



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
الاغذية والزراعة
للامم المتحدة

R

КОМИССИЯ ПО ФИТОСАНИТАРНЫМ МЕРАМ

Десятая сессия

Рим, 16-20 марта 2015 года

Предлагаемые исправления для устранения несоответствий в использовании терминов в принятых стандартах - фитосанитарный статус

Пункт 8.4 повестки дня

Подготовлен Секретариатом МККЗР

I. История вопроса

1. Техническая группа экспертов по Глоссарию (ТГЭГ) в 2010 году признала, что не имеющее определения выражение "фитосанитарный статус" используется в различных контекстах. В ноябре 2010 года Комитет по стандартам (КС) добавил выражение "фитосанитарный статус" в Перечень тем для стандартов МККЗР для того, чтобы ТГЭГ проанализировала его использование в стандартах и рассмотрела вопрос о необходимости его разъяснения. В ходе своих совещаний в феврале 2013 и 2014 годов¹ ТГЭГ провела детальный анализ.

Текущее использование выражения "фитосанитарный статус" и попытки его интерпретировать

2. Выражение "фитосанитарный статус" использовано в МСФМ в различных контекстах (как показывает резюме в таблицах А.1-А.6). Предполагаемое значение существенно варьируется в зависимости от контекста. Для того чтобы преодолеть двусмысленность и несоответствие в использовании выражения в различных МСФМ, ТГЭГ внесла предложения по поводу того, как заменить "фитосанитарный статус" другими более точными терминами.

3. КС в мае 2014 года рассмотрел и утвердил предложения для их представления КФМ. Данные предложения представлены только на английском языке в таблицах А.1-А.6. После

¹ Доклады совещаний ТГЭГ размещены по адресу: <https://www.ippc.int/core-activities/standards-setting/expert-drafting-groups/technical-panels/technical-panel-phytosanitary-terms-ispm-5>

В целях сведения к минимуму воздействия процессов ФАО на окружающую среду и достижения климатической нейтральности настоящий документ напечатан в ограниченном количестве экземпляров. Просьба к делегатам и наблюдателям приносить на заседания свои экземпляры документа и не запрашивать дополнительных копий. Большинство документов к заседаниям ФАО размещено в Интернете по адресу: www.fao.org

того как эти незначительные поправки будут приняты к сведению КФМ, они будут направлены на перевод. Предлагаемый перевод незначительных поправок будет направлен на рассмотрение группами лингвистического анализа до публикации².

4. КФМ предлагается:

- *принять к сведению* исправления, представленные в таблице А.1-А.6, и попросить Секретариат внести их в соответствующие МСФМ;
- *согласиться* с тем, что как только Секретариат внесет изменения, описанные выше, предыдущие версии МСФМ будут отозваны и заменены новыми исправленными версиями.

² <https://www.ippc.int/core-activities/governance/standards-setting/ispms/language-review-groups>

Proposed ink amendments for replacement of phytosanitary status

Tables A.1- A.6: Proposed ink amendments for replacement of *phytosanitary status*

The ink amendments proposed in this section can be summarized as follows (details are given in each case in the tables below).

Summary table of the proposed ink amendments

Phytosanitary status used in existing ISPMs in relation to	Phytosanitary status can be replaced by
A.1 Pest	Pest risk
A.2 Pest detection	Pest status
A.3 Host plants	Pest risk
A.4 Area	Status of the pest in the area, pest status
A.5 Countries	Pest status
A.6 Commodities	Compliance with phytosanitary import requirements, phytosanitary security, inspection or not necessary/text can be deleted

A.1. Pertaining to pest

It appears that the intended meaning of the phytosanitary status of a pest is: the intrinsic ability of a pest to establish, spread and cause economic impact. It is proposed to substitute *phytosanitary status* to the defined term *pest risk*, as follows:

Table A.1 - Pertaining to pest				
ISPM	Section	Para	Current text	Proposed text
11	2.1.1.1	2	The taxonomic unit for the pest is generally species. The use of a higher or lower taxonomic level should be supported by scientifically sound rationale. In the case of levels below the species, this should include evidence demonstrating that factors such as differences in virulence, host range or vector relationships are significant enough to affect phytosanitary status .	The taxonomic unit for the pest is generally species. The use of a higher or lower taxonomic level should be supported by scientifically sound rationale. In the case of levels below the species, this should include evidence demonstrating that factors such as differences in virulence, host range or vector relationships are significant enough to affect phytosanitary status pest risk .
21	3.1.1.1	2	For the pest, the taxonomic unit is generally the species.	For the pest, the taxonomic unit is generally the species. The use of a higher or lower

		The use of a higher or lower taxonomic level should be supported by a scientifically sound rationale. In the case of levels below the species (e.g. race), this should include evidence demonstrating that factors such as difference in virulence, host range or vector relationships are significant enough to affect the phytosanitary status .	taxonomic level should be supported by a scientifically sound rationale. In the case of levels below the species (e.g. race), this should include evidence demonstrating that factors such as difference in virulence, host range or vector relationships are significant enough to affect the phytosanitary status pest risk .
--	--	---	--

A.2. Pertaining to *detection of a pest*

The intended meaning of phytosanitary status of the detection of a pest as used in ISPM 26, Annex 1 (2011) (*Fruit fly trapping*) seems to refer to pest status. It is proposed to substitute in ISPM 26: Annex 1 *phytosanitary status* by the defined term *pest status*, as follows:

Table A.2 - Pertaining to <i>detection of a pest</i>				
ISPM	Section	Para	Current text	Proposed text
26	Annex 1		Actions to apply the corrective action plan (1) <i>Determination of the phytosanitary status of the detection (actionable or non-actionable)</i> (1.1) If the detection is a transient non-actionable occurrence (ISPM 8:1998), no further action is required. (1.2) If the detection of a target pest may be actionable, a delimiting survey, which includes additional traps, and usually fruit sampling as well as an increased trap inspection rate, should be implemented immediately after the detection to assess whether the detection represents an outbreak, which will determine necessary responsive actions. If a population is present, this action is also used to determine the size of the affected area.	Actions to apply the corrective action plan (1) <i>Determination of the phytosanitary pest status of the detection (actionable or non-actionable)</i> (1.1) If the detection is a transient non-actionable occurrence (ISPM 8:1998), no further action is required. (1.2) If the detection of a target pest may be actionable, a delimiting survey, which includes additional traps, and usually fruit sampling as well as an increased trap inspection rate, should be implemented immediately after the detection to assess whether the detection represents an outbreak, which will determine necessary responsive actions. If a population is present, this action is also used to determine the size of the affected area.

A.3. Pertaining to *host plants*

It appears the intended meaning of phytosanitary status of host plants is: *the intrinsic characteristics of the host plant that determines its suitability as a host and the damage that a pest could confer to that plant*. It is proposed to substitute *phytosanitary status* to the defined term *pest risk*.

Table A.3 - Pertaining to <i>host plants</i>				
ISPM	Section	Para	Current text	Proposed text
21	3.1.1.1	3	Also for the host, the taxonomic unit is generally the species. The use of a higher or lower taxonomic level should be supported by a scientifically sound rationale. In	Also for the host, the taxonomic unit is generally the species. The use of a higher or lower taxonomic level should be supported by a scientifically sound rationale. In the case of levels below the species (e.g. variety), there should be evidence

		<p>the case of levels below the species (e.g. variety), there should be evidence demonstrating that factors such as difference in host susceptibility or resistance are significant enough to affect the phytosanitary status. Taxa for plants for planting above the species level (genera) or unidentified species of known genera should not be used unless all species in the genus are being evaluated for the same intended use.</p>	<p>demonstrating that factors such as difference in host susceptibility or resistance are significant enough to affect the phytosanitary status pest risk. Taxa for plants for planting above the species level (genera) or unidentified species of known genera should not be used unless all species in the genus are being evaluated for the same intended use.</p>
--	--	---	---

A.4. Pertaining to an area

It appears the intended meaning of *phytosanitary status* for area is in respect of the status of a pest in that area or, in one instance, of the actual pest incidence and distribution. It is proposed to substitute in two cases *phytosanitary status* by *status of the relevant pest in the area*, and in one case by *pest status*.

