



# COMMISSION ON PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES

## Twelfth Session

**Incheon, Republic of Korea , 5-11 April 2017**

**Adoption of International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures - Ink  
Amendments to Adopted ISPMs**

**Agenda item 9.2**

**Prepared by the IPPC Secretariat**

## I. Background

1. The Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG) proposed various sets of ink amendments in their meeting in December 2015. The ink amendments were reviewed and approved by the Standards Committee (SC) in their May 2016 meeting. The ink amendments are presented in Attachments 01 through 04, each document clarifying the background and rationale for the specific proposals.

- Attachment 01 contains ink amendments across standards to replace “trading partner” (2013-009).
- Attachment 02 contains ink amendments to ISPM 3 (*Guidelines for the export, shipment, import and release of biological control agents and other beneficial organisms*) to replace “quarantine facility” with “quarantine station”.
- Attachment 03 contains ink amendments across standards for “controlled area” and “protected area” with “regulated area”.
- Attachment 04 contains ink amendments to the term “practically free” in ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*).

## II. Decisions

2. The CPM is invited to:
  - 1) *note* the ink amendments presented in Attachments 1–4.
  - 2) *note* that the ink amendments, translated into FAO official languages, will be implemented into the language versions of the concerned standards as resources permit.
  - 3) *agree* that, once the Secretariat has applied the ink amendments, the previous versions of the standards are revoked and replaced by the newly noted versions.

## Consistency changes across ISPMs: *trading partner* (2013-009)

(Prepared by TPG 2015-12, approved by SC May 2016)

### Background

- [1] In reviewing ISPM 17 (*Pest reporting*) for consistency, in its October 2012 meeting, the TPG noted that the term *trading partners* was used in an unclear manner in this standard. Where ISPMs normally intend trading partners to be countries, the mention here could refer to a commercial trading company. In order to clarify the meaning of the term, the TPG asked that it should be added as a subject on the TPG work programme.
- [2] The SC May 2013 agreed and added the term to the *List of topics for IPPC standards*.
- [3] The TPG in its February 2014 meeting discussed the term.
- [4] Where it had previously been envisaged that this term in ISPMs covered both importing and exporting countries, the analysis presented to the meeting demonstrated that:
- in most cases the intended meaning of *trading partners* is *importing countries*. However, the TPG believed that the term *trading partners* potentially creates serious misunderstandings. In particular, it could be read to cover exporting countries and private companies, which was not intended in most cases.
- The TPG noted that a definition of *trading partners* would not be useful. It recommended that this term be avoided in ISPMs in the future, and text to this effect was added to the *General recommendation on consistency* (agenda item 7.1 and Appendix 7). Because its use caused serious misunderstanding of ISPMs, the TPG proposed that the process for consistency across standards be used to correct existing ISPMs. Proposals were made to replace *trading partners* where it is used in ISPMs, to be presented to the SC in May 2014.
- [5] The SC May 2014 discussed the consistency proposals (under agenda item 8.2) but since “there were some concerns regarding the proposal for replacing all the uses of *trading partners* with *importing countries*”, the TPG was asked to review the proposed ink amendments.
- [6] The TPG December 2014 discussed the proposed ink amendments and made changes to address the SC concerns.
- [7] The SC May 2015 reviewed the proposed ink amendments but “some SC members had some concerns with some of the proposals, either due to the wording or the change in meaning”, and invited SC members to submit written comments. Hereafter the TPG should revise the proposals and submit them for an SC e-decision.
- [8] The TPG received comments from one SC member and the TPG lead proposed responses and changes to the proposals. The TPG discussed this version in a TPG e-forum (TPG e-decision\_02) but did not reach agreement and the proposals were presented to the TPG December 2015 meeting, where consensus was reached.
- [9] The SC May 2016 reviewed the ink amendments and agreed to them, without proposing additional modifications.

