



[1]

**DRAFT AMENDMENTS TO ISPM 5:  
GLOSSARY OF PHYTOSANITARY TERMS (1994-001)**

[2] **Publication history**

[3]

<b>Date of this document</b>	2013-05-22
<b>Document category</b>	Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms)
<b>Current document stage</b>	2013-07 Submitted for Member Consultation
<b>Major stages</b>	CEPM (1994) added topic: 1994-001, Amendments to ISPM 5: Glossary of phytosanitary terms Specification TP5. 2012-10 and 2013-02 TPG drafted text 2013-05 SC revised and approved for MC
<b>Notes</b>	----

[4] Members are asked to consider the following proposals for additions, revisions and deletions to ISPM 5, as well as a proposal for the revision of the scope of ISPM 5. A brief explanation is given for each proposal. For revision of terms and definitions, only the proposed changes are open for comment.

[5] **1. ADDITIONS**

[6] **1.1 EXCLUSION (2010-008)**

[7] **Background**

[8] In 2009, the Technical Panel for Fruit Flies (TPFF) developed a proposal for a definition of *exclusion* in the draft ISPM on phytosanitary procedures for fruit fly management. The term was added to the *List of Topics for IPPC standards* by the SC in April 2010 based on a TPG proposal. The TPFF definition was reviewed and modified by the TPG in October 2010, reviewed by the SC in May 2011 and sent for member 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* (already on the *List of Topics for IPPC standards* – see section 2.2 for proposals for revision of these terms). A revised proposal was put forward by the TPG in October 2012 and reviewed by the SC in May 2013. The following explanatory points may be considered:

[9] It is useful to add this term and its definition to the existing collection of measure-related terms, which includes *containment*, *eradication* and *suppression*. The definition should be broad as the term has a wider application than fruit fly management, and has the same basic form as the other measure-related terms.

[10] It is recommended to use *official* measures rather than *phytosanitary* measures for all definitions in this group (*exclusion*, *containment*, *suppression*, *eradication* and *control*). *Phytosanitary* measures relates to regulated pests only (i.e. quarantine pests or regulated non-quarantine pests), but there is no need to restrict the definition of these terms to regulated pests. On the contrary, the terms *exclusion*, *containment*,

*suppression, eradication* and *control* do not relate only to quarantine pests of the country where the measures are applied, so *official* measures is more appropriate. Countries may also apply exclusion for their own benefit, and not with regard to the regulated pests of another country.

- [11] The term is qualified by *of a pest* so the word *exclusion* can still be used in its common English meaning in other contexts, as is currently the case in various ISPMs (such as “excludes wood packaging material” in ISPM 15:2009, “exclude a certain area” in ISPM 22:2005, exclusion of chemicals or equipment in ISPM 27:2006). The use of a qualifier is also consistent with other glossary terms, such as *control, entry* and *establishment*.
- [12] The term *introduction* (i.e. *entry* and *establishment*) is used and not *entry*. A package of exclusion measures might include measures to prevent *establishment* in cases of transience or incursion.
- [13] Although the definition of *introduction* already refers (indirectly) to an area by using the term *entry*, 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.
- [14] 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.

[15] **Proposed addition**

<b>exclusion</b> (of a <b>pest</b> )	Application of <b>official</b> measures to prevent the <b>introduction</b> of a <b>pest</b> into an <b>area</b> .
--------------------------------------	---

[17] **1.2 PRODUCTION SITE (2012-004)**

[18] **Background**

- [19] The term *production site* was added to the *List of Topics for IPPC standards* by the SC in April 2012 based on a TPG proposal. A definition was proposed by the TPG in October 2012 and reviewed by the SC in May 2013. The following explanatory points may be considered:
- [20] The term *production site* is often used in standards and therefore a definition would be useful. *Pest free production sites* was used in ISPM 10:1999 (and is defined in ISPM 5) to cover situations in which such a site is designated within a place of production without at the same time making that place a *pest free place of production*. The term *place of production* is already defined.
- [21] The proposed definition identifies a production site as a separate unit within a place of production.
- [22] In ISPMs production sites are defined for phytosanitary purposes (and not for other purposes), and this should be stated in the definition.
- [23] As a consequence of defining *production site*, the definitions of *place of production* and *pest free production site* need to be amended (see section 2.4).

