[PleaseReview document review. Review title: 2021 Second Consultation: 2019 & 2020 Amendments of ISPM 5 (1994-001). Document title: 1994-001_Draft_2019_2020_Amendments_to_ISPM5_2021-06-15.docx]

[1]DRAFT 2019 AND 2020 AMENDMENTS TO ISPM 5: *GLOSSARY OF PHYTOSANITARY TERMS* (1994-001)

[2]**Publication history**

[3]*(This is not an official part of the standard)*

[4]**Date of this document**	[5]2021-06-15
[6]**Document category**	[7]Draft 2019 and 2020 Amendments to ISPM 5 *(Glossary of phytosanitary terms)* (1994-001)
[8]**Current document stage**	[9]*To* second consultation
[10]**Major stages**	[11]CEPM (1994) added topic: 1994-001, Amendments to ISPM 5: Glossary of phytosanitary terms [12]2006-05 Standards Committee (SC) approved specification TP5 [13]2012-10 Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG) revised specification [14]2012-11 SC revised and approved revised specification, revoking Specification 1 [15]2018-12 TPG drafted text on "detection survey" as 2019 amendments [16]2019-05 SC approved 2019 amendments to first consultation and they are included below [17]2019-11 TPG proposed 2020 amendments below [18]2020-04 SC revised the 2020 amendments via the Online Comment System (to replace the cancelled 2020-05 SC meeting) and approved the 2020 amendments for first consultation via e-decision (2020_eSC_May_17). [19]2020-12-16 TPG reviewed countries' comments and proposed the amendments as included below for SC-7 consideration. *Note:* Further TPG elaboration on the term and definition of *Clearance (of a consignment)* has been postponed. [20]2021-05 SC-7 reviewed the 2019 and 2020 amendments via the Online Comment System and approved at its virtual meeting for the second consultation.
[21]**Notes**	[22]Note to Secretariat formatting this paper: formatting in definitions and explanations (strikethrough, bold, italics) needs to remain.

[23]1. DELETIONS

[24]1.1 "incidence" (2018-010)

[25]A topic was submitted during the 2018 Call for topics for standards and implementation to revise the definition of the term "incidence" and define the term "prevalence", as their meaning can be confused in human and animal epidemiological context versus phytosanitary context.

[26]The Standards Committee (SC) at its November 2018 meeting discussed the recommendation of the Task Force on Topics (TFT) and noted that the terms "incidence" and "prevalence" had been discussed in depth previously. Only "incidence" is defined in the Glossary and instead of revising that definition and defining "prevalence", the SC proposed to delete "incidence" from the Glossary and to use the terms "incidence" and "prevalence" in their

common dictionary sense in ISPMs. The SC therefore added the term "incidence" to the *List of topics for IPPC standards* and requested the Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG) consider deleting it from the Glossary.

[27]At its November 2019 meeting, the TPG analyzed previous work carried out by the TPG and decisions of SC and CPM since 1995, with regard to the term "incidence" and the linked Glossary terms "area of low pest prevalence" and "tolerance level". The TPG recalled that the initial intention had been to define the term "prevalence" but, following a lengthy process of consideration and consultation on the terms "prevalence", "incidence" and "tolerance", the term and definition of "incidence" (as well as of "tolerance level") had finally been adopted in 2009 and included in the Glossary rather than "prevalence". The TPG discussed all relative merits of retaining "incidence" in the Glossary, replacing it by "prevalence", or having both terms in the Glossary.

[28]Considering the extensive past discussions on the possible definitions of the terms "prevalence" and "incidence" and the divergent points of view expressed, the TPG confirmed that it is unlikely that an agreement could be reached on a revised Glossary definition of "incidence" and a new Glossary definition of "prevalence". Recognizing the pragmatic direction set out by the SC, the TPG therefore agreed to propose that the term "incidence" be deleted from the Glossary, with no ink amendments to the definition of "tolerance level" (which refers to "incidence"), and that the words "incidence" and "prevalence" be used in ISPMs with their general, dictionary meaning.

