



Rome, Italy  
8-12 December 2014

*REPORT*

# Technical Panel for the Glossary December, 2014



Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

## CONTENTS

1.	Opening of the Meeting .....	4
1.1	Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat .....	4
1.2	Selection of the Chairperson and Rapporteur.....	4
1.3	Review and adoption of the agenda .....	4
1.4	Current specification: TP5 (TPG) (2013).....	4
2.	Administrative Matters .....	4
3.	Reports.....	4
3.1	Previous meetings of the TPG (February 2014).....	4
3.2	Extracts from other meeting reports of relevance to the TPG.....	4
3.3	Current work plan .....	5
4.	Review of Draft ISPMs Sent for Member Consultation in 2014 (1 July-30 November) .....	5
4.1	Draft 2014 Amendments to ISPM 5: <i>Glossary of Phytosanitary terms</i> (1994-001).....	5
4.1.1	Review of member comments.....	5
4.1.2	Terms and definitions in languages.....	7
4.1.3	Process for further development .....	7
4.2	<i>International movement of used vehicles, machinery and equipment</i> (2006-004).....	8
4.3	<i>International movement of seeds</i> (2009-003).....	8
4.4	PT for HTFA for <i>Bactrocera melanotus</i> and <i>B. xanthodes</i> on <i>Carica papaya</i> (2009-105) .....	9
4.5	PT Vapour heat treatment for <i>Bactrocera dorsalis</i> on <i>Carica papaya</i> var. Solo (2009-109).....	9
4.6	PT Cold treatment for <i>Ceratitis capitata</i> on <i>Citrus clementina</i> var. Clemenules (2010-102).....	9
4.7	PT Cold treatment for <i>Ceratitis capitata</i> on <i>Citrus sinensis</i> vars. Navel and Valencia (2010-103).....	9
4.8	PT Vapour heat treatment for <i>Ceratitis capitata</i> on <i>Mangifera indica</i> (2010-106) .....	10
4.9	PT Irradiation for <i>Ostrinia nubilalis</i> (2012-009) .....	10
4.10	DP on <i>Erwinia amylovora</i> (Burrill) (2004-009).....	10
4.11	DP on Genus <i>Anastrepha</i> (2004-015) .....	10
4.12	DP on <i>Ditylenchus dipsaci</i> and <i>Ditylenchus destructor</i> (2004-017).....	10
4.13	DP on Phytoplasmas (2004-018).....	11
5.	Consideration of New or Revised Terms/Definitions.....	11
5.1	Subjects on the TPG work programme .....	11
5.1.1	<i>accredit, authorize, certify</i> (2013-004).....	11
5.1.2	<i>contaminating pest, contamination</i> (2012-001) .....	12
5.1.3	<i>identity</i> (of a consignment) (2011-001), <i>integrity</i> (of a consignment), <i>phytosanitary security</i> (of a consignment) (2013-008) and section 6.1 of ISPM 12 .....	13
5.1.4	<i>kiln-drying</i> (2013-006) .....	13
5.1.5	<i>phytosanitary status</i> (2010-004).....	14
5.1.6	<i>trading partners</i> (2013-009).....	14
5.1.7	<i>endangered area</i> (2014-009).....	15
6.	Review of ISPMs for Consistency of Terms and Style .....	15
6.1	General recommendations on consistency .....	15

6.2	Consistency of adopted ISPM (standard by standard) .....	16
6.3	Consistency across standards (Process as approved by SC Nov 2013).....	16
6.4	Other issues linked to consistency .....	16
7.	Annotated Glossary: 2013/14 Amendments .....	16
7.1	Discussion on future maintenance of the Annotated Glossary.....	17
7.2	TPG guidance to be included in the Annotated Glossary?.....	17
8.	Explanation of Glossary Terms .....	18
9.	TPG Work Plan and Medium Term Plan .....	20
9.1	TPG work plan .....	20
9.2	Medium term plan .....	20
10.	Membership of the TPG .....	20
11.	Other Issues .....	20
11.1	New definitions for wood commodities .....	20
12.	Date and Venue of the Next Meeting .....	20
13.	Close .....	21

## LIST OF APPENDIXES

APPENDIX 1: Annotated Agenda .....	22
APPENDIX 2: Documents List.....	25
APPENDIX 3: Participants list .....	28
APPENDIX 4: Draft 2014 Amendments to ISPM 5 <i>Glossary of phytosanitary terms</i> (1994-001).....	30
APPENDIX 5: Draft 2015 Amendments to ISPM 5 <i>Glossary of phytosanitary terms</i> (1994-001).....	35
APPENDIX 6: General recommendations on consistency.....	41
APPENDIX 7: <i>Phytosanitary status</i> (2010-004) – Proposed changes to ISPM 12, section 5 .....	45
APPENDIX 8: Consistency changes across standards - <i>Trading partners</i> (2013-009) .....	47
APPENDIX 9: TPG Work plan 2015-2016 .....	53
APPENDIX 10: TPG Medium term plan.....	73

## 1. Opening of the Meeting

### 1.1 Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat

- [1] The IPPC Secretariat welcomed the members of the Technical Panel of the Glossary (TPG) to Rome wishing them a fruitful meeting.

### 1.2 Selection of the Chairperson and Rapporteur

- [2] The TPG selected Mr John HEDLEY (New Zealand) as Chairperson, and Ms Stephanie BLOEM (USA) as Rapporteur.

### 1.3 Review and adoption of the agenda

- [3] The TPG adopted the agenda (Appendix 1).

### 1.4 Current specification: TP5 (TPG) (2013)

- [4] The TPG Steward presented the current specification for the TPG (TP 5)<sup>1</sup> for information, summarizing the tasks and also recalled the TPG activities in relation to languages, which were revised at the TPG February 2014 meeting and noted by the SC in May<sup>2</sup>.

## 2. Administrative Matters

- [5] The Documents list (Appendix 2), the Participants list (Appendix 3) and the local information<sup>3</sup> were presented. Members were reminded to inform the Secretariat of any erroneous information.

## 3. Reports

### 3.1 Previous meetings of the TPG (February 2014)

- [6] There were no comments to the TPG February 2014 report<sup>4</sup>.

### 3.2 Extracts from other meeting reports of relevance to the TPG

- [7] The Secretariat presented extracts of relevance to the TPG from meetings held by the Secretariat since February; CPM-9 (2014), SC May and SC November 2014<sup>5</sup>. Additionally, it was mentioned that the reports from the Strategic Planning Group and the Bureau meetings in October 2014 had recently been posted. These meetings had discussed issues in relation to translation, which could be of interest to the TPG.
- [8] One member expressed concern about the fact that the SC May 2014 did not agree to delete the term *pre-clearance* because the TPG had agreed that the term was incorrect. The Secretariat noted that with the new system of adding an asterisk in ISPM 5 *Glossary of phytosanitary terms* to the terms under revision, countries will be prompted to reconsider use of the term (see also discussion under 7).

---

<sup>1</sup> TP 5 (2013): <https://www.ippc.int/publications/specification-tp-5-technical-panel-glossary-2013>

<sup>2</sup> The procedure for TPG activities in relation to languages is included in the IPPC Procedure manual for standard setting, available at <https://www.ippc.int/publications/ippc-procedure-manual-standard-setting-2014>

<sup>3</sup> Local information document: <https://www.ippc.int/publications/local-information-meeting-participants-rome-italy>

<sup>4</sup> TPG February 2014 report is available at: <https://www.ippc.int/core-activities/standards-setting/expert-drafting-groups/technical-panels/technical-panel-glossary-phytosanitary-terms-ism-5>

<sup>5</sup> 20\_TPG\_2014\_Dec

### 3.3 Current work plan

- [9] The current work plan<sup>6</sup>, as decided by the TPG February 2013, was introduced. The work plan was updated during the meeting (see agenda item 9.1).

## 4. Review of Draft ISPMs Sent for Member Consultation in 2014 (1 July-30 November)

- [10] The TPG reviewed member comments on terms and on consistency, and reviewed the drafts for consistency in the use of terms. For the draft ISPM that included definitions, the TPG also reviewed the French and Spanish translations of the terms and definitions, and noted the translations suggested by TPG members for terms and definitions in Arabic, Chinese and Russian.
- [11] The detailed TPG recommendations on member comments and consistency will be compiled by the Secretariat and Steward after the meeting, transmitted to the relevant ISPM stewards and posted as a meeting document for the SC-7 meeting in May 2015. For diagnostic protocols and treatments, recommendations will be transmitted to the relevant TP steward. The tables of TPG recommendations are not attached to this report but will be posted on the TPG work area. This report only indicates general issues and the TPG recommendations regarding requests by members that new definitions be developed.
- [12] A different process was used for the Amendments to the Glossary (1994-001), detailed in 4.1.
- [13] The proposals on translation of draft terms and definitions will be transmitted by the Secretariat to translators for their consideration when translating the standards.

### 4.1 Draft 2014 Amendments to ISPM 5: *Glossary of Phytosanitary terms* (1994-001)

- [14] The TPG Steward introduced the draft 2014 Amendments to ISPM 5, the member comments, the French and Spanish translation of terms/definitions, and the proposed translations for the other languages<sup>7</sup>.

#### 4.1.1 Review of member comments

- [15] **Bark (as a commodity)** (2013-005). The TPG noted that several comments queried the need for this term because *bark* is already defined in its biological sense in ISPM 5. The TPG reiterated that two distinct definitions were needed to have a term that covers the definition of bark as a commodity (i.e. to be traded) and one that covers its botanical sense (which, in the phytosanitary context, is something that needs to be removed).
- [16] It was noted that the definition of *bark (as a commodity)* would contain *bark* in bold which indicates a cross reference to the term defined in its biological sense. The TPG did not feel it would be useful to add “(in its biological sense)” after *bark* in the definition.
- [17] The TPG did not modify the proposed revision.
- [18] **Additional declaration** (2010-006). The TPG discussed a member comment proposing to delete “regulated pests or regulated articles” from the definition. It was recognized that the wording could seem redundant since a phytosanitary certificate should only deal with regulated pests or regulated articles. However, it was recalled that the term had been proposed for revision with the purpose of including a reference to soil. The TPG therefore agreed that it was appropriate to retain the reference to regulated pests or regulated articles. The TPG did not modify the proposed revision.
- [19] **Seeds and grain** (2013-018). The TPG discussed a member comment suggesting to delete “in the botanical sense” from the proposed revised definition of these two terms but did not agree with this

---

<sup>6</sup> 04\_TPG\_2014\_Dec

<sup>7</sup> 1994-001\_Amendments; 1994-001\_Amendments\_Es; 1994-001\_Amendments\_Fr; 16\_TPG\_2014\_Dec

proposal because the panel found that the wording was necessary for the correct interpretation of the terms.

- [20] Some comments suggested that also *seeds* be defined in its biological sense, because of the term's similarities to bark. The TPG did not agree with this because *seeds* do not need a specific IPPC definition that is different from the normal understanding of the term. This is contrary to *bark* and the use of this term in ISPM 15 *Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade* and the draft ISPM on the *International movement of wood* (2006-029) (see also discussion on *bark*).
- [21] The TPG noted the concerns about the meaning of "in the botanical sense" and agreed to add a note in the Annotated Glossary on this.
- [22] The TPG agreed to a member comment proposal to delete "processing or consumption" in the definition of *seeds* because it was acknowledged that for example treatment might be misunderstood as a type of processing.
- [23] The TPG discussed a member comment suggesting that other intended uses of *seeds* be included in the definition, but did not agree to this. The TPG recognized that there may be several purposes for importing *seeds* (e.g. testing) but that the ultimate intended use will be planting.
- [24] The TPG modified the revised definition of *seeds* accordingly.
- [25] **Mark.** The TPG discussed the difference between "stamp, sign and symbol" based on a member comment suggesting changing the proposed definition from "stamp or brand" to "sign, symbol or brand". The TPG noted that (i) "stamping" and "branding indicate processes that are applied to the wood whereas "sign" does not, and; (ii) the ISPM 15 mark contains a "symbol" (the words mark and symbol are not synonymous). Therefore, "stamp or brand" was retained and the proposed revision not changed.
- [26] The TPG also discussed the proposal to change "phytosanitary procedure" to "phytosanitary measure", but *phytosanitary procedures* was preferred to *phytosanitary measures* (as procedures are applied, and measures complied with).
- [27] **Visual examination.** The TPG discussed whether visual examination, testing and inspection should be reviewed in combination, as suggested by a member comment. The TPG did not find that the three terms create immediate confusion but noted the concern also because of the terms' high importance in import regulations. The TPG felt, however, that the issue may arise from the definition of *test*, which may require revision and invited the SC to add the term to the *List of topics for IPPC standards*. Based on this discussion, the TPG found that "without testing" should be deleted to avoid confusion, because it does not add clarification, and the definition should focus on what *visual examination* is, not what is not.
- [28] The TPG modified the revised definition of *visual examination* accordingly.
- [29] **Wood (as a commodity class).** The TPG discussed a member comment suggesting to retain *processed wood material*. The TPG did not agree to this because the definition relates to wood as a commodity class and processed wood material presents a lower pest risk than wood commodities. Processed wood material is defined separately and is not capable of carrying quarantine pests according to ISPM 32 *Categorization of commodities according to their pest risk*. Wood packaging material is subject to the requirements of ISPM 15.
- [30] A comment suggested mentioning bamboo products as an exclusion and while the TPG felt that it would normally be understood that bamboo products were excluded, it concluded that it was better to include this explicitly in the definition if it could avoid confusion. The inclusion would also be in line with the draft ISPM on the *International movement of wood* (2006-029).