[24] **Proposed addition**

[25]	<b>production site</b>	A defined part of a <b>place of production</b> that is managed for phytosanitary purposes as a separate unit
------	------------------------	--

[26] **2. REVISIONS**

[27] **2.1 POINT OF ENTRY (2010-005)**

[28] **Background**

[29] The term *point of entry* was added to the *List of Topics for IPPC standards* by the SC in November 2010 based on a TPG proposal. A revised definition was proposed by the TPG in October 2012 and reviewed by the SC in May 2013. The following explanatory points may be considered:

[30] The use of *border* reduces the scope of the definition. Phytosanitary operations may take place not at the border, but inland at some other officially designated locations. It is a common practice in many countries to have points of entry inside countries, far from borders.

[31] *Land point*, which remains by deleting *border*, is not a correct expression in English. Considering that points of entry may be, for example, a facility, nursery, orchard or factory, the word *location* was chosen.

[32] The use of *and/or* should be avoided. *Or* is appropriate here.

[33] *Import* is the usual term in ISPMs.

[34] It was thought useful to maintain the reference to airport and seaport in the definition; that is, to not simplify the definition by using *any location* instead of *airport, seaport or any other location*.

[35] **Original definition**

[36]	<b>point of entry</b>	Airport, seaport or land border point <b>officially</b> designated for the importation of <b>consignments</b> , and/or entrance of passengers [FAO, 1995]
------	-----------------------	---

[37] **Proposed revision**

[38]	<b>point of entry</b>	Airport, seaport or <u>any other location</u> <del>land border point</del> <b>officially</b> designated for the importation of <b>consignments</b> <del>and/or</del> <u>and/or</u> <del>the</del> entrance of passengers
------	-----------------------	--

[39] **2.2 SYSTEMS APPROACH(ES) (2010-002)**

[40] **Background**

[41] The term *systems approach(es)* was added to the *List of Topics for IPPC standards* by the SC in November 2010 based on a TPG proposal. A revised definition was proposed by the TPG in October 2012 and reviewed by the SC in May 2013. The following explanatory points may be considered:

[42] A systems approach is a pest risk management option, and this is mentioned in the revised definition to clarify the concept.

[43] The wording *risk management measures* is replaced by *official measures*. This wording reflects the fact that systems approaches may be used not only for regulated pests, but also for other pests, and is therefore preferred instead of *phytosanitary measures*.

[44] The current definition includes three important elements, retained in the final proposal: the system approach integrates phytosanitary measures, two of those measures act independently, and all the measures have a cumulative effect.

[45] The definition should not specify the outcome of the systems approach and prejudge that it will be successful. The phrase *achieve the appropriate level of protection against regulated pests* was therefore deleted. However, the objective – pest risk management – is retained.

[46] Additional letters presented in parentheses that make a word optionally plural (such as “(es)”) should generally be avoided in ISPMs and in this case are not necessary as the definition was reworded as a pest risk management option.

[47] **Original definition**

[48] <b>systems approach(es)</b>	The integration of different risk management measures, at least two of which act independently, and which cumulatively achieve the appropriate level of protection against <b>regulated pests</b> [ISPM 14:2002; revised ICPM, 2005]
----------------------------------	--

[49] **Proposed revision**

[50] <b>systems approach(es)</b>	The integration of <b>Pest risk management</b> option that integrates different risk management <del>official</del> measures, at least two of which act independently, <u>with cumulative effect</u> and which cumulatively achieve the appropriate level of protection against <b>regulated pests</b>
----------------------------------	--

[51] **2.3 SUPPRESSION (2011-002), ERADICATION (2011-003), CONTAINMENT (2011-004), CONTROL (2011-005)**

[52] **Background**

[53] The terms *suppression*, *eradication*, *containment* and *control* were added to the *List of Topics for IPPC standards* by the SC in May 2011 based on a TPG proposal. Revised definitions were proposed by the TPG in October 2012 and reviewed by the SC in May 2013. The following explanatory points may be considered:

[54] For all definitions: *official measures* was used instead of *phytosanitary measures* for reasons detailed under the addition of *exclusion* (see section 1.1).