## Introduction

- [10] The TPG found that in the great majority of cases in ISPMs, trading partner (or trade partner) can be replaced by “NPPOs of importing countries”, or a very slightly different rewording can be done, without any apparent change of meaning. In a few cases, trading partner is understood to have another meaning and different rewording is proposed.
- [11] The ISPMs that are considered in this table are:
- [12] ISPM 4 (*Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas*), ISPM 8 (*Determination of pest status in an area*), ISPM 9 (*Guidelines for pest eradication programmes*), ISPM 11 (*Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests*), ISPM 14 (*The use of integrated measures in a systems approach for pest risk management*), ISPM 15 (*Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade*), ISPM 17 (*Pest reporting*), ISPM 24 (*Guidelines for the determination and recognition of equivalence of phytosanitary measures*), ISPM 29 (*Recognition of pest free areas and areas of low pest prevalence*) and ISPM 30 (*Establishment of areas of low pest prevalence for fruit flies (Tephritidae)*).
- [13] **Table 1: Proposed changes across ISPMs in relation to the use of “trading partners”**

Row	ISPM	Section / para	Current text	Proposed text	Rationale
1.	4	2.3.4	Documentation may include supporting evidence describing official controls such as survey results, phytosanitary regulations and information on the NPPO as noted in section 1.3. As this type of PFA is likely to involve an agreement between trade partners, its implementation would need to be reviewed and evaluated by the NPPO of the importing country.	Documentation may include supporting evidence describing official controls such as survey results, phytosanitary regulations and information on the NPPO as noted in section 1.3. As this type of PFA is likely to involve an agreement between <u>the exporting and the importing country</u> <del>between trade partners</del> , its implementation would need to be reviewed and evaluated by the NPPO of the importing country.	Because in the section 2.3 - case the PFA is created for export purposes, the 'likely agreement' is <b>between the exporting and the importing country</b> . Agreements within the exporting country between producers or producers and the NPPO are not relevant to mention in an ISPM, and such agreements are not providing the rationale for the NPPO to 'review and evaluate'.
2.	8	4, 3 <sup>rd</sup> para, 3 <sup>rd</sup> indent	To observe good reporting practices, NPPOs should: .... inform the NPPO of trading partners as soon as possible, and their regional plant protection organization (RPPO) where appropriate, of relevant changes in pest	To observe good reporting practices, NPPOs should: .... inform the <u>NPPOs of countries that are traded with trading partners</u> as soon as possible, and their regional plant protection organization (RPPO) where appropriate, of	The proposed change is consistent with reporting obligations of an NPPO under the IPPC and contributes to facilitation of international trade of plants and plant products. An NPPO has no 'trading partners' and has no obligation to report to trading organizations. The change clarifies

Row	ISPM	Section / para	Current text	Proposed text	Rationale
			status and especially reports of newly established pests	relevant changes in pest status and especially reports of newly established pest	that the obligation is towards those countries that the country in question trades with.
3.	9	Outline of Requirement s, 4 <sup>th</sup> para	When an eradication programme is completed, the absence of the pest must be verified. The verification procedure should use criteria established at the beginning of the programme and should be supported by adequate documentation of programme activities and results. The verification stage is integral to the programme, and should involve independent analysis if trading partners require this reassurance. Successful programmes result in a declaration of eradication by the NPPO. When unsuccessful, all aspects of the programme should be reviewed, including the biology of the pest to determine if new information is available, and the cost-benefit of the programme.	When an eradication programme is completed, the absence of the pest must be verified. The verification procedure should use criteria established at the beginning of the programme and should be supported by adequate documentation of programme activities and results. The verification stage is integral to the programme, and should involve independent analysis if <del>trading partners</del> <u>NPPOs of importing countries</u> require this reassurance. Successful programmes result in a declaration of eradication by the NPPO. When unsuccessful, all aspects of the programme should be reviewed, including the biology of the pest to determine if new information is available, and the cost-benefit of the programme.	Under the IPPC, NPPOs of importing countries (and not 'trading partners') have the right to verify/analyse pest status in the exporting countries which includes the results of eradication programs.
4.	9	2.3.2, 4 <sup>th</sup> para	In cases where survey data are to provide the basis for establishing a pest free area for export purposes, it may be desirable to consult trading partners in advance to determine the quantity and quality of data necessary to meet their phytosanitary import requirements.	In cases where survey data are to provide the basis for establishing a pest free area for export purposes, it may be desirable to consult <del>trading partners</del> <u>NPPOs of importing countries</u> in advance to determine the quantity and quality of data necessary to meet their phytosanitary import requirements.	This is up to NPPOs of importing countries (and not 'trading partners') to decide about quantity and quality of data necessary to meet phytosanitary import requirements.
5.	9	3, 2 <sup>nd</sup> para	Direction and coordination should be provided by an official management authority, ensuring that criteria are established to determine when eradication has been achieved and that appropriate documentation and process controls exist to provide sufficient confidence in the results. It may be necessary to consult with	Direction and coordination should be provided by an official management authority, ensuring that criteria are established to determine when eradication has been achieved and that appropriate documentation and process controls exist to provide sufficient confidence in the results. It may be necessary to consult with	NPPOs of importing countries (and not 'trading partners') establish phytosanitary import requirements. Therefore it is important that they accept aspects of the eradication process to consider eradication results reliable.