Table A.4 - Pertaining to area				
ISPM	Section	Para	Current text	Proposed text
29	Outline	1	Recognition of pest free areas (PFAs) and areas of low pest prevalence (ALPPs) is a technical and administrative process to achieve acceptance of the phytosanitary status of a delimited area. Technical requirements for establishment of PFAs and ALPPs, as well as certain elements relating to recognition, are addressed in other International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPMs). In addition, many principles of the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) are relevant.	Recognition of pest free areas (PFAs) and areas of low pest prevalence (ALPPs) is a technical and administrative process to achieve acceptance of the status of the relevant pest in phytosanitary status of a delimited area. Technical requirements for establishment of PFAs and ALPPs, as well as certain elements relating to recognition, are addressed in other International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPMs). In addition, many principles of the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) are relevant.
30	2.2.1	4	The presence and distribution of fruit fly hosts should be recorded separately identifying commercial and non-commercial hosts. This information will help in planning the trapping and host sampling activities and may help in anticipating the potential ease or difficulty of establishing and maintaining the phytosanitary status of the area.	The presence and distribution of fruit fly hosts should be recorded separately identifying commercial and non-commercial hosts. This information will help in planning the trapping and host sampling activities and may help in anticipating the potential ease or difficulty of establishing and maintaining the status of the relevant pest in phytosanitary status of the area.
30	Annex 2 (2)	Title	(2) <i>Determination of the phytosanitary status</i> Immediately after detecting a population level higher than the specified level of low pest prevalence, a delimiting survey (which may include the deployment of additional traps, fruit sampling of host fruits and increased trap inspection frequency) should be implemented to determine the size of the affected area and more precisely gauge the level of the fruit fly prevalence.	(2) <i>Determination of the phytosanitary pest status</i> Immediately after detecting a population level higher than the specified level of low pest prevalence, a delimiting survey (which may include the deployment of additional traps, fruit sampling of host fruits and increased trap inspection frequency) should be implemented to determine the size of the affected area and more precisely gauge the level of the fruit fly prevalence.

A.5. Pertaining to countries

It appears the intended meaning of *phytosanitary status* for countries is in respect of the actual status of the pest. That meaning could be conferred by substituting *phytosanitary status* to phrases referring to the status of the pest.