[55] For *containment*: the term has been qualified by *of a pest* for consistency. The term is used in ISPM 3:2005 for biological control agents, but the theme of ISPM 3:2005 is biological control agents as (possible) pests, so the qualifier *of a pest* is adequate for its use in ISPM 3:2005.

[56] For *eradication*: for consistency with *containment* and *suppression*, *infested* was added to the definition. The term has been qualified by *of a pest* for consistency.

[57] For *suppression*: the glossary term has been qualified by *of a pest* for consistency. Currently *suppression* is used in ISPMs only in the sense of suppressing pests, except for one use in ISPM 2:2007 (section 1.2.1), where it is used with a non-glossary meaning: a (plant as) pest suppressing other plants. The definite article *the* beginning the definition could be deleted for consistency.

[58] For *control*: the words *of a pest population* were deleted, as *suppression*, *eradication* and *containment* mention to what these concepts are applied. In addition, *suppression* does refer to pest population while *eradication* and *containment* refer to a *pest* (note that *pest population* is necessary in the definition of *suppression* because a pest (i.e. defined as a species) cannot be suppressed).

[59] - For *suppression*: it is suggested that the definition refers to “a population” (in the singular) in an infested area.

[60] **Original definitions**

[61]

<b>suppression</b>	The application of <b>phytosanitary measures</b> in an infested <b>area</b> to reduce <b>pest</b> populations [FAO, 1995; revised CEPM, 1999]
<b>eradication</b>	Application of <b>phytosanitary measures</b> to eliminate a <b>pest</b> from an <b>area</b> [FAO, 1990; revised FAO, 1995; formerly eradicate]
<b>containment</b>	Application of <b>phytosanitary measures</b> in and around an infested <b>area</b> to prevent <b>spread</b> of a <b>pest</b> [FAO, 1995]
<b>control (of a pest)</b>	<b>Suppression, containment</b> or <b>eradication</b> of a <b>pest</b> population [FAO, 1995]

[62] **Proposed revisions**

[63]

<b>suppression (of a pest)</b>	The application of <b>official phytosanitary</b> measures in an infested <b>area</b> to reduce a <b>pest</b> populations
<b>eradication (of a pest)</b>	Application of <b>official phytosanitary</b> measures to eliminate a <b>pest</b> from an <b>infested area</b>
<b>containment (of a pest)</b>	Application of <b>official phytosanitary</b> measures in and around an infested <b>area</b> to prevent <b>spread</b> of a <b>pest</b>
<b>control (of a pest)</b>	<b>Suppression, containment</b> or <b>eradication</b> of a <b>pest</b> population

[64] **2.4 PLACE OF PRODUCTION AND PEST FREE PRODUCTION SITE**

[65] **Background**

[66] Consequential changes to the definitions of *place of production* and *pest free production site* are needed due to the proposed new definition for *production site* (see section 1.2). Revised definitions were proposed by the TPG in October 2012 and reviewed by the SC in May 2013. The following explanatory points may be considered:

[67] The changes proposed simplify the definitions of both terms in view of the proposed new definition of *production site*.

[68] In addition, for *pest free production site*, the change from *does not occur* to *is absent* is a consequential change to the proposal to delete *occurrence* and to use *presence* or *present* (or *absent* for *does not occur*) (see section 3.1).

**[69] Original definitions**

<b>place of production</b>	Any premises or collection of fields operated as a single production or farming unit. This may include production sites which are separately managed for phytosanitary purposes [FAO, 1990; revised CEPM, 1999]
<b>pest free production site</b>	A defined portion of a <b>place of production</b> in which a specific <b>pest</b> does not <b>occur</b> as demonstrated by scientific evidence and in which, where appropriate, this condition is being <b>officially</b> maintained for a defined period and that is managed as a separate unit in the same way as a <b>pest free place of production</b> [ISPM 10:1999]