- [31] The TPG agreed with a member proposal to use *wood residue* instead of *wood waste* to be consistent with the draft ISPM on the *International movement of wood* (2006-029) and because this is the normal term used when commodities such as off-cuts are traded.
- [32] The TPG modified the revised definition of *wood (as a commodity class)* accordingly.

#### 4.1.2 Terms and definitions in languages

- [33] In reviewing the translations, the TPG noted that some Glossary terms had not been correctly translated and highlighted that ISPM 5 in languages should always be used, especially when translating Glossary terms. This was for instance the case for the translation of terms like planting and processing. It was noted that several definitions in ISPM 5 in Spanish used incorrect terms (for example, for processing, the translation *elaboración* was used, whereas *procesamiento* is the correct translation). The TPG proposed that ink amendments be applied to correct these translation issues.
- [34] In Russian, it was noted that *seeds* cannot be planted but only sown and that the translation reflected this.
- [35] In Arabic, it was noted that *brand* is difficult to translate because it is the same as stamp. The TPG discussed whether it could be left out in the translation and found that it was better not to invent a new Arabic word but only use the word for stamp, as the two words overall have the same meaning.
- [36] Lastly, the TPG urged the Secretariat to publish the multilingual glossary (last published in 2010), because it was a very useful tool but now out of date. The Secretariat would enquire about this.

#### 4.1.3 Process for further development

- [37] The Secretariat recalled that the TPG responses to member comments and modified draft Amendments will be submitted to the SC-7 (the draft Amendments are in Appendix 4 to this report and the responses will be made available on the TPG restricted work area). As had been agreed previously, the explanations accompanying definitions in the draft Amendments would be adjusted to reflect the changes and submitted to the SCCP in order to inform IPPC members adequately of the content of the definitions and the changes made.
- [38] The Secretariat noted that, after review by the SC-7 in May 2015, the amendments would be submitted to the SCCP but that only the terms that had received member comments would be open for commenting.
- [39] At the end of the SCCP (30 September 2015), member comments will be sent to the TPG Steward, who will contact TPG members if any substantive issues need to be discussed. Such consultation is expected to happen in the first part of October 2015. The steward's response and possible redraft will then go to SC November 2015 for approval for adoption and then be sent for translation for CPM. The translation of the Amendments should be ready to be reviewed by the TPG members in early January (15 January is official posting date for draft ISPMs for CPM). The Secretariat will send emails to individual members requesting them to review translations of terms and definitions to verify that no elements are missing and that there are no mistakes in translation of glossary terms.
- [40] The TPG:
- (1) *noted* that responses to comments and modified draft 2014 *Amendments to the Glossary (1994-001)* (Appendix 4) would be transmitted to the SC-7.
  - (2) *invited* the SC to add *test* to the List of topics for IPPC standards as a subject for the TPG.
  - (3) *invited* the SC to agree that the Spanish version of ISPM 5 be reviewed to correct translation issues (ink amendments).
  - (4) *agreed* to add a note on “in the botanical sense” to the Annotated Glossary.
  - (5) *asked* the Secretariat to enquire about publishing an updated version of the multilingual glossary.



- (6) *asked* the Secretariat to contact FAO Translation-services to highlight the importance of using ISPM 5 in languages when translating ISPMs.
- (7) *noted* that the Secretariat will transmit the TPG proposals regarding language versions of terms and definitions to the translators.

#### **4.2 International movement of used vehicles, machinery and equipment (2006-004)**

- [41] The Secretariat introduced the draft ISPM and the member comments on consistency in use of terms/definitions<sup>8</sup>.
- [42] The TPG discussed the use of *phytosanitary procedures* and *phytosanitary measures* in the draft and noted that for the draft to be consistent with adopted ISPMs, it should be clarified if it represents harmonized guidance on phytosanitary measures; it was not clear in the draft whether the measures were applied by the importing or the exporting country. Also the use of the terms *procedure* (which are applied) and *measures* (which are complied with) should be reviewed based on the SC May 2015 discussions on the meaning of *phytosanitary measure*. The TPG found that the term *procedures* had been used consistently in the draft (e.g. in relation to verification procedure).
- [43] The TPG supported comments suggesting that it was incorrect to use *importing country* and *exporting country* because these terms would restrict the standard. The TPG found that *country of destination* and *country of origin* were more inclusive for the purposes of this standard. Additionally, the use of *country of origin* would be coherent with the current definition of the term.
- [44] The TPG:
- (8) *noted* that recommendations on member comments and consistency would be transmitted to the steward and SC-7 for their consideration.

#### **4.3 International movement of seeds (2009-003)**

- [45] The Secretariat introduced the draft ISPM, the member comments on consistency in use of terms/definitions, the French and Spanish revision to the translation of terms/definitions and the proposed translations in Arabic, Chinese and Russian for the terms/ definition<sup>9</sup>.
- [46] The TPG discussed the use of the term *intended use*. Several comments noted that ISPM 32 clearly states that the intended use of seeds is for planting. For this reason, in the case where the seeds are not planted the term *intended use* should not be used. However, it was pointed out that seeds that are tested and subsequently destroyed are still a subset of seeds intended for planting (they are a sample of the consignment of seeds, which are intended for planting). It was also noted that any plant may be studied, but that the study does not change the intended use of the plant. Nevertheless, to avoid confusion, the TPG recommended using “purpose of import” instead of *intended use* so there would not be inconsistencies with the Glossary term.
- [47] Based on member comments related to the definition of seeds, and the discussion under 4.1.1, the TPG agreed to propose that the draft revision of the definition *seeds* (from the draft Amendments to the Glossary 2014) be added for information in this draft ISPM because it is vital that the correct definition be referred to when the draft ISPM is commented upon during SCCP. The actual revised definition would be open for commenting during SCCP only in the draft Amendments to the Glossary, not in the draft ISPM on the *International movement of seeds*.
- [48] Regarding the use of scientific (Latin) names, the TPG reiterated the need for scientific names and their describing authorities to be included at first mention (see also the TPG February 2014 report).
- [49] The TPG:

---

<sup>8</sup> 2006-004\_UsedEquip

<sup>9</sup> 2009-003\_Seed; 19\_TPG\_2014\_Dec; 17\_TPG\_2014\_Dec



- (9) *noted* that recommendations on member comments and consistency would be transmitted to the steward and SC-7 for their consideration.
- (10) *asked* that the SC-7 consider incorporating the draft revision of the definition *seeds* from the Amendments to the Glossary 2014 to the draft ISPM on the *International movement of seeds* (2009-003) for information only.
- (11) *noted* that the Secretariat will transmit the proposals regarding language versions of the term and definition to the translators.

#### **4.4 PT for HTFA for *Bactrocera melanotus* and *B. xanthodes* on *Carica papaya* (2009-105)**

[50] The Secretariat introduced the draft phytosanitary treatment and the member comments on consistency in use of terms/definitions<sup>10</sup>.

[51] For all the treatments that were reviewed, the TPG supported that common names be deleted as suggested by member comments.

[52] The TPG:

- (12) *noted* that recommendations on member comments and consistency would be transmitted to the TPPT for their consideration.

#### **4.5 PT Vapour heat treatment for *Bactrocera dorsalis* on *Carica papaya* var. Solo (2009-109)**

[53] The Secretariat introduced the draft phytosanitary treatment and the member comments on consistency in use of terms/definitions<sup>11</sup>.

[54] The TPG:

- (13) *noted* that recommendations on member comments and consistency would be transmitted to the TPPT for their consideration.

#### **4.6 PT Cold treatment for *Ceratitidis capitata* on *Citrus clementina* var. Clemenules (2010-102)**

[55] The Secretariat introduced the draft phytosanitary treatment and the member comments on consistency in use of terms/definitions<sup>12</sup>.

[56] The TPG:

- (14) *noted* that recommendations on member comments and consistency would be transmitted to the TPPT for their consideration.

#### **4.7 PT Cold treatment for *Ceratitidis capitata* on *Citrus sinensis* vars. Navel and Valencia (2010-103)**

[57] The Secretariat introduced the draft phytosanitary treatment and the member comments on consistency in use of terms/definitions<sup>13</sup>.

[58] The TPG:

---

<sup>10</sup> 2009-105\_HTFA; 23\_TPG\_2014\_Dec

<sup>11</sup> 2009-109\_VHT\_*B.dorsalis*; 23\_TPG\_2014\_Dec

<sup>12</sup> 2010-102\_CT\_*C.clement*; 23\_TPG\_2014\_Dec

<sup>13</sup> 2010-103\_CT\_NavelValencia; 23\_TPG\_2014\_Dec

(15) *noted* that recommendations on member comments and consistency would be transmitted to the TPPT for their consideration.

#### **4.8 PT Vapour heat treatment for *Ceratitis capitata* on *Mangifera indica* (2010-106)**

[59] The Secretariat introduced the draft phytosanitary treatment and the member comments on consistency in use of terms/definitions<sup>14</sup>.

[60] The TPG:

(16) *noted* that recommendations on member comments and consistency would be transmitted to the TPPT for their consideration.

#### **4.9 PT Irradiation for *Ostrinia nubilalis* (2012-009)**

[61] The Secretariat introduced the draft phytosanitary treatment and the member comments on consistency in use of terms/definitions<sup>15</sup>.

[62] The TPG:

(17) *noted* that recommendations on member comments and consistency would be transmitted to the TPPT for their consideration.

#### **4.10 DP on *Erwinia amylovora* (Burrill) (2004-009)**

[63] The Secretariat introduced the draft diagnostic protocol and the member comments on consistency in use of terms/definitions<sup>16</sup>.

[64] For all the DPs reviewed in this meeting, the TPG expressed concern that the recommendation to always include the describing authority at first mention in the draft diagnostic protocols had not been followed consistently.

[65] The TPG also noted that the footnotes referring to commercial brands, normally included for every brand name (as per SC November 2008 decision), had not been included. The Secretariat explained that the TPDP had proposed, at their July 2014 meeting, to have a general disclaimer in the text instead of several footnotes largely repeating the same text. The TPG noted that the protocol may need to be adjusted depending on whether the SC May 2015 agrees with this approach.

[66] The TPG:

(18) *noted* that recommendations on member comments and consistency would be transmitted to the TPDP for their consideration.

#### **4.11 DP on Genus *Anastrepha* (2004-015)**

[67] The Secretariat introduced the draft diagnostic protocol and the member comments on consistency in use of terms/definitions<sup>17</sup>.

[68] The TPG:

(19) *noted* that recommendations on member comments and consistency would be transmitted to the TPDP for their consideration.

#### **4.12 DP on *Ditylenchus dipsaci* and *Ditylenchus destructor* (2004-017)**

[69] The Secretariat introduced the draft diagnostic protocol and the member comments on consistency in use of terms/definitions<sup>18</sup>.

---

<sup>14</sup> 2010-106\_VHT\_C.capitata; 23\_TPG\_2014\_Dec

<sup>15</sup> 2012-009\_Irradiation\_Ostrinia; 23\_TPG\_2014\_Dec

<sup>16</sup> 2004-009\_Erwinia; 25\_TPG\_2014\_Dec

<sup>17</sup> 2004-015\_Anastrepha; 26\_TPG\_2014\_Dec

[70] The TPG:

(20) *noted* that recommendations on member comments and consistency would be transmitted to the TPDP for their consideration.

#### 4.13 DP on Phytoplasmas (2004-018)

[71] The Secretariat introduced the draft diagnostic protocol and the member comments on consistency in use of terms/definitions<sup>19</sup>.

[72] The TPG:

(21) *noted* that recommendations on member comments and consistency would be transmitted to the TPDP for their consideration.

### 5. Consideration of New or Revised Terms/Definitions

#### 5.1 Subjects on the TPG work programme

[73] The TPG discussed the working documents prepared by its members on individual terms on the *List of topics for IPPC standards*. Proposals for new or revised terms and definitions, as well as justifications, were included in the draft 2015 *Amendments to the Glossary* (Appendix 5). The draft 2015 *Amendments to the Glossary* will be submitted to the SC in May 2015 for approval for member consultation in 2015. If sent for member consultation, the TPG will review member comments at its 2015 meeting.