Row	ISPM	Section / para	Current text	Proposed text	Rationale
			trading partners over some aspects of the eradication process.	<del>NPPOs of importing countries</del> trading partners over some aspects of the eradication process.	
6.	9	3.4	NPPOs should ensure that records are kept of information supporting all stages of the eradication process. It is essential that NPPOs maintain such documentation in case trading partners request information to support claims of pest freedom.	NPPOs should ensure that records are kept of information supporting all stages of the eradication process. It is essential that NPPOs maintain such documentation in case <del>trading partners</del> <del>NPPOs of importing countries</del> request information to support claims of pest freedom.	Under the IPPC, NPPOs of importing countries have the obligation to report on request of the exporting countries (and not 'trading partners') of the "occurrence outbreak or spread of pests". This includes records of information on eradication programs.
7.	11	2.3.1.2, 1 <sup>st</sup> para, 1 <sup>st</sup> indent	effects on domestic and export markets, including in particular effects on export market access (The potential consequences for market access which may result if the pest becomes established, should be estimated. This involves considering the extent of any phytosanitary regulations imposed (or likely to be imposed) by trading partners.)	effects on domestic and export markets, including in particular effects on export market access (The potential consequences for market access which may result if the pest becomes established, should be estimated. This involves considering the extent of any phytosanitary regulations imposed (or likely to be imposed) by <del>importing countries</del> trading partners.)	Any phytosanitary regulations could be imposed only by importing countries and not by 'trading partners'.
8.	14	8, 1 <sup>st</sup> para	The development of a systems approach may be undertaken by the importing country, or by the exporting country, or ideally through the cooperation of both countries. The process of developing systems approaches may include consultation with industry, the scientific community, and trading partner(s). However, the NPPO of the importing country decides the suitability of the systems approach in meeting its requirements, subject to consideration of technical justification, minimal impact,	The development of a systems approach may be undertaken by the importing country, or by the exporting country, or ideally through the cooperation of both countries. The process of developing systems approaches may include consultation with industry, the scientific community, and <del>NPPOs of importing and exporting countries</del> trading partner(s). However, the NPPO of the importing country decides the suitability of the systems approach in meeting its requirements, subject to consideration of technical justification, minimal impact,	The systems approaches are primarily developed by NPPOs of importing countries (and not 'trading partners') in cooperation (if needed) with the scientific community and industry.