Table A.5 - Pertaining to countries				
ISPM	Section	Para	Current text	Proposed text
1	1.7	1	Contracting parties should, in accordance with the IPPC, apply phytosanitary measures without discrimination between contracting parties if contracting parties can demonstrate that they have the same phytosanitary status and apply identical or equivalent phytosanitary measures.	Contracting parties should, in accordance with the IPPC, apply phytosanitary measures without discrimination between contracting parties if contracting parties can demonstrate that <u>they have the same phytosanitary status and the status of the relevant pest is the same and that they</u> apply identical or equivalent phytosanitary measures.
11	3.4	1	Appropriate measures should be chosen based on their effectiveness in reducing the probability of introduction of the pest. The choice should be based on the following considerations, which include several of the phytosanitary principles of ISPM 1:1993:....[5th indent: - <i>Principle of "non-discrimination"</i> : If the pest under consideration is established in the PRA area but of limited distribution and under official control, the phytosanitary measures in relation to import should not be more stringent than those applied within the PRA area. Likewise, phytosanitary measures should not discriminate between exporting countries of the same phytosanitary status .	Appropriate measures should be chosen based on their effectiveness in reducing the probability of introduction of the pest. The choice should be based on the following considerations, which include several of the phytosanitary principles of ISPM 1:1993:....[5th indent: <i>Principle of "non-discrimination"</i> : If the pest under consideration is established in the PRA area but of limited distribution and under official control, the phytosanitary measures in relation to import should not be more stringent than those applied within the PRA area. Likewise, phytosanitary measures should not discriminate between exporting countries <u>of the same phytosanitary status where the status of the relevant pest is the same</u> .
21	4.3	1	Appropriate measures should be chosen based on their effectiveness in limiting the economic impact of the pest on the intended use of the plants for planting. The choice should be based on the following considerations, which include several of the principles of plant quarantine as related to international trade (ISPM 1:1993): ...[5th indent: <i>Principle of "non-discrimination"</i> . Phytosanitary measures should not discriminate between exporting countries of the same phytosanitary status .	Appropriate measures should be chosen based on their effectiveness in limiting the economic impact of the pest on the intended use of the plants for planting. The choice should be based on the following considerations, which include several of the principles of plant quarantine as related to international trade (ISPM 1:1993): ...[5th indent: <i>Principle of "non-discrimination"</i> . Phytosanitary measures should not discriminate between exporting countries <u>of the same phytosanitary status where the status of the relevant pest is the same</u> .
24	2.4	1+2	The principle of non-discrimination requires that when equivalence of phytosanitary measures is granted for one	The principle of non-discrimination requires that when equivalence of phytosanitary measures is granted for one exporting contracting party, this should also apply to

		<p>exporting contracting party, this should also apply to contracting parties with the same phytosanitary status and similar conditions for the same commodity or commodity class and/or pest. Therefore, an importing contracting party which recognizes the equivalence of alternative phytosanitary measures of an exporting contracting party should ensure that it acts in a non-discriminatory manner. This applies both to applications from third countries for recognition of the equivalence of the same or similar measures, and to the equivalence of any domestic measures.</p> <p>It should be recognized that equivalence of phytosanitary measures does not, however, mean that when a specific measure is granted equivalence for one exporting contracting party, this applies automatically to another contracting party for the same commodity or commodity class or pest. Phytosanitary measures should always be considered in the context of the pest status and phytosanitary regulatory system of the exporting contracting party, including the policies and procedures.</p>	<p>contracting parties <u>with the same phytosanitary status where the status of the relevant pest is the same</u> and similar conditions for the same commodity or commodity class and/or pest. Therefore, an importing contracting party which recognizes the equivalence of alternative phytosanitary measures of an exporting contracting party should ensure that it acts in a non-discriminatory manner. This applies both to applications from third countries for recognition of the equivalence of the same or similar measures, and to the equivalence of any domestic measures.</p> <p>It should be recognized that equivalence of phytosanitary measures does not, however, mean that when a specific measure is granted equivalence for one exporting contracting party, this applies automatically to another contracting party for the same commodity or commodity class or pest. Phytosanitary measures should always be considered in the context of the pest status and phytosanitary regulatory system of the exporting contracting party, including the policies and procedures.</p>
--	--	---	--

A.6. Pertaining to *consignment*

It appears the intended meaning of *phytosanitary status* for consignments varies. In some cases, it appears to relate to compliance with phytosanitary import requirements, phytosanitary security or inspection. In other cases, the words *phytosanitary security* appear unnecessary (ISPM 23, section 2.5; ISPM 12, section 5, sub-section on Certifying statement).

A few other cases where *phytosanitary status* is used in relation to consignments are not clear and would require extensive rewriting to replace these words. These are presented in Table B.2, and the TPG is still considering the possibility to define *phytosanitary status (of a consignment)* in this context.