**[71] Proposed revisions**

<b>place of production</b>	Any premises or collection of <b>fields</b> operated as a single production or farming unit. <del>This may include production sites which are separately managed for phytosanitary purposes</del>
<b>pest free production site</b>	A <b>production site</b> defined portion of a place of production in which a specific <b>pest does not occur</b> is <b>absent</b> , as demonstrated by scientific evidence, and in which, where appropriate, this condition is being <b>officially</b> maintained for a defined period <del>and that is managed as a separate unit in the same way as a pest free place of production</del>

**[73] 2.5 QUARANTINE STATION (2010-013)****[74] Background**

**[75]** The term *quarantine station* was added to the *List of Topics for IPPC standards* by the SC in April 2010. A revised definition was proposed by the TPG in October 2010, reviewed by the SC in May 2011 and sent for member consultation in June 2011. In November 2011 the TPG reviewed member comments and retained the proposed definition with fuller explanations. In November 2011 the SC returned the proposal to the TPG for further consideration. In October 2012 the TPG again discussed the proposal and submitted an unchanged definition but with added explanations to the SC. The revised definition was reviewed by the SC in May 2013. The following explanatory points may be considered:

**[76]** The current definition is restrictive as quarantine stations might be used to hold in quarantine not only plants or plant products, but also other regulated articles (including beneficial organisms, when being subject to phytosanitary regulation). The definition was therefore broadened to include other regulated articles and to mention beneficial organisms as possible regulated articles. It is still considered useful to cover the different types of elements that can be kept in a quarantine station.

**[77]** Specific mention of beneficial organisms is recommended, as it is important in relation to ISPM 3:2005. Note that ISPM 3:2005 currently uses *quarantine facilities* to refer to the concept of quarantine stations. For consistency in the use of terms, once the revised definition is adopted, ISPM 3:2005 could be adjusted to use *quarantine station*.

**[78]** Consideration was given as to whether *regulated articles* should be mentioned, as they cover not only plants and organisms, but also, for example, conveyances. Note that quarantine stations are used in practice for various regulated articles, such as baggage, pots and soil, and even vehicles and material, especially when quarantine stations are situated close to a point of entry. However, there is no need to restrict the definition. Definitions do not specify what countries should do or not do, and countries may have different practices and requirements regarding regulated articles in quarantine stations.

[79] The definition uses *quarantine*, which in turn includes *regulated articles* in its own definition.

[80] The expanded term *phytosanitary quarantine station* was considered. However, no other types of quarantine stations than those for phytosanitary purposes are mentioned in ISPMs so the word *phytosanitary* is not needed.

[81] Responses to member comments in 2011 may be found in the TPG 2011 meeting report.

[82] **Original definition**

[83] quarantine station	Official station for holding <b>plants</b> or <b>plant products</b> in <b>quarantine</b> [FAO, 1990; revised FAO, 1995; formerly <b>quarantine station or facility</b> ]
-------------------------	--

[84] **Proposed revision**

[85] quarantine station	Official station for holding <b>plants, plants products</b> or other <b>regulated articles</b> , <u>including beneficial organisms</u> , in <b>quarantine</b>
-------------------------	---

[86] **2.6 AREA OF LOW PEST PREVALENCE, COMMODITY PEST LIST, HABITAT, PEST FREE AREA, PEST FREE PLACE OF PRODUCTION, SURVEILLANCE, SURVEY**

[87] **Background**

[88] Consequential changes to the definitions below are needed due to the proposed deletion of the definition of *occurrence* (see section 3.1). A similar consequential change was made to *pest free production site* under 2.4. Revised definitions were proposed by the TPG in February 2013 and reviewed by the SC in May 2013. The following explanatory points may be considered:

[89] It is proposed that only *presence* and *present* are used in ISPMs.

[90] *Is absent* is preferred to *is not present* to replace and avoid the use of the negative form *does not occur* in the definitions concerned. This term is also used in ISPM 8:1998.

[91] Note: for three terms marked with \* in the tables below (*area of low pest prevalence*, *commodity pest list* and *survey*), the SC identified the need to further consider conceptual issues in these definitions and added these terms as subjects to the List of topics for IPPC standards for further consideration by the TPG. However, the proposals below were maintained and only relate to the consequential change arising from the proposed deletion of *occurrence*.