Row	ISPM	Section / para	Current text	Proposed text	Rationale
			transparency, non-discrimination, equivalence and operational feasibility.	transparency, non-discrimination, equivalence and operational feasibility.	
9.	14	9.1, 2 <sup>nd</sup> para	Where the systems approach has been found unacceptable, the rationale for this decision should be described in detail and made available to trading partners to facilitate the identification of possible improvements.	Where the systems approach has been found unacceptable, the rationale for this decision should be described in detail and made available to <u>NPPOs of the exporting country trading partners</u> to facilitate the identification of possible improvements.	Under the ISPM 14, “The development of a systems approach may be undertaken by the importing country, or by the exporting country, or ideally through the cooperation of both countries.” This means that when the importing country finds the systems approach unacceptable (not feasible, not sufficiently effective, unnecessarily restrictive or not possible to evaluate) the rationale for this decision should be made available to the NPPO of the exporting country.
10.	15	3.3	NPPOs may accept measures other than those listed in Annex 1 by bilateral arrangement with their trading partners. In such cases, the mark shown in Annex 2 must not be used unless all requirements of this standard have been met.	NPPOs may accept measures other than those listed in Annex 1 by bilateral arrangement <u>with their trading partners</u> . In such cases, the mark shown in Annex 2 must not be used unless all requirements of this standard have been met.	The ‘bilateral arrangement’ (which could include exemptions from ISPM 15 requirements) is an agreement between the exporting and importing countries which means between their NPPOs (and not ‘trading partners’).
11.	17	Outline of requirements , 1 <sup>st</sup> para	The International Plant Protection Convention requires contracting parties to report on the occurrence, outbreak and spread of pests with the purpose of communicating immediate or potential danger. National plant protection organizations (NPPOs) have the responsibility to collect pest information by surveillance and to verify the pest records thus collected. Occurrence, outbreak or spread of pests that are known (on the basis of observation, previous experience,	The International Plant Protection Convention requires contracting parties to report on the occurrence, outbreak and spread of pests with the purpose of communicating immediate or potential danger. National plant protection organizations (NPPOs) have the responsibility to collect pest information by surveillance and to verify the pest records thus collected. Occurrence, outbreak or spread of pests that are known (on the basis of observation, previous experience,	Reporting occurrence, outbreak or spread of pests is an obligation of NPPOs and should be ensured for countries concerned. Using “countries that are traded with” limits this obligation to those countries that are really concerned. If “importing countries” was used it would not be clear <i>which</i> importing countries would be intended, whereas it is now clear that it is only those countries that are traded with.

Row	ISPM	Section / para	Current text	Proposed text	Rationale
			or pest risk analysis (PRA)) to be of immediate or potential danger should be reported to other countries, in particular to neighbouring countries and trading partners.	or pest risk analysis (PRA)) to be of immediate or potential danger should be reported to other countries, in particular to <u>NPPOs of neighbouring countries and trading partners of countries that are traded with.</u>	
12.	17	2	The main purpose of pest reporting is to communicate immediate or potential danger. Immediate or potential danger normally arises from the occurrence, outbreak or spread of a pest that is a quarantine pest in the country in which it is detected, or a quarantine pest for neighbouring countries and trading partners.	The main purpose of pest reporting is to communicate immediate or potential danger. Immediate or potential danger normally arises from the occurrence, outbreak or spread of a pest that is a quarantine pest in the country in which it is detected, or a quarantine pest for neighbouring countries and <u>trading partners countries that are traded with.</u>	Countries are concerned about occurrence, outbreak or spread of pests if they are quarantine pests for them.  Using “countries that are traded with” limits this obligation to those countries that are really concerned. If “importing countries” was used it would not be clear <i>which</i> importing countries would be intended, whereas it is now clear that it is only those countries that are traded with.
13.	17	4.1, 4 <sup>th</sup> para	Contracting parties have an obligation to report occurrence, outbreak or spread of pests that are not of danger to them but are known to be regulated by or of immediate danger to other countries. This will concern trading partners (for relevant pathways) and neighbouring countries to which the pest could spread without trade.	Contracting parties have an obligation to report occurrence, outbreak or spread of pests that are not of danger to them but are known to be regulated by or of immediate danger to other countries. This will concern <u>importing countries</u> <del>trading partners</del> (for relevant pathways) and neighbouring countries to which the pest could spread without trade.	Occurrence, outbreak or spread of pests concern more countries than traders.
14.	17	5.1	Occurrence should normally be reported where the presence of a pest is newly determined, which is known to be a regulated pest by neighbouring countries or trading partners (for relevant pathways).	Occurrence should normally be reported where the presence of a pest is newly determined, which is known to be a regulated pest <u>by in</u> neighbouring <del>countries</del> or <u>importing countries</u> <del>trading partners</del> (for relevant pathways).	Countries are concerned about occurrence of pests if these pests are regulated by them (not by traders).
15.	17	5.2, 2 <sup>nd</sup> para	The term outbreak also applies to an unexpected situation associated with an established pest which results in a	The term outbreak also applies to an unexpected situation associated with an established pest which results in a	Outbreak and establishment of regulated pests concern more

