

**[1]Draft 2015 and 2016 amendments to ISPM 5: *Glossary of phytosanitary terms* (1994-001)**

**[2]Publication history**

<b>[3]Date of this document</b>	<b>[4]</b> 2017-05-22
<b>[5]Document category</b>	<b>[6]</b> Draft 2016 Amendments to ISPM 5 ( <i>Glossary of phytosanitary terms</i> ) (1994-001)
<b>[7]Current document stage</b>	<b>[8]</b> To second consultation period (2017-07)
<b>[9]Major stages</b>	<p><b>[10]</b>CEPM (1994) added topic: 1994-001, Amendments to ISPM 5: Glossary of phytosanitary terms</p> <p><b>[11]</b>2006-05 Standards Committee (SC) approved specification TP5</p> <p><b>[12]</b>2012-10 Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG) revised specification</p> <p><b>[13]</b>2012-11 SC revised and approved revised specification, revoking Specification 1</p> <p><b>[14]</b>2014-12 TPG drafted text (for draft Amendments approved by SC in 2015-05)</p> <p><b>[15]</b>2015-05 SC reviewed and approved for consultation</p> <p><b>[16]</b>2015-12 TPG drafted text (for draft Amendments approved by SC in 2016-05)</p> <p><b>[17]</b>2016-05 SC approved for first consultation</p> <p><b>[18]</b>2016-07 First consultation</p> <p><b>[19]</b>2016-12 TPG reviewed consultation comments and adjusted the draft 2016 Amendments.</p> <p><b>[20]</b><b>The TPG recommended withdrawing the revision of “endangered area” from the draft 2016 Amendments because “endangered area” is defined in Article II of IPPC and the original definition is not incorrect. The misunderstandings that the revision could address are not sufficiently important to merit an “agreed interpretation” of the term.</b> Instead, the Explanatory document on ISPM 5 (the “Annotated Glossary”), note 1, will be adjusted to clarify that the term “endangered area” should not be misinterpreted to mean an environmentally protected area in the ecological conservation sense.</p> <p><b>[21]</b>2017-05 SC-7 approved for second consultation</p>
<b>[22]Notes</b>	<p><b>[23]</b>Note to Secretariat formatting this paper: formatting in definitions and explanations (strikethrough, bold, italics) needs to remain.</p> <p><b>[24]</b><b>“Kiln-drying”</b> did not receive comments during first consultation and is therefore not open for comments in second consultation.</p> <p><b>[25]</b>2017-03-20 IPPC Secretariat corrected minor errors in the draft Amendments in consistency with TPG decisions.</p>

**[26]**IPPC Official contact points 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](#).

**[27]1. ADDITION**

**[28]1.1“exclusion (of a pest)” (2010-008)**

**[29]**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)<sup>1</sup>. The term was added to the *List of topics for IPPC standards* by the Standards Committee (SC) in April 2010 based on a proposal from the Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG). The TPGF definition was reviewed and modified by the TPG in October 2010, reviewed by the SC in May 2011 and sent for 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 first consultation.

[31]The TPG reviewed consultation 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 consultation comments that contracting parties had different understandings of “phytosanitary measure”. The TPG outlined two interpretations: 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 according to the definition of phytosanitary measures. The SC in May 2015 discussed the understanding of the term “phytosanitary measure” and did not agree which interpretation should be used.

[32]In their December 2015 meeting, the TPG discussed further the understanding of “phytosanitary measure”. 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 not to propose changes to the definitions of the terms “containment”, “control (of a pest)”, “eradication” and “suppression”.

[33]In their December 2016 meeting, the TPG reviewed comments from first consultation (2016) and adjusted the definition of the new term “exclusion (of a pest)” accordingly. The SC-7 reviewed the term and approved it for the second consultation.

[34]The following explanatory points may be considered when reviewing the proposal:

- [35]As this term is used frequently in ISPMs, it is useful to add the term and its definition in the Glossary to clarify its meaning relative to the collection of “control”-related terms,

---

□□

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

which currently includes “containment”, “control (of a pest)”, “eradication” and “suppression”.

