

联 合 国 粮 食 及 农 业 组 织

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

Organisation des Nations Unies pour l'alimentation et l'agriculture

Продовольственная и сельскохозяйственная организация Объединенных Наций

Organización de las Naciones Unidas para la Alimentación y la Agricultura

منظمة لللغذية والزراعة للأمم المتحدة

CPM 2017/CRP/06

H)

COMMISSION ON PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES

Twelfth Session

Incheon, Republic of Korea, 5-11 April 2017

Topics for IPPC Standards - New topics and adjustments to the List of topics for IPPC standards - Key IPPC terms in need of TPG review and attention

Agenda item 9.3

Prepared by The United States of America

English only

This document is printed in limited numbers to minimize the environmental impact of FAO's processes and contribute to climate neutrality. Delegates and observers are kindly requested to bring their copies to meetings and to avoid asking for additional copies. Most FAO meeting documents are available on the Internet at www.fao.org

The United States proposes that the following key terms be reviewed by the Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG) as a matter of urgency because of their important relevance to a number of existing ISPMs which will soon be updated to reflect current practices. The United States urges the Standards Committee to consider these and to direct the TPG to review and update these terms.

Terms proposed for revision:

Pest Free Areas

<u>Need for urgent revision</u>: A meeting of the Expert Working Group for revision ISPM 8 "Pest status in the area" is planned for September 2017. A central concept of the ISPM 8 is reporting presence or absence of a (specific) pest in certain areas. If the pest is absent, then this area is considered to be free of the pest. Thus the definition of the pest free area (PFA) is closely related to the revision of ISPM 8.

<u>Current definition</u>: Pest free area: An **area** in which a specific **pest** is absent as demonstrated by scientific evidence and in which, where appropriate, this condition is being **officially** maintained [ISPM 2, 1995; revised CPM, 2015]

<u>Reason for revision of the existing definition:</u> Presence of the pest is based on scientific evidence which includes both identification and detection tools. The ability to detect an organism varies with the quality and specificity of the detection tool(s). Some NPPOs have tools with such a high level of sensitivity that the organism (or fragments of its DNA) can be found in the <u>absence</u> of any <u>injury</u> to plants (defeating the existing IPPC definition of the "Pest"). Other NPPOs base their detection on the manifestation of the injury to plants (more in-line with the Glossary definition of the pest).

Differences in detection level and protocols lead to the assumption that any organism <u>potentially capable</u> of causing injuries can be considered a pest. This interpretation becomes misleading when considering the organisms potentially incapable of establishment either in their present biological state, or in the absence of an endangered area, or via a certain pathway. For example, spores of a pathogen can be present as a contaminant on the surface of a fruit for consumption while the pathogen does not inflict any disease symptoms to this fruit.

The above issues associated with the ambiguity of the PFA definition lead to serious concerns about validity or even necessity of pest reporting, as well as reasons for taking regulatory actions that can be unjustified and consistency in making such decisions. We are asking the CPM to request the revision of the term "Pest Free Area" and address this revision as soon as possible due to the upcoming meeting of the Expert Working Group on the revision of ISPM 8.

Proposed definition (PFA): An **area** in which a specific **pest is absent, or if present, is not likely to establish or cause damage to plants or plant products** (as demonstrated by scientific evidence), and in which this condition is being officially maintained for pests that can establish or cause damage.

Pathway

<u>Need for urgent revision</u>: There are several adopted ISPMs as well as ISPMs at different stages of development that consider various commodities and conveyances as possible pathways for introduction and spread of quarantine pests. Therefore, clear understanding of the concepts associated with the term "pathway" are essential for implementing adopted and future international standards.

<u>Current definition</u>: Pathway is currently defined as "Any means that allows the **entry** or **spread** of a **pest** [FAO, 1990; revised FAO, 1995]"

<u>Reason for revision of the existing definition</u>: The definition above refers to entry rather than *pest introduction* which appears to be incorrect. The Convention (IPPC, 1997) does not refer to pest entry but consistently refers to pest introduction. The definition of pathway has not been revised since 1995, which was before the new text of the Convention went into force.

From a Pest Risk Analysis (PRA) standpoint, the current definition implies that a pathway only needs to lead to entry, not pest establishment, therefore, the establishment can be assumed. Neither is technically correct, disregarding that, by definition, <u>introduction</u> (of a pest) is "the **entry** of a **pest** resulting in its **establishment**" (FAO, 1990; revised ISPM 2, 1995; IPPC, 1997).

A "pathway" that leads only to entry but cannot result in establishment is obviously not a risk for *pest introduction*. We frequently encounter situations where establishment is highly unlikely except under the most contrived conditions (e.g., citrus canker on fruit for consumption). The same pest would be easily introduced via another pathway, i.e., on plants for planting. In this example, we would consider plants for planting to be a pathway for introduction of citrus canker and fruit for consumption would not be a pathway for introduction. Although pest entry can occur on both fruit for consumption and plants for planting, only the latter is the pathway for introduction (of citrus canker) and where application of phytosanitary measures would be technically justified.

The outdated definition of "pathway" can lead to justified concerns about validity of phytosanitary measures in those situations where the establishment of the pest is unlikely. We are the TPG to revise the term and to address the revision as soon as possible because clear guidance is needed for implementation of several ISPMs where the concept of a pathway is being used.

Proposed new definition:

Pathway: Any means that allows the introduction or spread of a pest.