Row	ISPM	Section / para	Current text	Proposed text	Rationale
			significant increase in phytosanitary risk to the reporting country, neighbouring countries or trading partners, particularly if it is known that the pest is a regulated pest. Such unexpected situations could include a rapid increase in the pest population, changes in host range the development of a new, more vigorous strain or biotype, or the detection of a new pathway.	significant increase in phytosanitary risk to the reporting, neighbouring <del>countries</del> or <del>importing countries</del> <del>trading partners</del> , particularly if it is known that the pest is a regulated pest. Such unexpected situations could include a rapid increase in the pest population, changes in host range the development of a new, more vigorous strain or biotype, or the detection of a new pathway.	countries (reporting, neighbouring and importing) than traders.
16.	17	5.3	Spread concerns an established pest that expands its geographical distribution, resulting in a significant increase in pest risk to the reporting country, neighbouring countries or trading partners, particularly if it is known that the pest is regulated.	Spread concerns an established pest that expands its geographical distribution, resulting in a significant increase in pest risk to the reporting <del>country</del> , neighbouring <del>countries</del> or <del>importing countries</del> <del>trading partners</del> , particularly if it is known that the pest is regulated.	Spread of regulated pests concern more countries (reporting, neighbouring and importing) than traders.
17.	24	Annex 1, 1 <sup>st</sup> para	The interactive procedure described below is recommended for assessing phytosanitary measures in order to make a determination as to their equivalence. However, the procedure that trading partners utilize to determine equivalence may vary depending on the circumstances.	The interactive procedure described below is recommended for assessing phytosanitary measures in order to make a determination as to their equivalence. However, the procedure that <del>contracting parties</del> <del>trading partners</del> utilize to determine equivalence may vary depending on the circumstances.	This is the responsibility of contracting parties to determine equivalence. "Countries" is not used for consistency with the text of ISPM 24, which uses "contracting parties".
18.	24	Annex 1, 2 <sup>nd</sup> para	Recommended steps are: (1) The exporting contracting party communicates its interest in an equivalence determination to its trading partner, indicating the specified commodity, the regulated pest of concern and the existing and proposed alternative measures, including relevant data. At the same time it may request from the importing contracting party the technical justification for the existing measures. In discussions on the determination of equivalence, an agreement including an	Recommended steps are: (1) The exporting contracting party communicates its interest in an equivalence determination to <del>the importing country</del> <del>contracting party</del> <del>its trading partner</del> , indicating the specified commodity, the regulated pest of concern and the existing and proposed alternative measures, including relevant data. At the same time it may request from the importing contracting party the technical justification for the existing measures. In discussions on the determination of equivalence, an	This is the responsibility of importing contracting parties to determine equivalence.