##### 5.1.1 *accredit, authorize, certify* (2013-004)

[74] The TPG Steward introduced the paper<sup>20</sup>. The need for a review had first been presented to the TPG in 2012, but deferred to the TPG 2013 meeting where a proposal for SC consideration was made<sup>21</sup>. The SC May 2013 added the terms to the *List of topics for IPPC standards*. The terms were discussed at the TPG February 2014 meeting, and the TPG concluded that rather than defining the terms for the Glossary, text for inclusion in the *General recommendations on consistency* (for presentation to the SC in May 2015) would be prepared. In this same occasion, the TPG had also asked that a task be added to the draft specification on *Authorization of entities other than national plant protection organizations to perform phytosanitary actions* (2014-002), and the Secretariat informed the TPG that the SC May 2014 decided that the steward should keep this in mind when revising the draft specification.

[75] The TPG Steward noted that the differences between the terms are slight and that they are often used without clear distinction.

[76] One member queried whether *authorized* would be used in the future to indicate growers who obtain approval to export to specific countries (where *approved* would normally be used). The TPG agreed that it would be the case.

[77] The TPG noted that it may consistency changes across standards may be needed.

[78] The TPG added a note in the *General recommendations on consistency* (Appendix 6) that the terms *accredit, authorize and certify* be used in preference to other terms when the concept that is to be covered corresponds to one of the those of the terms.

---

<sup>18</sup> 2004-017\_*Ditylenchus*; 28\_TPG\_2014\_Dec

<sup>19</sup> 2004-018\_Phytoplasmas; 29\_TPG\_2014\_Dec

<sup>20</sup> 14\_TPG\_2014\_Dec

<sup>21</sup> TPG\_2012\_Oct\_27; TPG\_2013\_Feb\_10

### 5.1.2 *contaminating pest, contamination* (2012-001)

- [79] The TPG lead for these terms introduced the paper<sup>22</sup> noting that *contaminating pest* was added to the *List of topics for IPPC standards* by the Standards Committee (SC) in April 2012 based on a TPG proposal.
- [80] She recalled that the TPG in February 2013 proposed *contaminating pest* be deleted from the Glossary, but member comments did not support this, because they considered the term useful. Some member comments suggested reviewing the definition by making it fit with the meaning of *hitchhiker pest*.
- [81] The TPG in February 2014 considered that: (i) the term *contaminating pest* is used in practice, although not commonly in ISPMs; (ii) both *contaminating pest* and *contamination* are valid terms, and; (iii) *contaminating pest* is easier to use than *contamination* in some contexts. However, the TPG believed there is still a need to avoid duplication between the definitions. In addition, other issues have been raised in relation to *contamination*. Thus, the TPG suggested that *contaminating pest* be withdrawn from the draft *Amendments to the Glossary* (2013), for reconsideration at the next TPG meeting together with *contamination*. The SC May 2014 agreed with this approach, noting that the TPG should also take account of member comments made at the 2013 member consultation on *contaminating pest*.
- [82] A TPG member lastly noted that while adopted ISPMs rarely use the term *contaminating pest* (compared to more frequent uses of *contamination*), some draft ISPMs use the term frequently and some make use of the term *contaminant*, which is not defined.
- [83] The TPG discussed the proposed revisions of the definitions of *contaminating pest* and *contamination*, and whether to define *contaminant*. The TPG agreed that an additional definition for *contaminant* would not be needed because no situation could be imagined where *contamination* or *contaminating pest* could not be used, but agreed that the definitions of *contaminating pest* and *contamination* should be modified to be aligned with each other and to correctly cover the concept of “hitchhiker pest”.
- [84] Explanations are given in the draft 2015 *Amendments to the Glossary* (Appendix 5). In addition the following points were discussed:
- [85] Whether to include a qualifier “(of a commodity)” to *contamination*. The TPG proposed to keep the term without the qualifier, because this would allow for it to be used in a broader sense. Should there be a need for a different meaning of “contamination” (e.g. in the draft ISPM on sea containers where e.g. invasive alien species, snails, slugs or snakes may need to be covered), the meaning could be defined or specified in that specific standard.
- [86] The TPG agreed on revised definitions for both *contamination* and *contaminating pest*. During the discussion, it became clear that revision could not be achieved without a certain amount of duplication between the definitions. The TPG acknowledged this but still thought that both terms and definitions are useful.
- [87] The TPG also agreed to slightly modify the *General recommendations on consistency* (Appendix 6) for *contamination* to also include *contaminating pest*, and to delete mention of commodities because the terms are not hereto restricted.
- [88] The TPG:
- (22) proposed the revision of *contaminating pest* and *contamination* in the draft 2015 *Amendments to the Glossary* (1994-001) (Appendix 5) to be presented to SC May 2015.

---

<sup>22</sup> 15\_TPG\_2014\_Dec

### **5.1.3 *identity* (of a consignment) (2011-001), *integrity* (of a consignment), *phytosanitary security* (of a consignment) (2013-008) and section 6.1 of ISPM 12**

- [89] The TPG lead for these terms introduced the papers relating to the revised definition of *identity* (of a consignment) and consequential changes to *integrity* (of a consignment) and *phytosanitary security* (of a consignment), as well as proposed modifications to section 6.1 of ISPM 12 *Phytopsanitary certificates*<sup>23</sup>. He recalled that a proposal for the three terms had been presented to SC May 2014 together with TPG observations on self-contradictory wording in ISPM 12. The SC agreed and withdrew the terms from the draft Amendments to the Glossary (2014) for the TPG to review them together with section 6.1 in ISPM 12 as a consistency review.
- [90] The TPG discussed the proposal for consistency changes to ISPM 12.
- [91] The TPG lead noted some editorial consequential changes were introduced in section 4 to ensure that the reader would be directed to section 6 and 6.1, instead of repeating text or explaining what is detailed later on. The TPG noted that the whole section 4 could be reduced to only refer to sections 6 and 6.1. Likewise, in section 6 a change was proposed as the paragraph was in contradiction with section 6.1.
- [92] The TPG agreed that to avoid using *identity* and to avoid internal inconsistencies extensive amendments were needed to section 6.1. The TPG also discussed restructuring the subsections of 6 so that it would be clearer that there are different re-export situations (phytosanitary certificate for re-export; phytosanitary certificate for export). The original text was found to be self-contradictory because it both states that a phytosanitary certificate for re-export cannot be used if the 'identity' is changed, and allows a phytosanitary certificate for re-export be issued subject to inspection. Another reason for the proposed revision was that re-packaging should not be mentioned as a restriction, because what is relevant is whether or not the phytosanitary security of the consignment has been compromised. The current wording does not cover the situation where there is no infestation or contamination and nothing is added to the consignment at repacking.
- [93] The TPG felt that the amendments proposed did not change the intended and agreed meaning of the sections. However, the TPG found that the proposed changes and rationale should be explained more in detail, and agreed that the TPG lead should prepare a new draft of the revision to ISPM 12 with additional explanations. The TPG will review and discuss the proposal in an e-forum (scheduled for 15/1-15/2/2015). Upon agreement by the TPG, the terms and revised definitions may be incorporated into the draft 2015 *Amendments to the Glossary* (1994-001). The revision to ISPM 12 will be presented to the SC May 2015 in a separate paper. The revised definitions and the consequential revision to ISPM 12 shall be presented together.
- [94] The TPG:
- (23) *deferred* decision on inclusion into the draft 2015 *Amendments to the Glossary* (1994-001) of *identity* (of a consignment) (2011-001), *integrity* (of a consignment), *phytosanitary security* (of a consignment) (2013-008) and the consequential changes to section 6.1 of ISPM 12 to be taken after e-forum discussions.

### **5.1.4 *kiln-drying* (2013-006)**

- [95] The Secretariat introduced the paper<sup>24</sup>. She noted that the SC May 2014 had received the TPG February 2014 proposal, and had withdrawn the term from the draft Amendments (2014) because of concerns about the definition stating that kiln-drying could be done with or without heat. The SC agreed that kiln-drying in the phytosanitary context always involves heat. Additionally, the SC found that the proposal was contradictory to ISPM 15 and the draft ISPM on the *International movement of wood* (2006-029). Other members supported that the term be deleted from the Glossary.

---

<sup>23</sup> 08\_TPG\_2014\_Dec; 09\_TPG\_2014\_Dec

<sup>24</sup> 06\_TPG\_2014\_Dec

- [96] The TPG acknowledged that, if kiln-drying is used as a phytosanitary measure, heat treatment would be applied according to a certain treatment schedule. In the case of ISPM 15, kiln-drying qualifies as a phytosanitary measure only when it satisfies the requirement that the core temperature reaches a minimum temperature of 56° C for a minimum duration of 30 continuous minutes; it will be referred to as a heat treatment in that case (code HT), and not as kiln-drying.
- [97] It was noted that kiln-drying is also used in the wood industry to meet quality requirements (for example moisture content of the wood), and not only as a phytosanitary measure.
- [98] Noting that the draft ISPM on the *International movement of wood* (2006-029) clearly explains kiln-drying as a phytosanitary measure, that the previous proposed rewording had raised diverging comments on whether the term should be defined, and that kiln-drying is an industrial process without a specific IPPC meaning, the TPG agreed to suggest the term be deleted from the Glossary.
- [99] The TPG:
- (24) *proposed* the deletion of *kiln-drying* (2013-006) in the draft 2015 *Amendments to the Glossary* (1994-001) (Appendix 5) to be presented to SC May 2015.

### 5.1.5 *phytosanitary status* (2010-004)

- [100] The TPG lead for this term introduced the paper<sup>25</sup> recalling that the SC May 2014 had approved the proposed ink amendments to replace phytosanitary status in some ISPMs for noting by CPM-10 (2015), noting also that work continues on the need for, and content of, a definition. This was based on suggestions made by the TPG February 2013, specifically regarding cases where the term was used in relation to consignments in ISPM 12.
- [101] The TPG discussed the usage of the term in ISPM 12, section 5 “Place of origin”, agreeing it refers to the presence or absence of regulated pests (infestation or contamination) in the consignment and not to pest risk factors. The TPG agreed that it would be inappropriate to define a term for only two specific cases and noted that a possible definition would be very long (which is not the common format of definitions that are to be easily understood and used) and that the section in question could be improved for clarity. Therefore, the TPG found that rather than defining the term, the text of ISPM 12 should be amended and the TPG made a number of proposals to be considered when ISPM 12 is revised in order to avoid the use of *phytosanitary status* while also retaining the original meaning of the standard.
- [102] The TPG:
- (25) *invited* the SC to consider the proposed changes to ISPM 12 (Appendix 7).

### 5.1.6 *trading partners* (2013-009)

- [103] The Secretariat introduced the paper<sup>26</sup> recalling that the TPG proposals for consistency changes had been discussed by the SC May 2014 but returned to the TPG because some concerns had been raised.
- [104] The Standards Officer pointed out that normally *trading partners* would imply the importing and the exporting country, not only importing countries.
- [105] Regarding a suggestion to use *trading countries* instead, some TPG members agreed that including *trading* in the term would reflect the concept correctly, but others felt the proposal would not solve the issue of confusion about which countries are concerned (whether importing or exporting); it would not clarify that the trading was between two partners as it could mean all trading countries worldwide.
- [106] Some members expressed concern that *trading partner* should not be used. While they noted that the request had arisen from the TPG, some members did not agree that there were sufficient grounds for confusion. However, others recalled that some confusion had been expressed for instance in the CPM,

---

<sup>25</sup> 05\_TPG\_2014\_Dec

<sup>26</sup> 07\_TPG\_2014\_Dec



and some NPPOs may face problems because Industry believes the standards relate to them and find the NPPOs hinder trade. The TPG did not agree to use the term *trading countries* but added some changes to the proposal for consistency across ISPMs.

[107] The TPG did not amend the note on *trading partner* in the *General recommendation on consistency* (see 6.1 and Appendix 6).

[108] The TPG:

(26) *proposed* ink amendments to replace the term *trading partners* where used in ISPMs, which will be presented to the SC May 2015 (Appendix 8).

### 5.1.7 *endangered area* (2014-009)

[109] The TPG lead for this term introduced the paper<sup>27</sup>. It was recalled that the term had originally been added to the *List of topics for IPPC standards* by SC April 2012 (with the topic number 2012-002) based on a TPG November 2011 proposal. In TPG October 2012 recommended the term be deleted from the draft Amendments to the Glossary (2012). SC May 2013 agreed and removed the term from the List of topics. However, based on a survey undertaken by the Implementation Review and Support System (IRSS), published in January 2014, there was evidence that many countries misinterpret the term. As a consequence the SC May 2014 reinstated the term (2014-009) to the TPG work programme.