[92] **Original definitions**

[93] area of low pest prevalence*	An <b>area</b> , whether all of a country, part of a country, or all or parts of several countries, as identified by the competent authorities, in which a specific <b>pest occurs</b> at low levels and which is subject to effective <b>surveillance, control</b> or <b>eradication</b> measures [IPPC, 1997]
commodity pest list*	A list of <b>pests occurring</b> in an <b>area</b> which may be associated with a specific <b>commodity</b> [CEPM, 1996]

<b>habitat</b>	Part of an <b>ecosystem</b> with conditions in which an <b>organism</b> naturally occurs or can establish [ICPM, 2005]
<b>pest free area</b>	An <b>area</b> in which a specific <b>pest</b> does not <b>occur</b> as demonstrated by scientific evidence and in which, where appropriate, this condition is being <b>officially</b> maintained [FAO, 1995]
<b>pest free place of production</b>	<b>Place of production</b> in which a specific <b>pest</b> does not <b>occur</b> as demonstrated by scientific evidence and in which, where appropriate, this condition is being <b>officially</b> maintained for a defined period [ISPM 10:1999]
<b>surveillance</b>	An <b>official</b> process which collects and records data on <b>pest occurrence</b> or absence by <b>survey, monitoring</b> or other procedures [CEPM, 1996]
<b>survey*</b>	An <b>official</b> procedure conducted over a defined period of time to determine the characteristics of a <b>pest</b> population or to determine which species <b>occur</b> in an <b>area</b> [FAO, 1990; revised CEPM, 1996]

[94] **Proposed revisions**

[95]

<b>area of low pest prevalence*</b>	An <b>area</b> , whether all of a country, part of a country, or all or parts of several countries, as identified by the competent authorities, in which a specific <b>pest occurs is present</b> at low levels and which is subject to effective <b>surveillance</b> or <b>control</b> measures [IPPC, 1997]
<b>commodity pest list*</b>	A list of <b>pests occurring present</b> in an <b>area</b> which may be associated with a specific <b>commodity</b> [CEPM, 1996]
<b>habitat</b>	Part of an <b>ecosystem</b> with conditions in which an <b>organism is naturally occurs present</b> or can establish [ICPM, 2005]
<b>pest free area</b>	An <b>area</b> in which a specific <b>pest does not occur is absent</b> as demonstrated by scientific evidence and in which, where appropriate, this condition is being <b>officially</b> maintained [FAO, 1995]
<b>pest free place of production</b>	<b>Place of production</b> in which a specific <b>pest does not occur is absent</b> as demonstrated by scientific evidence and in which, where appropriate, this condition is being <b>officially</b> maintained for a defined period [ISPM 10:1999]
<b>surveillance</b>	An <b>official</b> process which collects and records data on <b>pest presence occurrence</b> or absence by <b>survey, monitoring</b> or other procedures [CEPM, 1996]
<b>survey*</b>	An <b>official</b> procedure conducted over a defined period of time to determine the characteristics of a <b>pest</b> population or to determine which species <b>occur are present</b> in an <b>area</b> [FAO, 1990; revised CEPM, 1996]

[96] **3. DELETIONS**

[97] **3.1 OCCURRENCE (2010-026)**

[98] **Background**



- [99] The terms *occurrence* and *presence* (2010-025) were added to the *List of Topics for IPPC standards* by the SC in April 2010 based on a TPG proposal to consider how they are used in English and if a single term can be recommended, noting that both terms in ISPMs are translated to only one term in French (*presence*) and Spanish (*presencia*). Deletion of *occurrence* was proposed by the TPG in October 2012 and reviewed by the SC in May 2013. No action was recommended for *presence*. The following explanatory points may be considered:
- [100] *Occurrence* is defined in terms of *presence* that implies a status more specific and restricted than *presence*. However, that distinction does not exist in other languages. The actual use in ISPMs does not seem to intend or require such distinction. Similarly, the Convention text (written before *occurrence* was defined) uses the two terms synonymously.
- [101] The current definition of *occurrence* (referring to a degree of permanence) seems counter-intuitive to the normal English meaning of the word (referring to a sudden event).
- [102] It is suggested that the terms *presence* and *occurrence* should be accepted as synonyms in current ISPMs, and that only *presence* and *present* (or *absent* for “does not occur”) be used in future standards.
- [103] In addition, the current definition of *occurrence* (“officially recognized to be indigenous or introduced and not officially reported to have been eradicated”) refers to requirements. Definitions should not make such requirements.
- [104] It is proposed to delete the definition of *occurrence* and not to define *presence*, rather allowing the various grades and nuances of *presence* to be dealt with only in the revised ISPM 8:1998.
- [105] The proposal to delete *occurrence* includes a number of consequential changes to other glossary definitions are needed (see section 2.6).