Row	ISPM	Section / para	Current text	Proposed text	Rationale
			outline of the steps involved, an agenda and a possible timetable may be established.	agreement including an outline of the steps involved, an agenda and a possible timetable may be established.	
19.	29	1, 3 <sup>rd</sup> para	ISPM 4:1995 points out that, since certain PFAs are likely to involve an agreement between trading partners, their implementation would need to be reviewed and evaluated by the national plant protection organization (NPPO) of the importing country (section 2.3.4).	ISPM 4:1995 points out that, since certain PFAs are likely to involve an agreement <u>between the exporting and the importing country</u> <del>between trading partners</del> , their implementation would need to be reviewed and evaluated by the national plant protection organization (NPPO) of the importing country (section 2.3.4). <i>[note: this is a direct quote of ISPM 4, with the same change as proposed above]</i>	Because the PFA is created for export purposes, the 'likely agreement' is <b>between the exporting and the importing country</b> . Agreements within the exporting country between producers or producers and the NPPO are not relevant to mention in an ISPM, and such agreements are not providing the rationale for the NPPO to 'review and evaluate'.
20.	30	2.1.1, 2 <sup>nd</sup> para, 1 <sup>st</sup> indent	Individual NPPOs may draw on a variety of different factors when determining exactly what an appropriate level of pest prevalence should be for a given FF-ALPP. Some commonly considered factors include the following: levels stipulated by trading partners in order for trade to proceed	Individual NPPOs may draw on a variety of different factors when determining exactly what an appropriate level of pest prevalence should be for a given FF-ALPP. Some commonly considered factors include the following: - levels stipulated by <del>trading partners</del> <u>NPPOs of importing countries</u> in order for trade to proceed	NPPOs of importing countries are responsible for plant health and not traders.

## Proposed ink amendments to ISPM 3 to replace “quarantine facility” with the Glossary term “quarantine station”

(Prepared by TPG 2015-12; approved SC May 2016)

### Introduction

- [1] The Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG) proposed a revised definition to “quarantine station” in the amendments to ISPM 5, which were adopted by CPM-10 (2015). In the proposed amendments reviewed by the TPG in their February 2014 meeting, the TPG noted that ISPM 3 (*Guidelines for the export, shipment, import and release of biological control agents and other beneficial organism*) used the term “quarantine facility” and that, once the revised definition for “quarantine station” would be adopted, ISPM 3 could have ink amendments to correct this. The below table outlines the proposed ink amendments to ISPM 3 to ensure consistency in the use of Glossary terms.
- [2] The SC May 2016 reviewed the ink amendments and agreed to them, without proposing additional modifications.

**Table 1 - Ink amendments to replace “quarantine facility” with the Glossary term “quarantine station” (ISPM 3)**

Row	Section / para	Current text	Proposed text
1.	Scope, 1 <sup>st</sup> para, last sentence	Provisions are also included for import for research in quarantine facilities of non-indigenous biological control agents and other beneficial organisms.	Provisions are also included for import for research in quarantine <u>stations</u> <del>facilities</del> of non-indigenous biological control agents and other beneficial organisms.
2.	Outline of requirements, 3 <sup>rd</sup> para, 4 <sup>th</sup> indent	- ensure that biological control agents and other beneficial organisms are taken either directly to designated quarantine facilities or mass-rearing facilities or, if appropriate, passed directly for release into the environment	- ensure that biological control agents and other beneficial organisms are taken either directly to designated quarantine <u>stations</u> <del>facilities</del> or mass-rearing facilities or, if appropriate, passed directly for release into the environment
3.	1.2 General responsibilities, 2 <sup>nd</sup> para, 4 <sup>th</sup> indent	- ensure that biological control agents and other beneficial organisms are taken either directly to designated quarantine facilities or, if appropriate, passed to mass rearing facilities or directly for release into the environment	- ensure that biological control agents and other beneficial organisms are taken either directly to designated quarantine <u>stations</u> <del>facilities</del> or, if appropriate, passed to mass rearing facilities or directly for release into the environment
4.	3.1 Responsibilities of the importing contracting party, 3.1.2, 2 <sup>nd</sup>	The contracting party should establish appropriate phytosanitary measures for import, shipment, quarantine facilities (including approval of research facilities, and phytosanitary measures for	The contracting party should establish appropriate phytosanitary measures for import, shipment, quarantine <u>stations</u> <del>facilities</del> (including approval of research facilities, and phytosanitary