- [36]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 (e.g. “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 (of a pest)”, “entry (of a pest)” or “establishment (of a pest)”.
- [37]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 be desirable to introduce inconsistency between these definitions.
- [38]The term “introduction” was replaced by the terms “entry or establishment” because by using the term “introduction” (i.e. “the entry of a pest resulting in its establishment”), the concept of exclusion could be misinterpreted as if it would only apply to pests which can establish. This would be in conflict with the Article VII of the IPPC (Requirements in relation to imports) paragraph 3, which specifies that “A contracting party may apply measures specified in this Article to pests which may not be capable of establishment in its territories but, if they gained entry, cause economic damage”. By using “entry or establishment” in the proposed definition, it is clear that the applied phytosanitary measures may address either entry or establishment, or both.
- [39]Although the definition of “entry (of a pest)” and “establishment (of a pest)” already refers to an area, 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.
- [40]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.

#### [41]Proposed addition

[42]exclusion (of a pest)	[43]Application of <b>phytosanitary measures</b> to prevent the <b>entry</b> or <b>establishment</b> of a <b>pest</b> into an <b>area</b> .
---------------------------	---

## [44]2. REVISIONS

### [45]2.1 “contaminating pest”, “contamination” (2012-001)

[46]The term “contaminating pest” was added to the *List of topics for IPPC standards* by the 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, in the 2013 consultation, many IPPC Official contact points 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 the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM-7) in 2012). Thus, they suggested not to delete the term “contaminating pest”, but rather to revise its definition.

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

[48]Revised definitions of “contaminating pest” and “contamination” were proposed by the TPG in December 2014 and reviewed in May 2015 by the SC which agreed to send them for first consultation in 2016. In December 2016, the TPG reviewed consultation comments and adjusted the definitions of “contaminating pest” and “contamination” accordingly. The SC-7 reviewed both terms and approved them for the second consultation.

[49]The following explanatory points may be considered when reviewing the proposed revised definitions.

**[50]For both terms:**

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

**[52]For “contaminating pest”:**

- [53]“packaging, conveyance, container or present in a storage place” was added not to restrict the definition to a commodity, hereby conveying the concept of “hitch-hiker pest” better, to align the definition of “contaminating pest” with that of “contamination”, and to more adequately reflect the various regulated articles that may carry a contaminating pest.
- [54]“carried by” was retained to clarify that a contaminating pest does not cause “infestation”. Indeed “infestation (of a commodity)” is defined as the “presence in a commodity of a living pest of the plant or plant product concerned” and thus using “present in” instead of “carried by” for commodities in the definition of “contaminating pest” could create confusion.
- [55]“present in” was added for “storage place”, as a “storage place” does not move and thus cannot carry a “contaminating pest”.
- [56]“does not infest those plants or plant products” was simplified by using the object pronoun “them”.

**[57]For “contamination”:**

- [58]“pests” was modified to “contaminating pest” to increase clarity of the definition by cross referring to this Glossary term, whose definition includes mention of “infestation”.
- [59]“other” was deleted, as it implied that pests are regulated articles, which is incorrect.
- [60]“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.

- [61]“or on” was added to “presence in” because, for example, a “regulated article” such as soil may be present in “or on” a container.
- [62]“packaging” was added to more adequately reflect the various regulated articles that may be contaminated.
- [63]“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”).

#### [64]Original definitions

[65]contaminating pest	[66]A <b>pest</b> that is carried by a <b>commodity</b> and, in the case of <b>plants</b> and <b>plant products</b> , does not infest those <b>plants</b> or <b>plant products</b> [CEPM, 1996; revised CEPM, 1999]
[67]contamination	[68]Presence in a <b>commodity</b> , storage place, conveyance or container, of <b>pests</b> or other <b>regulated articles</b> , not constituting an <b>infestation</b> (see <b>infestation</b> ) [CEPM, 1997; revised CEPM, 1999]

#### [69]Proposed revisions

[70]contaminating pest	[71]A <b>pest</b> that is carried by a <b>commodity</b> , <u>packaging</u> , conveyance or container, or present in a <u>storage place</u> and <u>that</u> , in the case of <b>plants</b> and <b>plant products</b> , does not <b>infest them</b> <del>these plants or plant products</del> [CEPM, 1996; revised CEPM, 1999]
[72]contamination	[73]Presence of <u>a <b>contaminating pests</b></u> or <del>other unintended presence of a regulated articles</del> in <u>or on</u> a <b>commodity</b> , <u>packaging</u> , <u>storage place</u> , conveyance, <u>or container or storage place</u> , <del>not constituting an infestation (see infestation)</del> [CEPM, 1997; revised CEPM, 1999]

#### [74]2.3“quarantine” (2015-002)

[75]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. The SC in May 2016 agreed to send the term “quarantine” for first consultation. In their December meeting, the TPG reviewed consultation comments and adjusted the definition accordingly. The SC-7 reviewed the term and approved it for the second consultation.