[110] Explanations are given in the draft 2015 *Amendments to the Glossary* (Appendix 5). In addition the following points were discussed:

[111] Whether to use *will*, *would* or *likely to (result in economically loss)*. The TPG found that *will* was appropriate, and in line with ISPM 11 *Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests*.

[112] *Ecological factors* were changed to *abiotic and biotic conditions*, to avoid misunderstanding of the term “ecological”, and using terms of ISPM 11. The TPG discussed whether cultural practices, which are also mentioned in ISPM 11 as a factor to be considered in relation to establishment, should be added. The TPG concluded that abiotic and biotic conditions were sufficient for the purpose of the definition.

[113] The TPG:

(27) *proposed* the revision of *endangered area* (2014-009) in the draft 2015 *Amendments to the Glossary* (1994-001) (Appendix 5) to be presented to SC May 2015.

## 6. Review of ISPMs for Consistency of Terms and Style

### 6.1 General recommendations on consistency

[114] The Secretariat recalled that the SC May 2014 had approved the *General recommendations on consistency* as proposed by TPG February 2014. The SC had also taken two decisions inviting the use of these recommendations by expert drafting groups<sup>28</sup>. The guidance on *General recommendations on consistency* were included in the 2014 IPPC Standard Setting Procedure Manual and the full list of terms were included in the IPPC Style Guide.

[115] The TPG modified the *General recommendations on consistency* by adding notes on *accredit*, *authorize and certify* (see agenda item 5.1.1) and by slightly modifying the note on *contamination* which now also covers the term *contaminating pest* (see agenda item 5.1.2). Additionally, the TPG modified several notes on terms to help increase clarity and comprehension.

[116] The TPG:

(28) *invited* the SC to note the modified *General recommendations on consistency* (Appendix 6).

---

<sup>27</sup> 11\_TPG\_2014\_Dec

<sup>28</sup> 21\_TPG\_2014\_Dec



(29) *asked* the Secretariat to include the modified *General recommendations on consistency* (Appendix 6) to the IPPC Style guide.

## 6.2 Consistency of adopted ISPM (standard by standard)

[117] The Secretariat introduced a list of ISPMs that have undergone consistency review<sup>29</sup>.

[118] The TPG thought the list was very useful and noted that it should be updated every time a consistency review is noted by CPM. The Secretariat noted that the list would be posted on the TPG work area on the IPP for easy reference.

## 6.3 Consistency across standards (Process as approved by SC Nov 2013)

[119] The Secretariat provided a brief update on the terms currently being reviewed for consistency across standards: *phytosanitary status* (2010-004), *trading partners* (2013-009) and various terms to which “*as a commodity class*” are being added (see the TPG work plan in Appendix 9 for details).

## 6.4 Other issues linked to consistency

[120] The TPG member presented a paper on the review of the Glossary terms for inconsistency in the use of the qualifier “commodity class”<sup>30</sup>. He recalled that TPG February 2014 had started discussing this issue when reviewing *grain* (2013-018) and *wood* (2013-011). Ink amendments to ISPM 5 on seven terms were proposed, and approved by SC May 2014 for noting by CPM-10 (2015).

[121] He pointed out some questions that arose from the analysis, such as whether a commodity should always belong to a commodity class (in which case it was not clear which commodity class *bark* would be belong to; or which other commodities belong to the commodity class *grain*); and whether there are “commodity subclasses” (*bulbs and tubers* is a commodity class, but also belong to the commodity class of *plants for planting*).

[122] Several members felt that this discussion was outside of the remit of the TPG, and that the issue would need to be addressed when creating the ePhyto system as a higher level of harmonization would be needed. Additionally, according to the definition of *commodity class* the actual content of these would differ between countries. Other members felt that it would be appropriate to align the TPG work with that of the ePhyto steering group by looking at the commodity classes to be able to feed into the ePhyto system development.

[123] The TPG generally agreed that there is a problem in relation to which terms are considered commodity classes and the understanding of the different levels of commodity classes. The TPG, however, did not feel comfortable proposing to take on the task of reviewing the full system of commodity classes.

[124] The TPG:

(30) *asked* that the Secretariat consider facilitating contact between the ePhyto steering group and the TPG to ensure that there is consistency between the ISPM 5 terms and those used for the ePhyto hub, because there seem to be several inconsistencies.

## 7. Annotated Glossary: 2013/14 Amendments

[125] The TPG Chairperson introduced the Annotated Glossary<sup>31</sup> which had been revised to take account of the TPG February 2014, CPM-9 and SC May 2014 outcomes. He recalled that the next version should be finalized in 2016.

[126] The TPG discussed specific questions and comments provided in advance of the meeting.

---

<sup>29</sup> 10\_TPG\_2014\_Dec

<sup>30</sup> 12\_TPG\_2014\_Dec

<sup>31</sup> 18\_TPG\_2014\_Dec

- [127] The TPG discussed the explanations given in the Annotated Glossary in reference to terms that are under revision or discussion. It was recalled that a decision had been made regarding indicating these in ISPM 5 by an asterisk and by information in the publication history. In this connection, the TPG Steward expressed concern about indicating in ISPM 5 all terms that are on the *List of topics for IPPC standards*; he felt that only the terms which were far in the process of consultation (i.e. sure to be revised or deleted) should be listed.
- [128] Other members felt that a full overview of all terms that are on the TPG work programme should be indicated because there are terms, such as pre-clearance, which will be revised or deleted but are currently pending; they felt it is helpful to know this when using ISPM 5.
- [129] The TPG agreed that when the SC adds or removes any terms, or notes that terms will be subject to consequential changes, asterisks should be added, just as when amendments are adopted by CPM, asterisks are taken off.
- [130] The TPG also agreed that the same should be the case for the Annotated Glossary, but that an explanatory note on the meaning of the asterisk should indicate that it relates only to the specific year of publishing of the Annotated Glossary (as the work programme will change much more often and the Annotated Glossary therefore not represent any current situation). In spite of this incoherence between the Annotated Glossary and ISPM 5, the TPG found it would be very useful to have the asterisks in the Annotated Glossary.
- [131] In this connection, the TPG discussed whether the Annotated Glossary should be updated annually instead of every three years; this would entail a lot of work from the TPG and the SC in approving it. The TPG agreed to keep the current process of publishing it every three years.
- [132] The TPG discussed whether the Annotated Glossary should supply explanations on what sort of revision was foreseen for a term (ink amendment, revision, deletion, or other). The Secretariat recalled that the TPG work plan would contain all terms, i.e. not only those officially subjects on the *List of topics for IPPC standards* but also those which are under revision due to consequential changes or to introduce ink amendments. The TPG agreed that the work plan with all terms listed in this way would provide sufficient information to the TPG regarding the terms which are under revision, hence additional explanations in the Annotated Glossary were not considered necessary.
- [133] The TPG agreed that the scope, purpose and outline sections of ISPM 5 would be included in the Annotated Glossary.

### **7.1 Discussion on future maintenance of the Annotated Glossary.**

- [134] Mr Ian SMITH, who had been lead for the Annotated Glossary for years, had informed the TPG that he would no longer be available to attend TPG meetings or update the Annotated Glossary. Ms Beatriz MELCHO offered to become the new lead, and the TPG agreed with this. The Secretariat was asked to contact Mr Ian SMITH to see if he is available to mentor on this task the coming year.
- [135] The TPG:
- (31) *invited the SC to thank* Mr Ian SMITH for his tremendous contribution to the TPG from the beginning until the end of 2014.
  - (32) *thanked* Ms Beatriz MELCHO for agreeing to become lead for the Annotated Glossary.

### **7.2 TPG guidance to be included in the Annotated Glossary?**

- [136] The TPG Steward raised the issue of increasing visibility and consequently use of the *General recommendations on consistency*. He noted that many expert drafting groups still submit drafts that seem not to have taken into consideration the recommendations and he wondered if this was due to the experts not being appropriately aware of them. One solution to this problem could be to include them into the Annotated Glossary. The TPG discussed this, noting that the Annotated Glossary is only published every three years whereas the *General recommendations on consistency* is normally updated

every year, and for this reason is added to the Procedure manual for standard setting (in relation to the procedure) and to the Style guide (as regards the full list of terms).

[137] Some TPG members found that it was confusing to have TPG guidance split between a number of different documents (Annotated Glossary, Style guide, Procedure manual for standard setting, General recommendations on consistency, TPG Workplan, etc.) and asked the Secretariat to create a list of all the relevant guidance material related to terminology and post this publicly on the IPP with a brief indication on when to use the specific material. This list would help expert drafting groups, TPG included, when developing standards.

## 8. Explanation of Glossary Terms

[138] This standing agenda item allows for TPG members to enquire and discuss specific Glossary terms.

[139] The following terms were discussed.

[140] **Detection survey.** A member suggested changing “if pests are” to “a pest is”; because normally a detection survey is developed for a specific pest and the current definition may therefore be misinterpreted. Another member noted that *delimiting survey* is for “a pest” while *detection survey* could be for more pests.

[141] **Monitoring survey.** A member noted that the term seems self-contradictory because monitoring is normally ongoing whereas survey is conducted over a defined period of time. However, another member noted that an area may be monitored and that surveys for a specific period of time may be conducted as part of the ongoing monitoring.

[142] TPG suggested that when ISPM 6 *Guidelines for surveillance* is revised, these two terms (detection survey and monitoring survey) may also be discussed and proposals for their revisions developed.

[143] **Phytosanitary procedure.** A member suggested deleting “in connection with regulated pests” because phytosanitary measures only relate to regulated pests and the wording is therefore redundant. Other members found that the additional clarification was useful.

[144] **Practically free.** A member suggested adding a qualifier “of a consignment, field or place of production” to the term, and consequently remove this text from the definition, which would also align with the term *free from (of a consignment, field or place of production)*. The TPG agreed with the proposal, and considered it an ink amendment.

[145] **Quarantine.** A member suggested deleting “observation and research” from the definition because these purposes would not normally be understood to be quarantine. Normally, quarantine is confinement with the purpose of understanding if the consignment is safe. Some TPG members found that the definition adequately reflects current practices, others agreed that it would benefit from revision. It was suggested that “confinement facility” (which would include observation and research) should be defined so that there would be two distinct terms for the different purposes.

[146] **Regulated article.** A member queried if it would be possible to delete *storage place* from the definition because in many languages “article” is a moveable object, which is not the case for *storage place*. Other members noted that the term is defined in the Convention and should therefore not be revised. Additionally, linguistically speaking, storage places may not fall under “articles”, but they are “capable of harbouring or spreading pests, deemed to require phytosanitary measures” as per the definition of regulated articles

[147] A member suggested defining “release (from a quarantine station)” but the other members did not feel this was needed because *release (of a consignment)* would cover release from a quarantine station, as it is regulated articles that are released from a quarantine station.

[148] **Standard.** A member noted that the definition includes mention of consensus but the current standard setting procedure provides for voting. It was explained that the meaning of consensus will be

discussed in the SC-7 group on the review of the standard setting procedure, after which it will be clear whether consensus is still correctly used in the definition. Another member also recalled that consensus is what is strived for, and that all exceptions to agreed definitions cannot be mentioned in the definition (because it would no longer be a Glossary definition).

[149] **Phytosanitary measure.** The TPG Steward provided a summary of the recent discussions in the SC on the interpretation of *phytosanitary measure*, noting that the SC in May 2014 only had a brief discussion, and set up a small working group who provided a paper for the SC November 2014 meeting. The discussion was deferred at this time. He recalled that the issue of interpretation is related to whether phytosanitary measures are considered to be those applied in both the importing and the exporting country (broad interpretation), or those applied only in the importing country (narrow interpretation). The broad interpretation implies that the exporting country may have/apply phytosanitary measures for another country's regulated pests, and this is not in line with the IPPC. Additionally, if used by both importing and exporting country, it would be necessary to specify at every occasion whether the phytosanitary measures relate to the importing or exporting country. However, many countries find it easy to use the term in the broad interpretation and prefer to not make the distinction.

[150] A member noted that he had previously been convinced of the broad interpretation, because, ultimately phytosanitary measures relate to regulated pests and focus should be on that. However, he recently changed his mind because he realized that there may be situations where a country applies measures because of regulated pests in a third country. Instead, he advocated for the term *phytosanitary procedures* to be used because importing countries create phytosanitary measures, but methods for implementing these measures (i.e. procedures) can be developed in either the importing or the exporting country. To meet the phytosanitary import requirements of the importing country (i.e. their phytosanitary measures), an exporting country may regulate domestically, because this is the country's sovereign right.