Row	Section / para	Current text	Proposed text
		confinement and disposal) or release of biological control agents appropriate to the assessed risk.	measures for confinement and disposal) or release of biological control agents appropriate to the assessed risk.
5.	3.1 Responsibilities of the importing contracting party, 3.1.5. 1 <sup>st</sup> sentence and 2 <sup>nd</sup> sentence	If appropriate, ensure entry of consignments, and processing where required, through quarantine facilities. Where a country does not have secure quarantine facilities, import through a quarantine station in a third country, recognized by the importing contracting party, may be considered.	If appropriate, ensure entry of consignments, and processing where required, through quarantine <u>stations facilities</u> . Where a country does not have secure quarantine <u>stations facilities</u> , import through a quarantine station in a third country, recognized by the importing contracting party, may be considered.
6.	4.4 Documentary requirements related to research in quarantine, 2 <sup>nd</sup> para, 1 <sup>st</sup> sentence, 3 <sup>rd</sup> and 4 <sup>th</sup> indents	The researcher, in conjunction with the quarantine facility to be used, should also provide the following information: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- (...)</li> <li>- (...)</li> <li>- detailed description of the quarantine facility (including security and the competency and qualifications of the staff)</li> <li>- an emergency plan that will be implemented in the case of an escape from the quarantine facility.</li> </ul>	The researcher, in conjunction with the quarantine <u>station facility</u> to be used, should also provide the following information: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- (...)</li> <li>- (...)</li> <li>- detailed description of the quarantine <u>station facility</u> (including security and the competency and qualifications of the staff)</li> <li>- an emergency plan that will be implemented in the case of an escape from the quarantine <u>station facility</u>.</li> </ul>
7.	6.1 Inspection	Where required (see section 3.1.5) after checking the documentation, inspection should take place at an officially nominated quarantine facility.	Where required (see section 3.1.5) after checking the documentation, inspection should take place at an officially nominated quarantine <u>station facility</u> .

## CONSISTENCY CHANGES ACROSS ISPMS TO REPLACE “PROTECTED AREA”

(Prepared by the TPG - TPG\_2016-01\_e-decision\_04; approved by the SC May 2016)

### Background

- [1] CPM-10 (2015) adopted the deletions of the terms “protected area” and “controlled area” from ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*), as it was agreed that these terms are redundant, making the collection of area-related definitions overly complicated. Both terms were used to illustrate particular cases of regulated area, applied in one case for endangered area (protected area) and in the other for quarantine area (controlled area). They were also used very infrequently in ISPMs (and “controlled area” not used at all).
- [2] Only in one case, is “protected area” used to refer to the protection of nature. In the other instances, the term refers to a “regulated area” and that term could be used instead for consistency.
- [3] Consequently, in December 2015, the Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG) noted that ink amendments should be made to replace “protected area” with “regulated area”, unless “protected area” was used in the sense of “environmental protection”.
- [4] The SC May 2016 reviewed the ink amendments and agreed to them, without proposing additional modifications.
- [5]

**Introduction**

The ISPMs that are considered in this table are:

ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*), ISPM 11 (*Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests*) and ISPM 30 (*Establishment of areas of low pest prevalence for fruit flies (Tephritidae)*)