[76]The following explanatory points may be considered when reviewing the proposed revised definition:

- [77]Regulated articles may be kept in quarantine not only for inspection, testing or treatment, but also for observation or research (e.g. prohibited plants that are used for varietal selection or breeding in a quarantine station).
- [78]“pests or beneficial organisms” was added to the definition because it is current practice in many countries that pests or beneficial organisms are kept in quarantine stations for observation and research.
- [79]Intentionally, the definition is kept simple and not overly restrictive by not distinguishing between the purposes for quarantine of regulated articles and the purposes for quarantine of pests or beneficial organisms.
- [80]“observation or research” was moved to the end of the definition, so that the most common purposes of quarantine are quoted first.

- [81] “further” was removed from 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.

[82]**Current definition**

[83] <b>quarantine</b>	[84] <b>Official</b> confinement of <b>regulated articles</b> for observation and research or for further <b>inspection, testing</b> or <b>treatment</b> [FAO, 1990; revised FAO, 1995; CEPM, 1999]
------------------------	---

[85]**Proposed revision**

[86] <b>quarantine</b>	[87] <b>Official</b> confinement of <b>regulated articles, pests</b> or <b>beneficial organisms</b> for <del>observation and research</del> or for further <b>inspection, testing, or treatment,</b> <del>observation or research</del> [FAO, 1990; revised FAO, 1995; CEPM, 1999]
------------------------	--

[88]**2.4 “test” (2015-003), “visual examination” (2013-010)**

[89]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 consultation by the SC in May 2014. At their December 2014 meeting, the TPG discussed whether “visual examination”, “test” and “inspection” should be reviewed in combination, as suggested by a consultation 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 draft 2014 *Amendments to ISPM 5* (1994-001) so that definitions of “visual examination”, “test” and “inspection” could be considered by the TPG together to ensure they were 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 and concluded that the current definition of “inspection” did not need to be revised. As regards “test” and “visual examination”, the TPG reviewed consultation comments from first consultation (2016) in their December 2016 meeting and adjusted the definitions accordingly. The SC-7 reviewed both terms, adjusted the definition of “visual examination”, and approved both terms for the second consultation.

[90]The following explanatory points may be considered when reviewing the proposed revised definitions.

[91]**For both terms:**

- [92]Collecting and sending samples to a laboratory for the verification of a pest’s identity may be combined with the inspection process, independent if the verification is made visually or by testing.
- [93]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.

[94]**For “test”:**

- [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.



- [96]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 (one being visual and the other not).
- [97]The addition of “or determine compliance with phytosanitary regulations” allows the definition of “test” to cover the common use of testing to check for compliance (e.g. whether a required treatment has been carried out), beyond only determining if pests are present or identifying pests. It also permits a better alignment of the purposes of “inspection” and “test”.

**[98]For “visual examination”:**

- [99]The definition of “visual examination” should describe the process of visual examination, but not its purpose (“to detect pests or contaminants”) which 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 carried out on regulated articles 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.
- [100]“Without testing” was deleted because it does not add clarification, and the contrast to “testing” is already well covered under the definition of “test”. Although “processing” is often necessary and more elaborate before “testing”, some simple processing (e.g. dyeing) may also be carried out before visual examination, so need not to be mentioned.
- [101]“physical” was deleted from the definition of “visual examination” as it was felt to be redundant, could cause confusion and did not help to define the term.
- [102]“plants, plant products, or other regulated articles” was deleted from the definition to make it less restrictive by not focusing on *what* is being examined but rather emphasizing *how* the examination is carried out. This deletion allows the term to be used for “visual examination” of objects that are not regulated articles.
- [103]ISPM 23 states that certain tools may be used in conjunction with the inspection process. The simple use of an optical microscope can be considered part of the inspection process, although it was recognized that it may also be used with tests. “Optical microscope” was used instead of “microscope” to avoid creating interpretation difficulties between “visual examination” and “test” which may require the use of a microscope. Besides, “other” was added before “optical microscope” as a stereoscope is a type of optical microscope.

