

Template for comments - Draft ISPMs for country consultation, 2006

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

Please use this table for sending country comments to the IPPC Secretariat ([ippc@fao.org](mailto:ippc@fao.org)). See instructions on how to use this template at the end of the table. Following these will greatly facilitate the compilation of comments and the work of the Standards Committee

**Please make sure that the cell "country name" is filled for each row of comments and contains the name of the country submitting the comments**

1. Term and definition	2. Country	3. Type of comment	4. Location	5. Proposed rewording	6. Explanation
1.1 phytosanitary security					
1.1 integrity (of a consignment)					
2.1 buffer zone					
2.2 compliance procedure (for a consignment)					
3.1 biological control	USA	technical	definition	Delete "sterile insects" and "biological control agents". Reword: "Pest control strategy making use of living natural enemies, antagonists, competitors or other organisms intended to reduce or control a pest population."	The term "biological control" describes a naturally occurring ecological process, as well as a technique derived from an understanding of this process, which has been developed by man as one tool for implementing integrated pest management (IPM). In contrast, the sterile insect technique, while a valuable IPM practice, is not naturally occurring and has not been derived from a naturally occurring process. We note that biological control has historically included the use of living organisms that are considered natural enemies, such as parasites, predators, or pathogens to suppress undesirable animals or plants. We believe that the addition of "sterile insects" to this definition would be inappropriate as it goes beyond the classical definition of "biological control" and it would unnecessarily expand the scope of several standards under the IPPC.
3.2 reference specimen(s) (of a biological control agent)					



## INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE USE OF THE TEMPLATE

Tables of comments will be compiled so that all country comments on each section (or even paragraph) will appear together. The compiled tables will be transmitted to the SC (and added to the IPP). **Please do not add or delete columns and do not change their width.**

Title of the columns and expected content:

### 1. SECTION

- This gives the titles of sections as they appear in the draft, plus a row for general comments. If changes are proposed for titles of sections, they should be made in the column "proposed rewording".
- **There should be no empty cell in this column**
- General comments apply to the entirety of the standard. Specific comments apply to a defined section of the draft, which should be clearly identified.
- If several comments are made on several paragraphs of a same section, it is suggested that one or several row(s) should be added. The titles of the section should be repeated in the new rows
- If there is no comment on one section, the other cells in the row should be left empty or the entire row should be deleted.

### 2. COUNTRY

- To facilitate compilation of comments, the country name should be indicated in every row for which a comment is being made
- **There should be no empty cell in this column.**
- **The country name should be that of the country submitting the comments**

### 3. TYPE OF COMMENTS

For each comment on specific sections of the text, governments are requested to clearly indicate if the comment is considered to refer to:

- a technical/substantive issue with the content of the standard.
- an editorial issue
- a translation issue.

#### Technical/substantive issue

These are the comments which suggest changes to the meaning of the standard, if the concepts expressed or the technical content is wrong in the view of the country commenting. They cover conceptual problems, scientific errors, technical adjustments etc. Rewording should be proposed and detailed explanations should be given to facilitate understanding and review by the Standards Committee.

#### Editorial issue

The ideas expressed are thought to be correct, but the wording could be improved (spelling, vocabulary used, grammar or structure of the sentence) to clarify or simplify the text. **The meaning must not be changed.** Examples:

- A term appears in the text and is thought to be needed in the definitions section of the standard.
  - A sentence needs to be changed to make it consistent with wording used elsewhere in the text.
  - A clearer word which does not change the meaning could be used.
  - The language used could be simplified
- Note: Any change, although minor, which might change the meaning of the text is not editorial and should be classified as technical.

#### Translation issue

This is limited to points for which the English version is thought to be correct, but appears wrongly translated in the French or Spanish versions. Examples:

- A term of the Glossary used in the English has not been given its proper Glossary equivalent in the language concerned
- A technical term has not been translated with its proper technical equivalent in the plant protection framework
- A quote from another document should have been taken directly from the document concerned but has been retranslated.

## **4. LOCATION**

The place where the comment applies in the section or tables, it is suggested that governments refer to titles, vary depending on the word processor used. Example

<b>Comment regarding</b>
Title of the section
Rewording of the second paragraph of the section
Rewording of the fourth sentence of the 3rd paragraph of section
Rewording of the 6th indent of paragraph 4
Addition of a new indent after indent 2 in paragraph 7
Addition of a new indent after the last of a list