[151] Other TPG members strongly disagreed and still felt that the broad interpretation of phytosanitary measures was correct, noting that the IPPC does not specify "whose" phytosanitary measures are meant and that, according to the definition, any measure that prevents the introduction of pests from one to another country is a phytosanitary measure. Further, some TPG members argued that in international trade, phytosanitary measures (legislation, regulation and procedures) are used to prevent introduction of pests (regulated pests) of the importing country. These measures can occur in the exporting country (inspection at port of departure, treatment), during transit (cold treatment) and at point of entry into the importing country (inspection, treatment, regulation, legislation).

[152] The TPG discussed the understanding of measure vs procedure and agreed that measures may be taken by any party for any given reason. Treatments carried out in the exporting country could be understood as phytosanitary procedures to implement a phytosanitary measure required by the importing country. The TPG acknowledged that the SPS agreement states that quarantine treatments are phytosanitary measures, and agreed that this is correct, however, the panel also agreed that the implementation of the treatments is a phytosanitary procedure.

[153] The TPG noted that the SC May 2015 should discuss the interpretation in detail, and look forward to learning about the outcomes.

[154] The TPG:

- (33) *invited the SC to task the EWG on the Revision of ISPM 6 to consider revising the terms detection survey and monitoring survey.*
- (34) *invited the SC to add the revision of quarantine and the new term confinement facility to the List of topics for IPPC standards.*

## 9. TPG Work Plan and Medium Term Plan

### 9.1 TPG work plan

[155] The TPG updated its work plan for 2015 (Appendix 9). This work plan will be presented to SC May 2015.

[156] The Secretariat reminded TPG members that the work plan is posted on the TPG restricted work area and is updated throughout the year. Members should refer to the online version for the latest updates, and the Secretariat also circulates the work plan by email when needed.

[157] The TPG:

(35) *invited the SC to note* the TPG work plan 2015 (Appendix 9).

### 9.2 Medium term plan

[158] The TPG reviewed and updated its medium term plan, to be presented to the May 2015 SC.

[159] The TPG:

(36) *invited the SC to approve* the TPG medium term work plan (Appendix 10).

## 10. Membership of the TPG

[160] Under this agenda item, members are expected to notify any expected change in membership, so that calls can be organized in good time. No changes were communicated.

[161] The Secretariat recalled that the SC May 2014 had offered Ms Beatriz MELCHO and Mr Andrei ORLINSKI a new five-year term. They both accepted.

## 11. Other Issues

### 11.1 New definitions for wood commodities

[162] A TPG member introduced a list of terms for wood commodities compiled from a 2014 EPPO study, ISPM 5, the draft standard on the *International movement of wood* (2006-029)<sup>32</sup>, and shared with the International Forest Quarantine Research Group (IFQRG), noting that there could be confusion about the definitions of the various terms and asking if the TPG thought any of the terms should be defined in the Glossary.

[163] As an example, he noted that cutting a tree may mean processing for some people, and that this makes the term *processed wood material* confusing.

[164] The TPG general felt was that it is helpful to ensure harmonized understanding of terms used in phytosanitary contexts, also when they have not yet appeared in ISPMs, and therefore agreed that some of the terms should be defined in the Glossary. It was also noted that the undefined terms listed all presented different pest risk, and that some terms may be found to fit concepts for which there are not currently appropriate terms under the IPPC.

[165] The TPG:

(37) *invited* the SC to include the following terms as subjects on the *List of topics for IPPC standards*: harvesting residues, processing wood residues, wood chips, hogwood, post-consumer scrap wood and wood residue.

## 12. Date and Venue of the Next Meeting

[166] The next TPG meeting is tentatively scheduled for 7-11 December 2015.

---

<sup>32</sup> 13\_TPG\_2014\_Dec

[167] The Secretariat invited TPG members consider hosting the next TPG meeting. Ms Stephanie BLOEM informed the TPG that she would enquire to host the meeting in USA.

### **13. Close**

[168] The TPG Steward thanked the members for their input into the meeting preparation, and their enthusiastic participation and efforts during the meeting.

[169] He reminded all members of the fundamental work carried out by the TPG, highlighting the importance that terms carry in drafting solid and comprehensive ISPMs. “Terms,” he noted, “are the most important building blocks to ensure harmonized understanding and ultimately facilitating trade and limiting the introduction and spread of pests”.

[170] He also thanked the Secretariat for their work and especially thanked Ms Fabienne GROUSSET for her valued contributions over many years because this was her last meeting.



**APPENDIX 1: Annotated Agenda**

AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER
<b>1. Opening of the meeting</b>	-	
1.1 Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat	-	Secretariat
1.2 Selection of the Chair and Rapporteur	-	-
1.3 Review and adoption of the agenda	01_TPG_2014_Dec	Chairperson
1.4 Current specification: TP5 (TPG) (2013) (for information)	<a href="#">Web link</a>	Steward
<b>2. Administrative Matters</b>	-	
2.1 Local information	<a href="#">Web link</a>	Secretariat
2.2 Documents list	02_TPG_2014_Dec	Secretariat
2.3 Participants list	03_TPG_2014_Dec	Secretariat
<b>3. Reports</b>	-	
3.1 Previous meetings of the TPG (February 2014)	<a href="#">Web link</a>	Steward
3.2 Extracts from other meeting reports of relevance to the TPG (SC, CPM)	20_TPG_2014_Dec	Secretariat
3.3 Current work plan The work plan was decided by the TPG 2014. The work plan will be reviewed during the meeting (agenda item 9.1)	04_TPG_2014_Dec	Secretariat
<b>4. Review relating to draft ISPMs sent for member consultation in 2014 (1 July-30 November)</b> The TPG will review member comments on terms and definitions, and will review the drafts for consistency in the use of terms. Recommendations will be transmitted to stewards and the SC-7 (May 2015). When countries make requests for definitions for new terms, the TPG considers the requests and make a recommendation for the SC to add, or not, these terms to the work programme. Volunteers for each term are also identified as needed during TPG meetings. Finally, the TPG reviews the translations of new and revised terms/definitions in the French and Spanish drafts, and may propose translations for terms and definitions in other languages.	-	-
4.1 Draft Amendments to ISPM 5: Glossary of Phytosanitary terms 2014 (1994-001) 1. Member comments on terms and consistency 2. Translations of terms and definitions in French and Spanish  3. Proposed draft translations of terms and definitions for Arabic, Chinese, Russian (only terms and definitions, not any additional text)	1994-001_Amendments  22_TPG_2014_Dec 1994-001_Amendments_Es; 1994-001_Amendments_Fr 16_TPG_2014_Dec	2. Bouhot, Melcho  3. Omar, Hong, Orlinski
4.2 Int. Movement of used vehicles, machinery and equipment (2006-004) 1. Member comments on terms and consistency	2006-004_UsedEquip 24_TPG_2014_Dec	
4.3 International movement of seed (2009-003) 1. Member comments on terms and consistency 2. Translations of terms and definitions in French and Spanish 3. Proposed draft translations of terms and definitions for Arabic, Chinese, Russian (only terms and definitions, not any additional text)	2009-003_Seed 27_TPG_2014_Dec 19_TPG_2014_Dec 4_Dec 17_TPG_2014_Dec	2. Bouhot, Melcho 3. Omar, Hong, Orlinski
4.4 PT for HTFA for <i>Bactrocera melanotus</i> and <i>B. xanthodes</i> on <i>Carica papaya</i> (2009-105) (For all PTs – discuss member comments if there are any, otherwise discuss consistency issues, if any.) 1. Member comments on terms and consistency	2009-105_HTFA  23_TPG_2014_Dec	
4.5 PT Vapour heat treatment for <i>Bactrocera dorsalis</i> on <i>Carica papaya</i> var. Solo (2009-109) 1. Member comments on terms and consistency	2009-109_VHT_B.dorsalis  23_TPG_2014_Dec	



AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER
4.6 PT Cold treatment for <i>Ceratitis capitata</i> on <i>Citrus clementina</i> var. Clemenules (2010-102) 1. Member comments on terms and consistency	2010-102_CT_C.clement  23_TPG_2014_Dec	
4.7 PT Cold treatment for <i>Ceratitis capitata</i> on <i>Citrus sinensis</i> vars. Navel and Valencia (2010-103) 1. Member comments on terms and consistency	2010-103_CT_NavelValencia  23_TPG_2014_Dec	
4.8 PT Vapour heat treatment for <i>Ceratitis capitata</i> on <i>Mangifera indica</i> (2010-106) 1. Member comments on terms and consistency	2010-106_VHT_C.capitata 23_TPG_2014_Dec	
4.9 PT Irradiation for <i>Ostrinia nubilalis</i> (2012-009) 1. Member comments on terms and consistency	2012-009_Irradiation_Ostrinia 23_TPG_2014_Dec	
4.10 DP on <i>Erwinia amylovora</i> (Burrill) (2004-009) 1. Member comments on terms and consistency	2004-009_Erwinia 25_TPG_2014_Dec	
4.11 DP on Genus <i>Anastrepha</i> (2004-015) 1. Member comments on terms and consistency	2004-015_Anastrepha 26_TPG_2014_Dec	
4.12 DP on <i>Ditylenchus dipsaci</i> and <i>Ditylenchus destructor</i> (2004-017) 1. Member comments on terms and consistency	2004-017_Ditylenchus 28_TPG_2014_Dec	
4.13 DP on Phytoplasmas (2004-018) 1. Member comments on terms and consistency	2004-018_Phytoplasmas 29_TPG_2014_Dec	
<b>5. Consideration of new or revised terms/definitions</b>	-	
5.1 Subjects on the TPG work programme Discussion papers needed for the next meeting are listed below, and details are in the TPG work plan. The reasons for adding the term to the work programme and discussions in relevant groups (TPG, SC) should be taken into account (even if additional proposals are made). <b>Deadline: 08-10-2014.</b> Papers will be posted as they become available. Proposals for new or revised terms/definitions will be compiled into new draft Amendments to the Glossary, to be submitted to the SC in May 2015. 5.1.1 authorize, accredit, certify (Use of the terms) (2013-004) 5.1.2 contaminating pest, contamination (2012-001) 5.1.3 identity (2011-001), integrity (of a consignment), phytosanitary security (of a consignment) (2013-008) and section 6.1 of ISPM 12:2011 5.1.4 kiln-drying (2013-006) 5.1.5 phytosanitary status (2010-004) 5.1.6 trading partners (2013-009) 5.1.7 endangered area (2014-009)	-      14_TPG_2014_Dec 15_TPG_2014_Dec 08_TPG_2014_Dec; 09_TPG_2014_Dec 06_TPG_2014_Dec 05_TPG_2014_Dec 07_TPG_2014_Dec 11_TPG_2014_Dec	-      Hedley Bouhot Nordbo  Secretariat Melcho Secretariat Bloem
<b>6. Review of ISPMs for consistency of terms and style</b>	-	
6.1 General recommendations on consistency (as modified following the TPG Feb 2014 and noted by the SC. To be reviewed and completed as needed)	21_TPG_2014_Dec	Secretariat
6.2 Consistency of adopted ISPM (standard by standard) List of standards that have gone through the consistency review	10_TPG_2014_Dec	Secretariat

AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER
6.3 Consistency across standards (Process as approved by SC Nov 2013)		Secretariat
6.4 Other issues linked to consistency "commodity class" vs "commodity"	12_TPG_2014_Dec	Orlinski
<b>7. Annotated glossary: 2013/14 amendments</b> The annotated glossary, version 3, was finalized at TPG 2013 and published. The next version should be finalized in 2016. The TPG considers yearly which amendments need to be made. Intermediate version 7.1 Discussion on future maintenance of the annotated glossary. 7.2 TPG guidance to be included in the Annotated glossary?	18_TPG_2014_Dec	Secretariat Hedley
<b>8. Explanation of Glossary terms</b> Standing agenda item for TPG meetings. Members identify before the meeting some glossary terms/definitions requiring further explanations (and not already explained in other places, such as the annotated glossary) (with a short statement on what is the issue with the definition). These terms/definitions will be discussed during the TPG meeting and the need for additional explanations (e.g. in the annotated glossary) discussed.		Secretariat
<b>9. TPG work plan and medium term plan</b>	-	
9.1 TPG work plan The TPG will update its work plan for the coming year, based on discussions at the meeting, to be presented to the SC May 2015 for noting.	To be prepared during the meeting	Secretariat
9.2 Medium term plan The TPG will review and update its medium term plan, to be presented to the May 2014 SC		Steward
<b>10. Membership of the TPG</b> Under that agenda item, members are also expected to notify any expected change in membership, so that calls can be organized in good time	See agenda item 2.3	
<b>11. Other issues</b> 11.1. New definitions for wood commodities	- 13_TPG_2014_Dec	Orlinski
<b>12. Date and venue of the next meeting</b>	-	
<b>13. Close</b>	-	