[29]The following explanatory points may be considered when reviewing the proposal for the deletion of the term "incidence (of a pest)":

- [30]The current Glossary definition of "incidence", although fitting well with the use of the term in plant protection, corresponds to the epidemiological definition of "prevalence" as used in human and animal health. For example, *TERMIUM Plus* defines the two terms as following for the subject field "Statistics; Epidemiology; General Medicine, Hygiene and Health":
    - [31]incidence: The number of new cases of a disease or condition in a population at risk over a given period, usually one year;
    - [32]prevalence: The number of people in a population with a specific disease or condition at a given time, usually expressed as a proportion of the number of affected people to the total population;
- [33]The general meaning of "incidence" in conventional dictionaries is consistent with its Glossary definition that simply makes the term more specific to plant protection;
- [34]It is therefore proposed that the term "incidence" be removed from the Glossary, and the terms "prevalence" and "incidence" used in their common dictionary sense.

[35]***Proposed deletion***

[36]**incidence** (of a **pest**)	[37]Proportion or number of units in which a **pest** is present in a sample, **consignment**, **field** or other defined population [CPM, 2009]

[38]**2. REVISIONS**

[39]**2.1 "emergency action" (2018-044)**

[40]At its December 2018 meeting, the TPG, while considering the comments received from first consultation on the proposed revised definition of the term "treatment" (2017-008), discussed how the term "emergency action" would apply for a new, non-yet regulated, pest discovered for instance in an imported consignment.

[41]The TPG had considered it appropriate that such situations could be managed by the national plant protection organisations (NPPO) taking "emergency action" but had noted that, since the definition of "emergency action" refers back to "phytosanitary action" and therefore to the implementation of a "phytosanitary measure", it currently applies only to regulated pests.

[42]Recalling that Article VII.6 of the IPPC states that "nothing in this Article shall prevent any contracting party from taking appropriate emergency action on the detection of a pest posing a potential threat to its territories or the report of such a detection", the TPG had considered that the text of the Convention justifies NPPOs taking action on any pest posing "a potential threat", including non-regulated pests. The TPG had therefore concluded that the definition of "emergency action" probably needed to be revised to cover non-regulated pests and in May 2019 the SC had agreed to add this term to the *List of topics for IPPC standards*.

[43]At its November 2019 meeting, the TPG analysed the use of the terms "emergency action" and "phytosanitary action" in adopted ISPMs, and proposed a revised definition of "emergency action"" that went for the first consultation July through September 2020. In reviewing comments received from that consultation, the TPG at its December 2020 meeting produced a revised proposal which was amended by the SC-7 in May 2021 and is presented below.

[44]The following explanatory points may be considered when reviewing the proposal for the revision of the definition of "emergency action":

- [45]There is a need for replacing "phytosanitary" with "official" in the current wording "phytosanitary action", to clarify that an emergency action can target both regulated and non-regulated pests, and at the same time retain the notion that any emergency action should be taken under the authority of the NPPO;

- [46]In the definition, replacing "action" with "operation" is proposed for consistency with the definition of "phytosanitary action", being "an official operation, such as inspection, testing, surveillance or treatment, undertaken to implement phytosanitary measures";

- [47]With the word "phytosanitary" being replaced by "official", wording is being added to explicitly state the purpose of an emergency action, namely "to prevent the entry, establishment or spread of a pest"; it is noted that a pest in question may be a regulated or a non-regulated pest, in consistency also with the change from "phytosanitary" to "official" (about the operation);

- [48]To distinctly characterize the situation in which an emergency action may be undertaken,

    - [49]the word "phytosanitary" (about the situation) has been removed to avoid any confusion with situations where a "phytosanitary action" may be undertaken, and

- [50]the phrase "not addressed by existing phytosanitary measures" has been added, thereby clearly distinguishing the situation triggering an "emergency action" from the situation triggering a "phytosanitary action", where, according to its definition, operations are undertaken to implement (existing) phytosanitary measures.