**[104]Current definitions**

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

**[109]Proposed revisions**

[110]test	[111]Official examination of <b>plants, plant products</b> or other <b>regulated articles</b> , other than visual, to determine if <b>pests</b> are present, <del>or to identify pests</del> or determine compliance with <b>phytosanitary regulations</b> [FAO, 1990]
[112]visual examination	[113]The physical examination of <b>plants, plant products</b> , or other <b>regulated articles</b> using the unaided eye, lens, stereoscope or <u>other optical</u>

	microscope to detect <del>pests or contaminants</del> without <del>testing or processing</del> [ISPM 23]
--	--

### [114]3. DELETIONS

#### [115]3.1 “kiln-drying” (2013-006)

[116]The term “kiln-drying” was added to the *List of topics for IPPC standards* by the SC in May 2013 based on a TPG proposal. The TPG in February 2014 proposed a revised definition in the draft 2014 *Amendments to ISPM 5*, which was not accepted by the SC in 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. This proposed deletion received no comments during first consultation in 2016, and it will therefore not be open for comments in second consultation in 2017.

[117]The following explanatory points may be considered:

- [118]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 also to meet quality requirements.
- [119]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.
- [120]In the current Glossary definition, “or humidity control” is incorrect as there is always humidity control.
- [121]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.

#### [122]*Proposed deletion*

[123]kiln-drying	[124]A process in which <b>wood</b> is dried in a closed chamber using heat and/or humidity control to achieve a required moisture content [ISPM 15]
------------------	--

#### [125]3.2. “pre-clearance” (2013-016)

[126]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 annex 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)<sup>2</sup> for 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-

□□—————

[127]<sup>2</sup> The annex to ISPM 20 on *Arrangements for verification of compliance of consignments by the importing country in the exporting country* was adopted in April 2017 by the CPM.



clearance” (2013-016). The TPG in December 2016 reviewed consultation comments from first consultation (2016) and noted that some contracting parties wished to retain the term in the Glossary, suggesting that the definition be revised. The TPG considered this carefully but agreed to retain the proposal for deletion. The SC-7 approved the proposed deletion of the term for the second consultation.

[128]The following explanatory points may be considered:

- [129]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.
- [130]“Pre-clearance” is currently used in many different countries with very different meanings, as also demonstrated by the variety of comments received during first consultation. It does not seem possible to revise its definition to adequately reflect all the various meanings of the term allowing for international harmonization and agreement.
- [131]The term “pre-clearance” is only used three times in ISPM 20 and without any clarification of the meaning or use of the concept. The term has intentionally not been used in the annex to ISPM 20 on *Arrangements for verification of compliance of consignments by the importing country in the exporting country*, adopted in 2017 by CPM-12. It took the IPPC community 12 years to agree on the content of that annex dealing with a concept that, for some, may be considered (partly) as pre-clearance, and for others not at all. In the annex a clear concept has been developed. If it is deemed desirable to develop a term and definition covering the concept of that annex, such process could be initiated according to the requirements set out in the IPPC Standard setting procedure.
- [132]Countries may continue to use the term if they deem it is useful, but the usage of a term does not necessitate it being defined in the Glossary.
- [133]Thus, the deletion of the term from the Glossary appears to be the best solution as its current definition is incorrect and there is currently no common understanding of which concept may need to be assigned a “shortcut” in the form of a term and definition.
- [134]Ink amendments to ISPM 20 might be considered at a later stage to reflect the concept outlined in the draft annex to ISPM 20 if deemed appropriate.
- [135]The deletion of the term “pre-clearance” would not affect the meaning of “clearance (of a consignment)” which is considered to be clear.

[136]**Proposed deletion**

[137] <b>pre-clearance</b>	[138] <b>Phytosanitary certification</b> and/or <b>clearance</b> in the <b>country of origin</b> , performed by or under the regular supervision of the <b>national plant protection organization</b> of the country of destination [FAO, 1990; revised FAO, 1995]
----------------------------	--

[139]