**APPENDIX 2: Documents List***Ordered by document number*

DOCUMENT NO.	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE	DATE POSTED / DISTRIBUTED
1994-001_Amendments	4.1	Draft Amendments to ISPM 5: Glossary of Phytosanitary terms 2014 (1994-001)	2014-10-28
1994-001_Amendments_Es	4.1	Translation of terms and definitions (Spanish)	2014-10-28
1994-001_Amendments_Fr	4.1	Translation of terms and definitions (French)	2014-10-28
2004-009_Erwinia	4.10	DP on <i>Erwinia amylovora</i> (Burrill) (2004-009)	2014-10-28
2004-015_Anastrepha	4.11	DP on Genus <i>Anastrepha</i> (2004-015)	2014-10-28
2004-017_Ditylenchus	4.12	DP on <i>Ditylenchus dipsaci</i> and <i>Ditylenchus destructor</i> (2004-017)	2014-10-28
2004-018_Phytoplasmas	4.13	DP on Phytoplasmas (2004-018)	2014-10-28
2006-004_UsedEquip	4.2	Draft ISPM Int. Movement of used vehicles, machinery and equipment (2006-004)	2014-10-28
2009-003_Seed	4.3	Draft ISPM International movement of seed (2009-003)	2014-10-28
2009-105_HTFA	4.4	PT for HTFA for <i>Bactrocera melanotus</i> and <i>B. xanthodes</i> on <i>Carica papaya</i> (2009-105)	2014-10-28
2009-109_VHT_B.dorsalis	4.5	PT Vapour heat treatment for <i>Bactrocera dorsalis</i> on <i>Carica papaya</i> var. Solo (2009-109)	2014-10-28
2010-102_CT_C.clement	4.6	PT Cold treatment for <i>Ceratitis capitata</i> on <i>Citrus clementina</i> var. Clemenules (2010-102)	2014-10-28
2010-103_CT_NavelValencia	4.7	PT Cold treatment for <i>Ceratitis capitata</i> on <i>Citrus sinensis</i> vars. Navel and Valencia (2010-103)	2014-10-28
2010-106_VHT_C.capitata	4.8	PT Vapour heat treatment for <i>Ceratitis capitata</i> on <i>Mangifera indica</i> (2010-106)	2014-10-28
2012-009_Irradiation_Ostrinia	4.9	PT Irradiation for <i>Ostrinia nubilalis</i> (2012-009)	2014-10-28
01_TPG_2014_Dec	1.3	Provisional agenda	2014-10-13
02_TPG_2014_Dec	2.2	Documents list	2014-10-28
03_TPG_2014_Dec	2.3	Participants list	2014-12-01
04_TPG_2014_Dec	3.3	Work plan	2014-10-28
05_TPG_2014_Dec	5.1.5	Subject: phytosanitary status (2010-004)	2014-10-28
06_TPG_2014_Dec	5.1.4	Subject: kiln-drying (2013-006)	2014-10-28
07_TPG_2014_Dec	5.1.6	Subject: trading partners (2013-009)	2014-11-10
08_TPG_2014_Dec; 09_TPG_2014_Dec	5.1.3	Subjects: identity (2011-001), integrity (of a consignment), phytosanitary security (of a consignment) (2013-008) and section 6.1 of ISPM 12:2011	2014-10-28

DOCUMENT NO.	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE	DATE POSTED / DISTRIBUTED
10_TPG_2014_Dec	6.2	List of standards that have gone through the consistency review	2014-10-28
11_TPG_2014_Dec	5.1.7	Subject: endangered area (2014-009)	2014-10-28
12_TPG_2014_Dec	6.4	“commodity class” vs. “commodity”	2014-10-28
13_TPG_2014_Dec	11.1	New definitions for wood commodities	2014-10-28
14_TPG_2014_Dec	5.1.1	Subject: authorize, accredit, certify (Use of the terms) (2013-004)	2014-10-28
15_TPG_2014_Dec	5.1.2	Subject: contaminating pest, contamination (2012-001)	2014-10-28
16_TPG_2014_Dec	4.1	Proposed translations Ar, Ru, Zh - Draft Amendments to ISPM 5: Glossary of Phytosanitary terms 2014 (1994-001)	2014-10-30
17_TPG_2014_Dec	4.3	Proposed translations Ar, Ru, Zh -International movement of seed (2009-003)	2014-10-30
18_TPG_2014_Dec	7	Annotated Glossary	2014-10-28
19_TPG_2014_Dec	4.3	Translations Es, Fr -International movement of seed (2009-003)	2014-10-28
20_TPG_2014_Dec	3.2	Extracts from other meetings	2014-11-27
21_TPG_2014_Dec	6.1	General recommendations on consistency	2014-11-27
22_TPG_2014_Dec	4.1	Compiled member comments – Draft Amendments to the Glossary (1994-001) 2014	2014-12-01
23_TPG_2014_Dec	4.4, 4.5, 4.6, 4.7, 4.8, 4.9	Compiled comments on terms and consistency for: 2009-105, 2009-109, 2010-102, 2010-103, 2010-106, 2012-009	2014-12-04
24_TPG_2014_Dec	4.2	Compiled comments on terms and consistency for 2006-004: Draft ISPM on <i>International movement of used vehicles, machinery and equipment</i>	2014-12-04
25_TPG_2014_Dec	4.10	Compiled comments on terms and consistency for 2004-009 <i>Erwinia amylovora</i> (Burrill)	2014-12-04
26_TPG_2014_Dec	4.11	Compiled comments on terms and consistency for 2004-015 Genus <i>Anastrepha</i>	2014-12-04
27_TPG_2014_Dec	4.3	Compiled comments on terms and consistency for 2009-003: Draft ISPM on <i>International movement of seed</i>	2014-12-05
28_TPG_2014_Dec	4.12	Compiled comments on terms and consistency for 2004-017 <i>Ditylenchus dipsaci</i> and <i>Ditylenchus destructor</i>	2014-12-05
29_TPG_2014_Dec	4.13	Compiled comments on terms and consistency for 2004-018 Phytoplasmas	2014-12-05

**Web links (documents to be downloaded)**

DOCUMENT NO.	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE	DATE POSTED / DISTRIBUTED
--------------	-------------	----------------	---------------------------

<a href="https://www.ippc.int/publications/specification-tp-5-technical-panel-glossary-2013">https://www.ippc.int/publications/specification-tp-5-technical-panel-glossary-2013</a>	1.6	Current specification: TP5 (TPG) (2013) (for information)	N/A
<a href="https://www.ippc.int/publications/local-information-meeting-participants-rome-italy">https://www.ippc.int/publications/local-information-meeting-participants-rome-italy</a>	2.1	Local information	N/A
<a href="https://www.ippc.int/core-activities/standards-setting/expert-drafting-groups/technical-panels/technical-panel-glossary-phytosanitary-terms-isp-5">https://www.ippc.int/core-activities/standards-setting/expert-drafting-groups/technical-panels/technical-panel-glossary-phytosanitary-terms-isp-5</a>	3.1	Previous meetings of the TPG (February 2014)	N/A

**APPENDIX 3: Participants list**

	Participants details			TPG member's term	
	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Participant role	Email address	begins	ends
✓	Mr John HEDLEY International Standard Organisations International Policy and Trade Ministry for Primary Industries Pastoral House, 25 The Terrace P.O. Box 2526 Wellington, <b>New Zealand</b> Tel: (+64) 4 894 0428 Mobile : (+64) 298940428 Fax: (+64) 4 894 0742	Steward / English	<a href="mailto:John.Hedley@mpi.govt.nz">John.Hedley@mpi.govt.nz</a>	2013	2018 (1 <sup>st</sup> term: 2008-2013)
✓	Ms Stephanie BLOEM U.S. Department of Agriculture, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Plant Protection Quarantine (USDA, APHIS, PPO) 1730 Varsity Drive, Suite 300, Room 310, Raleigh, North Carolina 27606, <b>USA</b> Tel: (+1) 9198557650 Mobile: (+1) 9194577849 Fax: (+1) 9198557599	English	<a href="mailto:Stephanie.bloem@aphis.usda.gov">Stephanie.bloem@aphis.usda.gov</a>	November 2013	2018
✓	Ms Laurence BOUHOT-DELDUC Ministry of Agriculture, Agro-food and Forestry General directorate for food Sub-directorate for plant quality and protection 251 rue de Vaugirard 75732 Paris Cedex 15 <b>France</b> Tel: (+33) 149558437 Fax: (+33) 149555949	French	<a href="mailto:laurence.bouhot-delduc@agriculture.gouv.fr">laurence.bouhot-delduc@agriculture.gouv.fr</a>	May 2013	2018
✓	Ms Beatriz MELCHO Ministry of Livestock, Agriculture and Fisheries, General Direction of Agricultural Services, Plant Protection Division Avda. Millan 4703 CP 12900 Montevideo, <b>Uruguay</b> Tel: (+598) 2 309 8410 ext 267	Spanish	<a href="mailto:bmelcho@mgap.gub.uy">bmelcho@mgap.gub.uy</a> ; <a href="mailto:bemelcho@hotmail.com">bemelcho@hotmail.com</a>	November 2010	2015
✓	Mr Ebbe NORDBO Danish AgriFish Agency Nyropsgade 30 DK - 1780 Copenhagen V, <b>Denmark</b> Tel: (+45) 45 263 891	English	<a href="mailto:eno@naturerhverv.dk">eno@naturerhverv.dk</a>	May 2013	2018 (1 <sup>st</sup> term: 2009-2014)

	Participants details			TPG member's term	
	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Participant role	Email address	begins	ends
✓	Ms Shaza Roushdy OMAR Phytosanitary Specialist Central Administration for Plant Quarantine Ministry of Agriculture 1 Nadi al Said Street Dokki, Giza, <b>Egypt</b> Mobile: (+20) 1014000813 Fax: (+20) 237608574	Arabic	<a href="mailto:shaza.roshtdy@gmail.com">shaza.roshtdy@gmail.com</a>	October 2012	2017
✓	Mr Andrei ORLINSKI European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization 21 bd. Richard Lenoir 75011 Paris, <b>France</b> Tel: (+33) 1 45 20 77 94 ; (+33) 1 84790743 Fax: (+33) 1 70 76 65 47	Russian	<a href="mailto:Orlinski@eppo.int">Orlinski@eppo.int</a>	November 2010	2015
✓	Ms Fabienne GROUSSET Standard Setting IPPC Secretariat FAO, Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00153 Rome, <b>Italy</b> Tel: +45 24483502 (cellphone)	IPPC Secretariat	<a href="mailto:Fabienne.Grousset@fao.org">Fabienne.Grousset@fao.org</a>		
✓	Ms Eva MOLLER Standard Setting IPPC Secretariat FAO, Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00153 Rome, <b>Italy</b> Tel: +390657052855	IPPC Secretariat	<a href="mailto:Eva.Moller@fao.org">Eva.Moller@fao.org</a>		
✓	Ms Adriana Moreira Standard Setting IPPC Secretariat FAO, Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00153 Rome, <b>Italy</b> Tel: +390657055809	IPPC Secretariat	<a href="mailto:Adriana.Moreira@fao.org">Adriana.Moreira@fao.org</a>		

*Not attending*

	Ms Hong NING Plant Quarantine Station of Sichuan Agricultural Department No. 4 Wuhouci Street, Chengdu, Sichuan, <b>P.R.China</b> 610041 Tel: (+86) 28 85505251 Fax: (+86) 28 85505251	Chinese	<a href="mailto:ninghong2006@yahoo.com.cn">ninghong2006@yahoo.com.cn</a> ; <a href="mailto:ninghong2006@aligun.com">ninghong2006@aligun.com</a>	September 2012	2017
--	--	---------	--	----------------	------



## APPENDIX 4: Draft 2014 Amendments to ISPM 5 *Glossary of phytosanitary terms* (1994-001)

### [1] Publication history (not an official part of the standard)

[2]

<b>Date of this document</b>	2015-02-18
<b>Document category</b>	<i>Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms)</i> 2014 (1994-001)
<b>Current document stage</b>	to SC-7
<b>Major stages</b>	CEPM (1994) added topic: 1994-001, Amendments to ISPM 5: Glossary of phytosanitary terms 2006-05 SC approved specification TP5  2012-10 TPG revised specification 2012-11 SC revised and approved revised specification, revoking Specification 1 2014-02 TPG reviewed draft amendments to ISPM 5 (2014) 2014-05 SC reviewed and approved for member consultation 2014-7/11 member consultation 2014-12 TPG revised amendments and responded to member comments
<b>Notes</b>	2014-05 SC withdrew: identity (of a consignment) (2011-001), kiln-drying (2013-006) phytosanitary security (of a consignment) (2013-008) and integrity (of a consignment) 2014-05-19 edited by Secretariat

[3] Members are asked to consider the following proposals for additions and revisions to ISPM 5 (*Glossary of Phytosanitary Terms*). A brief explanation is given for each proposal. For revision of terms and definitions, only the proposed changes are open for comment. For full details on the discussions related to the specific terms, please refer to the meeting reports on the IPP.

