

March 2007

E



منظمة الأغذية  
والزراعة  
للأمم المتحدة

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

Organización  
de las  
Naciones  
Unidas  
para la  
Agricultura  
y la  
Alimentación

## COMMISSION ON PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES

### Second Session

Rome, 26 – 30 March 2007

**Comments on draft standards (CPM 2007/2 - Annex I)**  
**Amendments to ISPM No. 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*)**

**Agenda Item 9.2 of the Provisional Agenda**

**Document by the IPPC Secretariat**

1. The Secretariat compiled comments received in advance of the CPM on the draft amendments to ISPM No. 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*) from the following members and RPPO:

- Argentina
- Australia
- Bolivia
- Brazil
- Chile
- COSAVE
- Paraguay
- Uruguay
- USA.

For reasons of economy, this document is produced in a limited number of copies. Delegates and observers are kindly requested to bring it to the meetings and to refrain from asking for additional copies, unless strictly indispensable.  
Most FAO meeting documents are available on Internet at [www.fao.org](http://www.fao.org)

W0000

Draft ISPMs for adoption at CPM-2 (2007)

**ANNEX I OF DOCUMENT CPM 2007/2**

**AMENDMENTS TO ISPM NO. 5 (GLOSSARY OF PHYTOSANITARY TERMS)**

The following are comments received as of 14 March 2007 according to guidelines given in the document CPM 2007/2. They are provided for information and the final document will be provided at the CPM meeting.

The Secretariat has compiled in the order of the text the comments received in advance of the CPM meeting, exactly as provided by countries.

	1. Term and definition	2. Country	3. Type of comment	4. Location	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation
1.	phytosanitary security (of a consignment)	USA	editorial	definition	After the word contamination, add “of regulated pests”	Clarifies the sentence.
2.	phytosanitary security (of a consignment)	Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Paraguay, Uruguay, COSAVE	Substantial		Maintenance of the integrity of a consignment and prevention of its infestation and contamination <u>by a regulated pest, by through</u> the application of appropriate phytosanitary measures	Some importing countries request safeguarding against an undetermined hitch-hiker pest. This kind of requirement should be avoided or technically justified. Even though “regulated pest” could appear to be redundant, it certainly contributes to clarify the previously mentioned scenario.
3.	buffer zone	Australia	<b>substantive</b>	sentence 1	...in order to minimize the <del>risk</del> <b>likelihood</b> of spread of the target pest....	this is probably what is meant – the chance/likelihood/probability of spread; we know that ‘risk’ means likelihood and consequences from other standards
4.	<b>3. PROPOSED DELETIONS FROM ISPM No. 5</b>	Australia	<b>General</b>			For deletions to Glossary, it would be appropriate to provide an explanation for the deletion in the agenda paper rather than relying on searching in the Standards Committee report as this is the first time the amendments are seen by parties.
5.	biological control	Australia	<b>General</b>	Dot point 1		Other ISPMs have definitions of the subject of the standard even when they are commonly used terms eg Surveillance, Inspection, Pest risk analysis ... so there needs to be consistency in determining whether commonly used terms are included in the Glossary or not. Arbitrary decisions that some commonly used terms will be deleted should be avoided.

	1. Term and definition	2. Country	3. Type of comment	4. Location	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation
6.	reference specimen(s)	Australia	<b>General</b>	Dot point 2		<p>1. While Australia agrees to the deletion of this term as proposed by the Standards Committee, it is worth noting that the recollection of a member of the EWG that the term was defined because it was being interpreted differently by different experts.</p> <p>2. As a matter of principle and practice, reference specimens should be housed in publicly available collections so that they are accessible to enable validation or otherwise of the organisms that were released and provide a clear and unambiguous record. This is particularly important when either the species has not been described (scientifically) or there potentially some unresolved concerns with regards to the taxonomy of the species released.</p>