[106] **Proposed deletion**

<b>occurrence</b>	The presence in an <b>area</b> of a <b>pest officially</b> recognized to be indigenous or <b>introduced</b> and not <b>officially</b> reported to have been <b>eradicated</b> [FAO, 1990; revised FAO, 1995; ISPM No. 17; formerly <b>occur</b> ]
-------------------	---

[108] **3.2 ORGANISM (2010-021), NATURALLY OCCURRING (2010-023)**

[109] **Background**

- [110] The terms *organism* and *naturally occurring* were added to the *List of Topics for IPPC standards* by the SC in April 2010 based on a TPG proposal to review the definitions and use in ISPMs of *pest*, *organism* and *naturally occurring*. Deletion of *organism* and *naturally occurring* was proposed by the TPG in October 2012 and reviewed by the SC in May 2013 (it was proposed that the definition of *pest* remains as it is). The following explanatory points may be considered:
- [111] The term *naturally occurring* is used only in the glossary definition of *organism*. Variants are used in ISPMs, with different meanings (e.g. the place where an organism naturally occurs (i.e. its place of origin); a place where the natural occurrence of a pest is low). The glossary definition of *naturally occurring* has no meaning or relevance in these contexts.
- [112] *Organism* is a common term, and it is not used in ISPMs with any specific meaning for IPPC purposes. It was originally defined as an individual term for the purpose of ISPM 3:2005, but is also used in other contexts.
- [113] **Proposed deletions**

[114]	<b>naturally occurring</b>	A component of an <b>ecosystem</b> or a selection from a wild population, not altered by artificial means [ISPM 3:1995]
	<b>organism</b>	Any biotic entity capable of reproduction or replication in its <b>naturally occurring</b> state [ISPM 3:1995; revised ISPM 3:2005]

[115] **3.3 RESTRICTION (2010-027)**

[116] **Background**

[117] The term *restriction* was added to the *List of Topics for IPPC standards* by the SC in April 2010 based on a TPG proposal to review its inconsistent use in ISPMs. Deletion of *restriction* was proposed by the TPG in October 2012 and reviewed by the SC in May 2013. The following point may be considered:

[118] *Restriction* is used according to its definition in some cases, but not in others. When it is used according to its definition, it will always be possible and more correct to reword (as a matter of consistency) the text by referring to *phytosanitary import requirements*. The definition of *restriction* is therefore not needed. Indeed, most ISPMs already refer to the establishment of *phytosanitary import requirements* rather than to *restrictions*.

[119] **Proposed deletion**

[120]	<b>restriction</b>	A <b>phytosanitary regulation</b> allowing the importation or movement of specified <b>commodities</b> subject to specific requirements [CEPM, 1996; revised CEPM, 1999]
-------	--------------------	--

[121] **3.4 PROTECTED AREA (2012-003), CONTROLLED AREA**

[122] **Background**

[123] The terms *endangered area* and *protected area* were added to the *List of Topics for IPPC standards* by the SC in April 2012 based on a TPG proposal. Deletion of *protected area* was proposed by the TPG in October 2012 and reviewed by the SC in May 2013. Deletion of *controlled area* was also proposed as a consequence. No change is considered necessary for the definition of *endangered area*. The following explanatory points may be considered:

[124] *Protected area* and *controlled area* are redundant, making the collection of area-related definitions overly complicated. Both terms are defined as particular cases of *regulated area*, applied in one case for *endangered area* (protected) and in the other for *quarantine area* (controlled).