Table A.6 - Pertaining to <i>consignment</i>			
ISPM	Section	Para	Current text
7	2.2	Indent 6	<p>The NPPO should have the capability to undertake the following functions:</p> <p>document and maintain the information regarding the phytosanitary import requirements where needed for phytosanitary certification and provide appropriate work instructions to personnel</p> <p>perform inspection, sampling and testing of plants, plant products and other regulated articles for purposes related to phytosanitary certification</p> <p>detect and identify pests</p> <p>identify plants, plant products and other regulated articles</p>

			perform, supervise or audit the required phytosanitary treatments perform surveys and monitoring and control activities to confirm <u>the phytosanitary status</u> <u>compliance with the phytosanitary import requirements to be attested</u> in phytosanitary certificates
12	Outline	6	Phytosanitary certificates may have a limited duration of validity <u>as the phytosanitary status of consignments may change after issuance of phytosanitary certificates</u> . The NPPO of the exporting country or the importing country may make relevant stipulations. <u>Justification: this change is proposed for internal consistency within the standard. The same text appears in section 1.6, for which an ink amendment is proposed below. As this is only the outline of requirements, it is proposed that the end of the sentence could be deleted. If this is not acceptable as considered beyond consistency, similar wording as in 1.6 could be used, i.e.:</u> “Phytosanitary certificates may have a limited duration of validity as the <u>phytosanitary status</u> <u>phytosanitary security</u> of consignments may <u>be lost</u> <u>change</u> after issuance of phytosanitary certificates. The NPPO of the exporting country or the importing country may make relevant stipulations.”
12	1.2	2	A phytosanitary certificate for export is usually issued by the NPPO of the country of origin. A phytosanitary certificate for export describes the consignment and, through a certifying statement, additional declarations and treatment records, declares that <u>the phytosanitary status</u> of the consignment meets phytosanitary import requirements. A phytosanitary certificate for export may also be issued in certain re-export situations for plants, plant products and other regulated articles originating in countries other than the country of re-export if <u>the phytosanitary status of the consignment</u> <u>compliance with the phytosanitary import requirements</u> can be <u>attested</u> <u>determined</u> by the country of re-export (e.g. by inspection). <u>Note to the SC: phytosanitary status in paragraph 3 of the same section could not be replaced by ink amendment, and is in Table B.2.</u>
12	1.6	1	The <u>phytosanitary security</u> <u>phytosanitary status</u> of consignments may <u>be lost</u> <u>change</u> after issuance of phytosanitary certificates and therefore the NPPO of the exporting or re-exporting country may decide to restrict the duration of the validity of phytosanitary certificates after issuance and prior to export.
12	5 (I) Certifying statement	4	In instances where phytosanitary import requirements are not specific, the NPPO of the exporting country may certify the general <u>status</u> <u>phytosanitary status</u> of the consignment for any pests believed by it to be of phytosanitary concern.
22	3.1.4.3	1	In cases where an ALPP is established for a regulated pest, phytosanitary measures may be required to reduce the risk of entry of the specified pests into the ALPP (ISPM 20:2004). These may include: regulation of the pathways and of the articles that require control to maintain the ALPP. All pathways into and out of the ALPP should be identified. This may include the designation of points of entry, and requirements for documentation, treatment, inspection or sampling before or at entry into the area. verification of documents and <u>of the phytosanitary status</u> <u>inspection</u> of consignments including identification of intercepted specimens of specified pest and maintenance of sampling records confirmation of the application and effectiveness of required treatments documentation of any other phytosanitary procedures
23	2.5	3	In many cases, pests or signs of pests that have been detected may require identification or a specialized analysis in a laboratory or by a specialist <u>before a determination can be made on the phytosanitary status of the consignment</u> . It may be decided that emergency measures are

		needed where new or previously unknown pests are found. A system for properly documenting and maintaining samples and/or specimens should be in place to ensure trace-back to the relevant consignment and to facilitate later review of the results if necessary. Justification: the requirement is well covered in the first part of the sentence and the use of phytosanitary status here is confusing.
--	--	--