[\[Note to SC-7: all terms received member comments\]](#)

### [4] 1. ADDITIONS

#### [5] 1.1 *bark (as a commodity)* (2013-005)

[6] The discussions on the revision of the definitions for *bark* (2013-005) and *wood* (2013-011) (see section 2.5) in the TPG in February 2014 led to the proposal that *bark* (2013-005) did not need to be revised, but that it would be useful to define bark as a commodity. The TPG proposed a definition for *isolated bark (as a commodity)*). However, the SC in May 2014, when reviewing the term and definition, did not agree with this proposal because ~~it was not they~~ found that *isolated* provided ~~did not -any additional clarification to~~ the term additionally. The SC agreed instead to define *bark (as a commodity)*.

-The following explanatory points may be considered when reviewing the definition (cf. also *wood*, section 2.5).

- *Bark* is currently defined in the Glossary in its biological sense, specifying how the term should be understood in the IPPC context. Such a definition is needed, in particular, with regards to ISPM 15:2009 (*Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade*) in relation to debarking; definitions in ISPM 5 that mention bark; and the draft ISPM on the Management of post risks associated with international

*movement of wood* (2006-029), which uses this term extensively.

- Also, a definition for *bark* as a commodity would be useful. Bark is dealt with as a commodity in the draft ISPM on ~~Management of pest risks associated with~~ *International movement of wood* (2006-029) (in its sections 1, 1.1, 2.2.2, 2.2.3 and 2.2.8). It was proposed to describe the commodity in a sufficiently broad manner (i.e. avoiding *bark chips*, used only once in that draft ISPM, because it may not be appropriate for all bark commodities).

- Member comments proposing that only one definition be maintained were considered, but it is still considered that a definition of *bark (as a commodity)* would be useful, referring to, but not repeating, the definition of bark in its biological sense. Consequently the proposed definition was not modified.

[7] **Proposed addition**

[8]

<b>bark (as a commodity)</b>	<b>bark separated from wood</b>
------------------------------	---------------------------------

[9] **2. REVISIONS**

[10] **2.1 additional declaration (2010-006)**

[11] The term *additional declaration* was added to the *List of topics for IPPC standards* by the SC in November 2010, as there was an inconsistency between the definition in ISPM 5 and ISPM 12:~~2014~~ (*Phytosanitary certificates*), which provides that soil may be the subject of additional declarations. The issue was discussed by the TPG in February 2013 and the SC November 2013 to consider whether *soil* only or *regulated articles* should be added to the definition. The SC requested the definition be modified to cover *regulated articles*. A definition was proposed by the TPG in February 2014 and reviewed by the SC in May 2014. The following explanatory points may be considered when reviewing the definition.

- ISPM 12:~~2014~~ provides that soil may also be the subject of additional declarations. Freedom from soil is a common requirement for additional declarations.
- Other items may be subject to additional declarations, such as growing media or the packaging in which the commodity is held. In order to cover such cases, the definition was broadened to regulated articles.
- As a result of the consideration of member comments, the proposal was left unchanged. It was recognized in particular that “in relation to regulated pests and regulated articles” is redundant because phytosanitary certificates apply only to these. However, this is the part of the definition for which revision was originally requested, and it was felt useful to maintain this wording.

[12] *Original definition*

[13]

<b>additional declaration</b>	A statement that is required by an importing country to be entered on a <b>phytosanitary certificate</b> and which provides specific additional information on a <b>consignment</b> in relation to <b>regulated pests</b> [FAO, 1990; revised ICPM, 2005]
-------------------------------	---

[14] *Proposed revision*

[15]

<b>additional declaration</b>	A statement that is required by an importing country to be entered on a <b>phytosanitary certificate</b> and which provides specific additional information on a <b>consignment</b> in relation to <b>regulated pests <u>or regulated articles</u></b>
-------------------------------	--

[16] **2.2 grain (2013-018), seeds**

[17] The term *grain* was added to the *List of Topics for IPPC standards* by the SC in November 2013 when

reviewing the draft specification on *International movement of grain* (2008-007). A revised definition was proposed by the TPG in February 2014, taking account of the views expressed by three strategic experts at the SC meeting. The revised definition was reviewed by the SC in May 2014. A consequential revision to the definition of *seeds* was also proposed. The following explanatory points may be considered when reviewing the definition.

- Grain is currently described using the word “seeds”, which is confusing as *seeds* are defined in ISPM 5 to be for planting.
- When defining *grain* as a commodity class, the word *seed* (in the botanical sense) cannot be avoided. However, in the proposed revised definitions for *grain* and *seed*, it is indicated, for clarity, that the word *seed* is used in its botanical sense.
- The three strategic experts had proposed to focus the definition of grain on “cereals, oilseeds and pulses”. One reason was to address the scope of the future ISPM on *International movement of grain* (2008-007). Another was because, in English, grain is commonly understood to cover “cereals, oilseeds and pulses” but not, for example, coffee beans, coconuts, cloves, nuts, poppy seed- (which are nevertheless all covered by the current definition). However, ~~that this~~ understanding of grain is not valid in other languages. For example, in Spanish, grain is commonly understood to cover also coffee beans. In French, grain would mostly be understood in relation to cereals only. In Chinese, it may be understood to cover potato tubers. Because of these differences in understanding and because definitions are not developed for a single standard, it was felt that the definition of grain should be kept more general rather than only relating to “cereals, oilseeds and pulses”.
- “but” is added to clarify the intended uses that are excluded from the definition, thus emphasizing the contrast to seeds.
- It was considered whether the commodity class should become *seed* (in singular) to be consistent with grain. However, it is suggested to remain as *seeds* (in plural), which is the term used in the definitions of “plant” in the IPPC itself.
- ~~Cross-references between the two definitions are unnecessary and confusing and were therefore deleted.~~
- ~~Based on a member consultation proposal, Finally-“processing or consumption” is used consistently in both definitions was deleted in the definition of seeds because it was recognized that “processing” may be misunderstood in common language.~~
- Several comments related to the words “(in the botanical sense)”. Discussions concluded that this expression is necessary in the definitions to convey the intended meaning.

[18] Original definitions

[19]

<b>grain</b>	A <b>commodity class</b> for <b>seeds</b> intended for processing or consumption and not for <b>planting</b> (see <b>seeds</b> ) [FAO, 1990; revised ICPM, 2001]
<b>seeds</b>	A <b>commodity class</b> for seeds for <b>planting</b> or intended for planting and not for consumption or processing (see <b>grain</b> ) [FAO, 1990; revised ICPM, 2001]

[20] Proposed revision

[21]

<b>grain (as a commodity class)</b>	A <del>commodity class</del> for <del>seeds</del> Seeds (in the botanical sense) intended for processing or consumption, <del>but and</del> not for <del>planting (see seeds)</del>
<b>seeds (as a commodity class)</b>	A <del>commodity class</del> for <del>seeds</del> Seeds (in the botanical sense) for <b>planting</b> or intended for planting, <del>but</del> and not for <del>processing or</del> consumption or processing (see <b>grain</b> )

[22] 2.3 mark (2013-007)

[23] The term *mark* was added to the *List of Topics for IPPC standards* by the SC in May 2013, based on a TPG proposal. A revised definition was proposed by the TPG in February 2014 and reviewed by the SC in May 2014. The following explanatory points may be considered when reviewing the definition.

- As agreed in the *General recommendations on consistency*, the use of *phytosanitary status* needs to

be avoided as it is ambiguous and creates problems for the understanding of ISPMs.

- *Phytosanitary status* in the definition of *mark* is understood to relate to the fact that phytosanitary procedures were applied. The changes proposed make the definition explicit and precise. *Phytosanitary procedures* was preferred to *phytosanitary measures* (as procedures are applied, and measures complied with; and because according to ISPM 15, marking is a phytosanitary procedure).
- At the moment, the term is used only in ISPM 15:2009. However, it is kept broad as *mark* could be used in the future for other purposes.
- Stamp or brand indicate the process by which the mark has been applied (one by ink, the other by burning). Some member comments proposed alternative wordings, such as “symbol”. Because the ISPM 15 mark contains a “symbol”, this term could not be included in the definition.

[24] Original definition

[25]

<b>mark</b>	An <b>official</b> stamp or brand, internationally recognized, applied to a <b>regulated article</b> to attest its phytosanitary status [ISPM 15:2002]
-------------	--

[26] Proposed revision

[27]

<b>mark</b>	An <b>official</b> stamp or brand, internationally recognized, applied to a <b>regulated article</b> to attest <del>its phytosanitary status</del> <u>that certain phytosanitary procedures have been applied.</u>
-------------	--

[28] 2.4 visual examination (2013-010)

[29] The term was added by the SC May 2013 to the *List of topics for IPPC standards*, based on a TPG proposal. A revised definition was proposed by the TPG in February 2014 and reviewed by the SC in May 2014. The following explanatory points may be considered when reviewing the definition.

- The definition should describe the process of visual examination, but not its purpose (as in the original definition - to detect pests and contaminants). The purpose is covered in the definition of *inspection*. Both definitions are needed with visual examination simply describing the process, whilst *inspection* describes its application in the phytosanitary context (i.e. it is *official* and *to determine if pests are present or to determine compliance with phytosanitary regulations*). The original wording in the definition of *visual examination* was also not correct (as *contamination* covers both “pests” and “~~other~~ regulated articles”).
- In general, processing is part of testing, and it does not need to be mentioned separately.
- “without testing” was deleted, based on a member consultation proposal, because it does not add clarification, and the definition should focus on what *visual examination* is, not what is not.
- A member consultation proposal suggested that “microscope” be deleted. However, it is believed that simple use of a microscope is part of visual examination.”

[30] Original definition

[31]

<b>visual examination</b>	The physical examination of <b>plants, plant products</b> , or other <b>regulated articles</b> using the unaided eye, lens, stereoscope or microscope to detect <b>pests</b> or <b>contaminants</b> without <b>testing</b> or processing [ISPM 23:2005]
---------------------------	---

[32] Revised definition

[33]

<b>visual examination</b>	The physical examination of <b>plants, plant products</b> , or other <b>regulated articles</b> using the unaided eye, lens, stereoscope or microscope, <del>to detect</del> <b>pests</b> or <b>contaminants</b> <del>without testing</del> or processing
---------------------------	--

[34] 2.5 wood (2013-011)

[35] The SC May 2013 added *wood* to *List of topics for IPPC standards*, based on a TPG proposal. A revised definition for *wood* was proposed by the TPG in February 2014 and reviewed by the SC in May 2014. The following explanatory points may be considered when reviewing the proposed definition.

- The current definition for *wood* as a commodity class is too restrictive considering the wide varieties of wood commodities that need to be covered.
- The commodity class proposed here does not provide an exhaustive list of commodities in the definition, partly because it would be difficult to find terms for broad categories, which would be agreed internationally. It was therefore considered appropriate to list examples that reflect the main broad categories of wood commodities. The examples could not be limited to the wood commodities defined in ISPM 5 (*round wood, sawn wood, now bark (as a commodity)* see section 1.1), which represent only a few types of commodities. The examples of *wood chips* and *wood waste* were added.
- The inclusion of the term *wood waste* had originally been proposed, but understood to cover commodities that are residues from the processing of wood (such as wood shavings, sawdust). Based on a member comment, it was changed to *wood residue*, which is more straightforward and used in the draft ISPM on *International movement of wood (2006-029)*. *Wood chips*, which was in the original definition, is a widely used term for a widely traded commodity. It is listed separately from *wood waste-residue* as it may be produced for itself (and is not necessarily a by-product of wood processing). Other commodities that would fall under this commodity class according to this definition would be, for example, furniture made of non-processed wood.
- Definitions do not normally mention what they exclude. However, because the proposed definition only gives examples, it is clearer to indicate which commodities are excluded (because they otherwise may be thought to be covered by the definition). Items excluded are: *wood packaging material* (defined separately and subject to the requirements of ISPM 15:~~2009~~); and *processed wood material* (defined separately and not capable of being infested with quarantine pests according to ISPM 32:~~2009~~). As a result of member consultation, “bamboo products” was added as another exclusion (as bamboo is also excluded from the draft ISPM on *International movement of wood (2006-029)*).
- *Dunnage* was deleted from the original definition because it is a type of wood packaging material.
- It is not considered useful that *wood* be defined in the biological sense as it has no specific IPPC meaning (unlike *bark* – see section 1.1).