**Table 1 - Proposed ink amendments to replace “protected area” with “regulated area”**

Row	ISPM	Section	Current text	Proposed text	Rationale
1.	5	SUPPLEMENT 1 1.1 Official control	Official control includes: - eradication and/or containment in the infested area(s) - surveillance in the endangered area(s) - restrictions related to the movement into and within the <b>protected area(s)</b> including phytosanitary measures applied at import.	Official control includes: - eradication and/or containment in the infested area(s) - surveillance in the endangered area(s) - restrictions related to the movement into and within the <b>regulated area(s)</b> including phytosanitary measures applied at import.	“Protected area” is used with the meaning of “regulated area”.
2.	11	2.3.1.2 Indirect pest effects	In the case of the analysis of environmental risks, examples of indirect pest effects on plants and/or their environmental consequences that could be considered include: ..... - significant effects on designated environmentally sensitive or <b>protected areas</b> .....	In the case of the analysis of environmental risks, examples of indirect pest effects on plants and/or their environmental consequences that could be considered include: ..... - significant effects on designated environmentally sensitive or <b>protected areas</b>	In this case, “protected area” is used with a different meaning (referring to the protection of nature) and the word “environmentally” refers to both “sensitive” and “protected”. Therefore, no change is proposed.
3.	30	APPENDIX 2 1. An FF-ALPP as a buffer zone	In cases where the biology of the target fruit fly species is such that it is likely to disperse from an infested area into a <b>protected area</b> , it may be necessary to define a buffer zone with a low fruit fly prevalence (as described in ISPM 26). Establishment of the FF-ALPP and FF-PFA should occur at the same time, enabling the FF-ALPP to be defined for the purpose of protecting the FF-PFA.	In cases where the biology of the target fruit fly species is such that it is likely to disperse from an infested area into a <b>regulated area</b> , it may be necessary to define a buffer zone with a low fruit fly prevalence (as described in ISPM 26). Establishment of the FF-ALPP and FF-PFA should occur at the same time, enabling the FF-ALPP to be defined for the purpose of protecting the FF-PFA.	“Protected area” is used with the meaning of “regulated area” (for keeping a pest out of an endangered area).
4.		APPENDIX 2 1.1 Determination of an FF-ALPP as a buffer zone	Determination procedures draw upon those listed in section 1.2 of this standard. In addition, in delimiting the buffer zone, detailed maps may be included showing the boundaries of the area to be protected, distribution of hosts, host location, urban	Determination procedures draw upon those listed in section 1.2 of this standard. In addition, in delimiting the buffer zone, detailed maps may be included showing the boundaries of the area to be protected,	“Area to be protected” or “area being protected”: the term protected is kept because it retains the

Row	ISPM	Section	Current text	Proposed text	Rationale
			<p>areas, entry points and control checkpoints. It is also relevant to include data related to natural biogeographical features such as prevalence of other hosts, climate, and location of valleys, plains, deserts, rivers, lakes and sea, as well as other areas that function as natural barriers. The size of the buffer zone in relation to the size of the area being protected will depend on the biology of the target fruit fly species (including behaviour, reproduction and dispersal capacity), the intrinsic characteristics of the <b>protected area</b>, and the economic and operational feasibility of establishing the FF-ALPP.</p>	<p>distribution of hosts, host location, urban areas, entry points and control checkpoints. It is also relevant to include data related to natural biogeographical features such as prevalence of other hosts, climate, and location of valleys, plains, deserts, rivers, lakes and sea, as well as other areas that function as natural barriers. The size of the buffer zone in relation to the size of the area being protected will depend on the biology of the target fruit fly species (including behaviour, reproduction and dispersal capacity), the intrinsic characteristics of the <b>regulated area</b>, and the economic and operational feasibility of establishing the FF-ALPP.</p>	<p>idea of “danger” and “protection” and there is no risk of confusion with environmental protection. Moreover, a buffer zone is also a “regulated area” so replacing “protected” with “regulated” is confusing.</p> <p>“Protected area” is used with the meaning of “regulated area”.</p>

## Proposed ink amendment to “practically free” in ISPM 5

(Prepared by TPG 2015-12; approved by the SC May 2016)

### Background

- [1] The TPG in their December 2015 meeting discussed the ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*) term “practically free” and agreed adding the qualifier “of a consignment, field or place of production” to the term, and consequently remove this text from the definition, which would also align with the term “*free from (of a consignment, field or place of production)*”.
- [2] The SC May 2016 reviewed the ink amendment and agreed to it, without proposing additional modifications.
- [3]

*Original term/definition:*

#### **practically free**

Of a **consignment, field, or place of production**, without **pests** (or a specific **pest**) in numbers or quantities in excess of those that can be expected to result from, and be consistent with good cultural and handling practices employed in the production and marketing of the **commodity** [FAO, 1990; revised FAO, 1995]

*Proposed revision:*

#### **practically free (of a consignment, field, or place of production)**

~~Of a **consignment, field, or place of production**, without **pests** (or a specific **pest**) in numbers or quantities in excess of those that can be expected to result from, and be consistent with, good cultural and handling practices employed in the production and marketing of the **commodity** [FAO, 1990; revised FAO, 1995]~~