[125] *Controlled area* has not been used in ISPMs.

[126] *Protected area* is used in ISPMs to a very limited extent, in one case (ISPM 11:2004) with a different meaning to its definition (referring to the protection of nature). Where referring in ISPMs to a *regulated area*, that term could be used instead for consistency.

[127] The term *protected area* was meant to apply to an *endangered area* (i.e. in the context of pest risk analysis). However, the revised ISPM 2:2007 already uses the term *regulated area*.

[128] Where *protected area* is used in ISPMs, it is described as being subject to constraints other than what the definition covers (i.e. technical justification and non-discrimination, not as the minimum area).

**[129] Proposed deletions**

<b>controlled area</b>	A <b>regulated area</b> which an <b>NPPO</b> has determined to be the minimum <b>area</b> necessary to prevent <b>spread</b> of a <b>pest</b> from a <b>quarantine area</b> [CEPM, 1996]
<b>protected area</b>	A <b>regulated area</b> that an <b>NPPO</b> has determined to be the minimum <b>area</b> necessary for the effective protection of an <b>endangered area</b> [FAO, 1990; omitted from FAO, 1995; new concept from CEPM, 1996]

**[131] 3.5 CONTAMINATING PEST (2012-001)****[132] Background**

[133] 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 *contaminating pest* was proposed by the TPG in February 2013. The following explanatory points may be considered:

[134] The definition of *contaminating pest* is limited to pests carried by a commodity, and does not cover pests carried by other means; for example, conveyances.

[135] There is a definition of *contamination* that covers appropriately all cases of contamination by pests or regulated articles (Contamination: Presence in a **commodity**, storage place, conveyance or container, of **pests** or other **regulated articles**, not constituting an **infestation** (see **infestation**) [CEPM, 1997; revised CEPM, 1999]).

[136] Deletion of *contaminating pest* is proposed rather than revising the definition because the wording *contaminating pest* can still be used as a derived form of *contamination*, which is defined appropriately. It is preferable to avoid duplicating definitions.

**[137] Proposed deletion**

<b>contaminating pest</b>	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]
---------------------------	---

**[139] 4. UNDERSTANDING OF “PLANTS” IN THE IPPC AND ITS ISPMs AND CONSEQUENTIAL REVISION OF THE SCOPE OF ISPM 5****[140] Background**

[141] In 2012, the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) raised the issue of whether the IPPC covered algae, bryophytes and fungi. It was noted that, when the IPPC was developed, living organisms were divided into only two kingdoms – plants and animals – and that these other organisms would have been covered under the term “plants”. At the request of the IPPC Secretariat, the TPG had preliminary discussions on this issue in October 2012. In November 2012, the SC requested the TPG to produce a document on the taxonomic classification of organisms such as algae, bryophytes and fungi and the IPPC coverage of plants. The proposal below was developed by the TPG in February 2013 and reviewed by the SC in May 2013.

**[142] What are “plants” for the IPPC?**

[143] There has never been a clear definition of what is to be understood by “plants” in the IPPC. Originally, the emphasis was on plants that are exploited for economic reasons by humans and that need to be protected from pests carried to new areas by international trade. In practice, this meant angiosperms, gymnosperms and pteridophytes (broadly “higher” or “vascular” plants). Yet the concept of plants for the botanical community at that time extended to bryophytes, algae, fungi and even bacteria; indeed, everything that was not animal. This was reflected in the fact that the same code of botanical nomenclature applied to all these organisms. The direct economic importance of these various other “plants” was not actually very great, and they did not need to be protected against the introduction and spread of pests. However, at that time, certain algae and fungi were exploited for economic reasons, and would presumably have qualified to be considered under the IPPC (though in fact no cases can be recalled).

