



[1] **Revision of ISPM 8:1998 *Determination of Pest Status in an area* (2009-005)**

[2]

<b>Date of this document</b>	2013-01-25
<b>Document category</b>	Draft specification to revise ISPM
<b>Current document stage</b>	To member consultation
<b>Origin</b>	Revision of ISPM 8:1998 - <i>Determination of Pest Status in an area</i> (2009-005)
<b>Major stages</b>	2009-11 SC introduced topic via e-mail (noted in SC 2010-04 report) 2010-3 CPM-5 added topic to the list of topics for IPPC standards 2010-11 SC deferred draft 2011-05 SC deferred draft 2012-04 SC requested SC members to send comments to steward 2012-09-10 Steward sent revised specification to IPPC Secretariat 2012-11 SC revised in lunch session and asked steward to finalize 2012-12 steward revised draft 2012-12 sent for e-decision 2013-01 SC approved for MC by e-decision
<b>Notes</b>	
<b>Steward history</b>	2009-11 SC: Melcho, Beatriz (Uruguay) Assistant steward: 2012-11 SC: Nordbo, Ebbe (Denmark)

[3] **Title**

[4] Revision of ISPM 8:1998 (*Determination of Pest Status in an area*).

[5] **Reason for the revision of the standard**

[6] ISPM 8:1998 on *Determination of pest status in an area* was adopted by the Interim Commission on Phytosanitary Measures in November 1998. A revision is needed to take into account new guidance in several other standards, mainly on pest free areas, that have been adopted since ISPM 8:1998.

[7] **Scope and purpose**

[8] ISPM 8:1998 describes the content of a pest record, the use of pest records and other information in the determination of pest status in an area. Descriptions of pest status categories are provided together with recommendations for good reporting practices.

[9] This standard is not concerned with reporting obligations, but with the quality of the reported information. Accurate reports are an essential part of the international cooperation to facilitate trade.

**[10] Tasks**

[11] The expert working group should:

[12] (1) review the consistency of ISPM 8:1998 with other relevant and subsequently adopted ISPMs, and with any relevant draft ISPMs under development

[13] (2) consider the existing pest status categories in ISPM 8:1998 and propose new categories if appropriate

[14] (3) consider to develop guidance for determining pest status for pests in relation to specific host commodities (the pest is present only on specific hosts)

[15] (4) consider to add guidance on how to combine the qualifications associated to pest status categories under "present".

[16] (5) consider whether to provide additional guidance to determine pest absence when only very old pest records are available

[17] (6) review the pest status "Transient", in particular the category of "Transient: actionable, under eradication" and its relationship to quarantine pests that are present and under official control.

[18] (7) consider the feasibility of detailing the pest status categorization "transience" further, e.g. to describe more precisely whether a particular pest outbreak may lead to establishment or not

[19] (8) consider including text to explain how NPPOs may consider the pest status in the particular situation where a pest is present only in collections (e.g. botanical gardens)

[20] (9) consider including text to explain how NPPO may consider the pest status for plants that are grown or kept under protected conditions only, and the NPPO has determined cannot survive outdoors in the PRA area

[21] (10) consider providing recommendations as to the use and meaning of the terms "finding of a pest" and "pest is not known to occur", as often used in pest reports

[22] (11) consider adding guidance about time needed for updating pest records

[23] (12) consider adding guidance on factors to determine validity of pest records to those already given in the current standard

[24] (13) include and update terms adopted after adoption of ISPM 8:1998

[25] (14) review and update references in the Appendix

[26] (15) identify other relevant points to be updated

[27] (16) consider implementation of the standard by contracting parties and identify potential operational and technical implementation issues. Provide information and possible recommendations on these issues to the SC

**[28] Provision of resources**

[29] Funding for the meeting may be provided from sources other than the regular programme of the IPPC (FAO). As recommended by ICPM-2 (1999), whenever possible, those participating in standard setting activities voluntarily fund their travel and subsistence to attend meetings. Participants may request financial

assistance, with the understanding that resources are limited and the priority for financial assistance is given to developing country participants.

**[30] Collaborator**

[31] To be determined.

**[32] Steward**

[33] Please refer to the list of topics for IPPC standards appended to the SC report.

**[34] Expertise**

[35] Five to seven phytosanitary experts with collective expertise on phytosanitary systems, the development and implementation of ISPMs and surveillance, monitoring or eradication programs for regulated pests.

**[36] Participants**

[37] To be determined.

**[38] References**

[39] The IPPC, relevant ISPMs and other national, regional and international standards and agreements as may be applicable to the tasks, and discussion papers submitted in relation to this work. IRSS Report on activities carried out for ISPM 8:1998.

**[40] Discussion papers**

[41] Participants and interested parties are encouraged to submit discussion papers to the IPPC Secretariat ([ippc@fao.org](mailto:ippc@fao.org)) for consideration by the expert drafting group.