood packaging material, processed wood material and bamboo products would normally be considered as wood in its broad sense, the Glossary definition of “wood” clearly excludes these materials and products. Because of these exclusions, the Glossary definition of “wood” is useful and the term should remain in the Glossary.
- [91]The scope of ISPM 39 (*International movement of wood*) is consistent with the Glossary definition of “wood” as it also excludes wood packaging material which is covered by ISPM 15 (*Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade*), processed wood material and bamboo.
- [92]For consistency with the proposed deletion of “commodity class” (see section 1.1) and revision of “seeds” and “grain” (see section 2.1), the qualifier “as a commodity” should be used instead of “as commodity class”.

[93]**Current definition**

[94] <b>wood</b> (as a <b>commodity class</b> )	[95] <b>Commodities</b> such as <b>round wood, sawn wood</b> , wood chips and wood residue, with or without <b>bark</b> , excluding <b>wood packaging material, processed wood material</b> and bamboo products [FAO, 1990; revised ICPM, 2001; CPM, 2016]
---	--

[96]**Proposed revision**

[97]wood (as a commodity class)	[98]Commodities such as <b>round wood, sawn wood</b> , wood chips and wood residue, with or without <b>bark</b> , excluding <b>wood packaging material, processed wood material</b> and bamboo products [FAO, 1990; revised ICPM, 2001; CPM, 2016]
---------------------------------	--

### [99]2.3 “treatment” (2017-008)

[100]In May 2017, the SC added the term “treatment” to the *List of Topics for IPPC Standards* for a possible revision to make the term usable in a non-official sense. Because treatment in the Glossary sense is always official and finding an alternative term to be used in national legislations for the non-official cases (e.g. farmers treating their crops) has proven difficult, it may be useful to consider revising the definition.

[101]The TPG discussed the term “treatment” in their December 2017 meeting. The following explanatory points may be considered when reviewing the proposal for its revision:

- [102]“Treatment” is both a common term and a phytosanitary term defined in the Glossary. It is useful to retain the Glossary term in order to refer to treatments as official procedures, as opposed to non-official treatments applied by farmers to their crops.
- [103]When used according to its Glossary definition, a treatment is a phytosanitary measure. The qualifier “as a phytosanitary measure” should be added to the term so that the word “treatment” can, in other contexts, still be used in its non-official sense. When used in the context of a phytosanitary measure, “treatment” would refer to an official procedure as per its Glossary definition.
- [104]“Regulated” should be added to “pests” in the Glossary definition of “treatment (as a phytosanitary measure)” because, according to its Glossary definition, a “phytosanitary measure” only applies to regulated pests. In some situations, official treatments need to be applied on imports for pests which are not yet regulated; however, this would not conflict with the proposed revised definition of “treatment (as a phytosanitary measure)” because the application of treatments in those situations would refer to emergency actions.
- [105]Editorials are proposed to simplify the definition and make it more readable, as all the actions of killing, inactivating, removing, rendering infertile and devitalizing are related to regulated pests.

#### [106]Current definition

[107]treatment	[108]Official procedure for the killing, <b>inactivation</b> or removal of <b>pests</b> , or for rendering <b>pests</b> infertile or for <b>devitalization</b> [FAO, 1990, revised FAO, 1995; ISPM 15, 2002; ISPM 18, 2003; ICPM, 2005]
----------------	---

#### [109]Proposed revision

[110]treatment (as a <u>phytosanitary measure</u> )	[111]Official procedure for the killing, <b>inactivating</b> , or removing <b>regulated pests</b> , or for rendering <b>regulated pests</b> infertile or for <b>devitalization</b> [FAO, 1990, revised FAO, 1995; ISPM 15, 2002; ISPM 18, 2003; ICPM, 2005]
---	---

[112]