- [51]Thus with the revision the distinction is clarified as to how the terms "phytosanitary action" and "emergency action" should be used appropriately, namely:
  - [52]the term "phytosanitary action" for operations undertaken to implement phytosanitary measures (e.g. in case of non-compliance of a consignment with phytosanitary import requirements);
  - [53]the term "emergency action" for operations undertaken in new or unexpected situations not addressed by existing phytosanitary measures, such as the detection in an imported consignment of a pest not previously assessed, or not regulated for that particular host or pathway, or the detection in an area of a pest that needs to be prevented from establishing or spreading following its recent entry. Thus, the two concepts are disjunctive, the one not being a subset of the other.
- [54]The proposed revision of the definition adequately reflects the disjunctive use of the terms "emergency action" and "phytosanitary action" in adopted ISPMs.

[55]***Current definition***

[56]**emergency action**	[57]A prompt **phytosanitary action** undertaken in a new or unexpected phytosanitary situation [ICPM, 2001]

[58]***Proposed revision***

[59]**emergency action**	[60]A prompt ~~**phytosanitary**~~ **official** ~~**action**~~ operation undertaken to prevent the **entry**, **establishment** or **spread** of a **pest** in a new or unexpected ~~phytosanitary~~ situation not addressed by existing **phytosanitary measures**

[61]**2.2 "detection survey" (consequential to 2015-013 "survey")**

[62]The Glossary term "survey" was added to the List of Topics for IPPC Standards by the SC in May 2013, for the TPG to consider whether the concept of "absence" should be included in its definition. TPG proposed to the draft 2017 Amendments a revision to the definition of "survey", in accordance with the draft revision of ISPM 6 (*Surveillance*), the use of the term in other ISPMs and the three types of surveys defined in the Glossary. During their review of first consultation comments, SC-7 in May 2018 noted that "absence" of a pest is not included in the definition of "detection survey", and asked the TPG to consider whether that definition should be amended to include "or absence". Notably, the revised definition of "survey" to include "absence" was adopted by the CPM in 2019.

[63]The TPG discussed the term "detection survey" in their December 2018 meeting and proposed a revised definition that went for the first consultation July through September 2020. In reviewing comments received from that consultation, the TPG at its December 2020 meeting produced the revised proposal as presented below.

[64]The following explanatory points may be considered when reviewing the proposal for the revision of the definition:

- [65]"Detection survey" is used in several instances throughout ISPMs when referring to determining or verifying absence of a pest.
- [66]The objective of a detection survey is to determine whether a pest is present, meaning that presence and absence are equally possible outcomes of a detection survey and it can thus be used to determine that a pest is absent.
- [67]"If" in the definition already expresses the concept of absence, but without being as explicit as in the definitions of "survey", "delimiting survey" and "surveillance". As the wording "the presence or absence" should be used consistently, it is suggested to replace the conditional "if" by the addition of "or absence" and insert "the" before "presence or absence".
- [68]The recently revised definition of "survey" includes the wording "in an area, place of production or production site". As "detection survey" is explicitly defined as a subset of "survey", mentioning the spatial scope of a detection survey would be redundant, and the wording "in an area" is therefore deleted by this revision. This is in analogy to the fact that the temporal scope specified in the "survey" definition (i.e.: "over a defined period") is not being repeated in the definition of "detection survey".
- [69]The proposed revised definition of "detection survey" adequately reflects the use of the term in adopted ISPMs.

- [70]***Current definition***

[71]**Detection survey**	[72]**Survey** conducted in an **area** to determine if **pests** are present [FAO, 1990; revised FAO, 1995]

- [73]***Proposed revision***

[74]**Detection survey**	[75]**Survey** conducted ~~in an **area**~~ to determine ~~if **pests** are present~~ the presence or absence of **pests** [FAO, 1990; revised FAO, 1995]

[76]