[144] Article IV.2.b of the revised IPPC (1997) makes it clear that the IPPC is also concerned with pests affecting uncultivated/unmanaged plants (“wild flora”) and with environmental effects and their consequences on plants, as reflected in various Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) decisions and in ISPM 11:2004 [*year to be adjusted after CPM-8*] (including its Annex 1). The scope of the IPPC now overlaps with that of the CBD, for plants. In practice, the CBD aims to protect species of all kinds of higher plants, including bryophytes. Algae and fungi are also covered by the CBD (whether they are considered to be plants or not).

#### [145] **Modern classification of plants**

[146] In the 21st century, the classification of organisms into kingdoms has greatly changed. There are no longer just the two kingdoms, Animalia and Plantae, but at least seven (Archaea, Bacteria, Animalia, Protozoa, Chromista, Fungi, Plantae). A fuller account of the changes is presented in Appendix 1. In modern terms, fungi and many algae are not plants. This leads to an apparent restriction in the scope of the IPPC, and it is accordingly proposed to make a specific declaration that restores the former implicit scope and asserts it explicitly. It is clear that certain algae and certain fungi are open to protection under the IPPC because of their economic exploitation, while others are important components of biodiversity.

#### [147] **Proposal for the understanding of “plants” in the IPPC and its ISPMs**

[148] At the recent International Botanical Congress in Melbourne, Australia (July 2011), the International Code of Botanical Nomenclature was renamed to the International Code of Nomenclature for algae, fungi, and plants (ICN). **The TPG suggests the IPPC should state that its scope extends to algae and fungi, as well as plants, consistent with the International Code of Nomenclature for algae, fungi, and plants.**

#### [149] **Means of formal inclusion of this understanding into IPPC documentation**

[150] It is suggested that this understanding is included formally into IPPC documentation by amending the scope of ISPM 5. This is preferred over amending the current definition of “plants” (which relates to plants as a commodity) or of developing an agreed interpretation of “plants”.

#### [151] **Proposed revision of the scope of ISPM 5**

[152] This reference standard is a listing of terms and definitions with specific meaning for phytosanitary systems worldwide. It has been developed to provide a harmonized internationally agreed vocabulary associated with the implementation of the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) and International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPMs).

[153] Within the context of the IPPC and its ISPMs, all references to plants should be understood to extend to algae and fungi, consistent with the International Code of Nomenclature for algae, fungi, and plants.

**[154] Questions arising from this proposal**

[155] The proposal is made in relatively simple terms because its expression in greater detail would make it much more complex (see Appendix 1). In scientific terminology, the proposed scope would be Plantae, Chromista and Fungi, but these categories do not correspond exactly to the English-language equivalents.

[156] Some plants, and many algae and fungi, are micro-organisms. For this reason, it is much less likely that they would be actively considered for protection under the IPPC. However, the dividing line between macro-organisms and micro-organisms is not clear, and it does not seem appropriate to draw a line to exclude the latter.

[157] The kingdoms Bacteria and Archaea are not included in the proposal. The organisms within these kingdoms were at one time covered by the International Code of Botanical Nomenclature but now have their own code. They are all micro-organisms. It has been suggested that they should be included in the IPPC's understanding of "plants", but there is little immediate prospect that they would require protection either for their economic importance or as components of biodiversity.

**[158] Appendix 1. Present kingdoms and their former classifications**

[159]

New kingdom	Groups included*	Former classification
Archaea	Primitive bacteria	Bacteria
Bacteria	Bacteria	Bacteria
	Cyanobacteria	Algae, and previously plants
Animalia	Animals	Animals
Protozoa	Protozoa	Animals
	Myxomycetes	Fungi, and previously plants
	Euglenozoa	Plants
Chromista	Phaeophyta (brown algae)	Plants
	Diatoms (microalgae)	Plants
	Dinoflagellates (microalgae)	Plants
	Oomycetes	Fungi, and previously plants
Fungi	Fungi and lichens	Fungi, and previously plants
Plantae	Higher plants and ferns	Plants
	Bryophytes	Plants
	Chlorophyta (green algae)	Plants
	Charophyta (stoneworts)	Plants

Plantae (or possibly another kingdom)	Rhodophyta (red algae)	Plants
---------------------------------------	------------------------	--------

[160] \* There are other small groups of Algae (previously plants), now in Chromista or Plantae, which have been omitted for simplicity.