[36] **Original definition**

<b>wood</b>	A commodity class for <b>round wood, sawn wood</b> , wood chips or <b>dunnage</b> , with or without bark [FAO, 1990; revised ICPM, 2001]
-------------	--

[38] *Proposed revision*

<b>wood (as a commodity class)</b>	A commodity class for <b>Commodities such as round wood, sawn wood</b> , wood chips or <b>dunnage</b> and wood <b>wasteresidue</b> , with or without <b>bark</b> , <b>excluding wood packaging material, processed wood material and bamboo products.</b>
------------------------------------	---

## APPENDIX 5: Draft 2015 Amendments to ISPM 5 *Glossary of phytosanitary terms* (1994-001)

### Publication history

<b>Date of this document</b>	2015-02-15
<b>Document category</b>	Draft 2015 Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms) (1994-001)
<b>Current document stage</b>	To SC May 2015 for approval for member consultation
<b>Major stages</b>	CEPM (1994) added topic: 1994-001, Amendments to ISPM 5: Glossary of phytosanitary terms Specification TP5. 2014-12 TPG drafted text
<b>Notes</b>	Note to Secretariat formatting this paper: formatting in definitions and explanations (strikethrough, bold, italics) needs to remain.

### EXPLANATORY NOTE FOR THE STANDARDS COMMITTEE MAY 2015 MEETING

At its meeting in December 2014, the Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG) made proposals for the addition, revision and deletion of terms and definitions in ISPM 5. As in past years, it is suggested that some explanation be given for each proposal in the document that will be sent for member consultation. The proposals refer to individual terms in the *List of topics for IPPC standards* and to a consequential change arising from these proposals. This paper is presented to the SC May 2015 meeting for review and approval for member consultation.

Members are asked to consider the following proposals for addition, revision and deletion of terms and definitions to ISPM 5 (*Glossary of Phytosanitary Terms*). A brief explanation is given for each proposal. For revision of terms and definitions, only the proposed changes are open for comment. For full details on the discussions related to the specific terms, please refer to the meeting reports on the IPP.

## 1. ADDITIONS

### 1.1 *identity (of a consignment)* (2011-001)

- [1] At CPM-6 (2011), in relation to the revised ISPM 12 (*Phytosanitary certificates*), the SC was asked to consider the need to define *identity (of a consignment)*. In May 2011, the SC added the term to the *List of topics for IPPC standards*. The TPG discussed the term at its meeting in October 2012 and proposed an approach to the SC May 2013, which approved it. The terms *identity (of a consignment)*, *integrity (of a consignment)* and *phytosanitary security (of a consignment)* (2013-008) were discussed together by the TPG in February 2014 (see also section 2.1). The proposed definition for *identity (of a consignment)* was reviewed by the SC in May 2014 but returned to the TPG for further review in combination with amendments to ISPM 12, section 6.1. The present proposal was reviewed by the TPG in December 2014. TPG recommends that this term is reviewed together with the proposed amendments to ISPM 12, presented to the SC May 2015 in a separate document.
- [2] The following explanatory points may be considered when reviewing the proposal.
- [3] - The *identity* of a consignment relates to the accompanying phytosanitary certificate. It had been considered previously whether simply the number of the phytosanitary certificate is the same as the consignment's identity; that would mean that all elements in a phytosanitary certificate together constitute the consignment's identity. However, TPG and SC determined that not all elements of the phytosanitary certificate can reasonably be considered part of the identity of the consignment.



- [4] - The SC proposed that the *identity* of a consignment is determined by those particular descriptive elements of the phytosanitary certificate that are related to origins, quantities and constituents (cf. section I of the respective model phytosanitary certificates). Those three broad terms are therefore used in the proposed definition.
- [5] - There has been particular a discussion on whether quantities of items in a consignment should be considered part of its *identity*. This is to say, whether the consignment’s *identity* changes if a part of a particular item is added or removed. Whereas it was unanimously agreed that the *identity* would change if any item was *added* to a consignment, opinions varied whether *loss or subtraction* of items would also change the consignment’s *identity*. The SC concluded that differentiation between addition and loss cases cannot possibly be handled in a definition, and therefore concluded that quantities should be considered part of *identity*. This is in line with how *identity* was used in standards.
- [6] - Referring to the section I elements of the respective model certificates, the coverage of the *identity* definition is as follows:
- “origins” would cover: name and address of exporter, and place of origin
  - “constituents, quantities” would cover: number and description of packages, distinguishing marks, name of produce and quantity declared, botanical name of plants.
- [7] - *Identity* would *not* cover: declared name and address of consignee, declared means of conveyance, declared point of entry.
- [8] - The number of the certificate is implicit as the *identity* refers to a specific certificate.
- [9] - Illustrative examples. If a consignment is composed of 100 apple trees and 100 pear trees from producer A, then, according to the proposed definition: if all pear trees are removed, the *identity* is changed (removal of quantity and constituents). If 50 of each are added, the *identity* is changed (addition of quantities). If 50 of each are removed, the *identity* is changed (removal of quantities). If the 100 apple trees from producer A are replaced by 100 apple trees from producer B, the *identity* is changed (change of origin, substitution of constituents). In all four cases, *identity* is changed.
- [10] - “origins” is proposed instead of “origin” because there may be different constituents, quantities and also origins when the consignment is composed of several lots.
- [11] - It is noted that the wording ‘...or other officially accepted document’ (as originally being part of the definition of *integrity*) has not been incorporated in the definition of *identity*, as ISPMs deal with harmonization of phytosanitary measures (here in the form of phytosanitary certificates), whereas possible bilateral arrangements are irrelevant for the definition.
- [12] - As a consequence of defining *identity* (of a consignment) and revising phytosanitary security (of a consignment), also the definition of *integrity* (of a consignment) needs to be amended.
- [13] - The proposed definition of *identity* (and consequential changes of *integrity* and *phytosanitary security*) does not conflict with current uses in ISPMs, and would provide support to solving the current textual problems in ISPM 12.

### ***Proposed addition***

<b>identity</b> (of a consignment)	The constituents, quantities and origins of a <b>consignment</b> as described in the accompanying <b>phytosanitary certificate</b>
------------------------------------	--

## **2. REVISIONS**

### **2.1 *phytosanitary security (of a consignment) (2013-008), integrity (of a consignment)***

- [14] The term *phytosanitary security (of a consignment)* was added to the *List of topics for IPPC standards* by the SC in May 2013 based on a TPG proposal. Consequential changes to the definition of *integrity (of a consignment)* were needed due to the proposed new definition for *identity (of a consignment)*. Revised definitions for *integrity (of a consignment)* and *phytosanitary security (of a consignment)*

were proposed by the TPG in February 2014, reviewed by the SC in May 2014 but returned to the TPG for further review in combination with amendments to ISPM 12, section 6.1. The present proposal was reviewed by the TPG in December 2014. TPG recommends that these terms are reviewed together with the proposed amendments to ISPM 12, presented to the SC May 2015 in a separate document.

- [15] The following explanatory points may be considered when reviewing the definitions.
- [16] - On the relationship between the three terms: The terms *identity* and *integrity* are used many times in ISPMs, often side-by-side, but their meaning and relation in those uses are often not clear (cf. in particular ISPM 7, section 4.2; ISPM 11 section 3.4.1; ISPM 12, section 4, 6 and 6.1; ISPM 13 Outline and section 6.1; ISPM 23, Outline, section 2 and 2.2; ISPM 25 section 1.3.2). The definition of *identity (of a consignment)* (see 1.1) partly clarifies the matter, but also underscores that the use of *integrity* along with *identity* is normally redundant. However, the redundancy has been there for long and seems relatively harmless. Immediately suppressing the definition and use of *integrity* at this stage would entail the need for consequential revision of several ISPMs. The SC therefore pragmatically considered it more appropriate to:
- maintain *integrity*
  - revise the definitions of *integrity* and *phytosanitary security* to become related to *identity*
  - ignore for the time being the redundancy of using *identity* and *integrity* alongside in many ISPMs, and leave amendments to the regular future revisions of the relevant ISPMs (except for the particular ISPM 12 case). In the long run, it is likely that the use and definition of *integrity* can cease altogether.
- [17] - By defining *identity*, the revised definition of *integrity* is considerably simplified, so as to avoid unnecessary repetition.
- [18] - The revised definition of *phytosanitary security* refers directly to maintenance of *identity*, making the definition immediately understandable without the detour of referring to *integrity*. The original definition of *phytosanitary security* seemed overly complicated and incomprehensible (referring to ‘maintenance of the integrity (which was then defined as ‘composition...maintained’)).
- [19] - It was discussed whether the definition of *phytosanitary security (of a consignment)* should cover the possible *escape* of pests from the consignment (and not only infestation of the consignment from the outside). However, this is not the common use of *phytosanitary security* in ISPMs. Only ISPM 25 (in *Background*, paragraph 5) uses the term *phytosanitary security* to explain how escape of pests from the consignment should be prevented. The SC therefore decided not to include this aspect in the current definition, but rather modify the wording in ISPM 25 when that standard is revised.

### Original definitions

<b>integrity</b> (of a <b>consignment</b> )	Composition of a <b>consignment</b> as described by its <b>phytosanitary certificate</b> or other <b>officially</b> acceptable document, maintained without loss, addition or substitution [CPM, 2007]
<b>phytosanitary security</b> (of a <b>consignment</b> )	Maintenance of the integrity of a <b>consignment</b> and prevention of its <b>infestation</b> and <b>contamination</b> by <b>regulated pests</b> , through the application of appropriate <b>phytosanitary measures</b> [CPM, 2009]

### Proposed revisions

<b>integrity</b> (of a <b>consignment</b> )	<del>The <b>identity</b> Composition of a <b>consignment</b> as described by its phytosanitary certificate or other officially acceptable document, maintained without loss, addition or substitution</del>
<b>phytosanitary security</b> (of a <b>consignment</b> )	Maintenance of the <b>identity</b> integrity of a <b>consignment</b> and prevention of its <b>infestation</b> and <b>contamination</b> by <b>regulated pests</b> , through the



	application of appropriate <b>phytosanitary measures</b>
--	--

## 2.2. *contaminating pest, contamination* (2012-001)

- [20] The term *contaminating pest* was added to the *List of topics for IPPC standards* by the Standards Committee (SC) in April 2012 based on a TPG proposal. Deletion of the term and definition was proposed in the 2013 Amendments to the Glossary. However, at the 2013 member consultation, many IPPC members did not support this deletion, because they considered the term *contaminating pest* useful, especially to express the concept previously covered by the term *hitch-hiker pest* (deleted from the Glossary by CPM-7 in 2012). Thus they suggested not to delete the term *contaminating pest*, but rather to revise its definition.
- [21] The TPG rediscussed the defined terms *contaminating pest* and *contamination* and their use in ISPMs at its meetings in February and December 2014.
- [22] Revised definitions of *contaminating pest* and *contamination* were proposed by the TPG in December 2014 and reviewed by the SC in May 2015.
- [23] **The following points may be considered when reviewing the revision:**
- [24] **For both terms:**
- [25] If the definition of *contaminating pest* was deleted, the concept expressed by the term *hitch-hiker pest* would be partly lost; if the definition of *contamination* was deleted, the symmetry between the definitions of *infestation* and *contamination* would be lost, whereas the wording “*infestation* or *contamination*” is often used in ISPMs..
- [26] This is the reason why it is proposed that both definitions are maintained, although duplication or considerable overlap between definitions should normally be avoided.
- [27] For *contaminating pest*:
- [28] – “carried by” was changed to “present in” to (i) align it with the definition for *contamination*; (ii) because *presence* more adequately focuses on the core meaning of the term, namely that a *contaminating pest* is present in an item, independently on whether this item may actually transport, move or convey the pest, and (iii) because *presence* sufficiently covers the concept of “hitch-hiker” pests.
- “or on” was added to “present in” because, for example, a *contaminating pest* may be present in “or on” a container.
- [29] – “storage place, conveyance or container” was added to not restrict the definition to a commodity, hereby conveying the concept of hitch-hiker pest better, and to align it with the definition of *contamination*.
- [30] – “does not infest those plants or plant products” was simplified by using the object pronoun “them”.
- [31] For *contamination*:
- [32] – *pest* was modified to *contaminating pest* to increase clarity of the definition by cross referring to this Glossary term, whose definition includes mention of *infestation*.
- [33] – “other” was deleted, as it implied that pests are regulated articles, which is incorrect.
- [34] – “the unintended presence of” was added in relation to regulated articles to clarify the difference between “presence of a contaminating pest”, where presence is always accidental, and “presence of a regulated article”, where presence is often intentional (as a commodity) and can only be considered as a contamination when the regulated article is unintentionally present. By adding the proposed wording, it is clearly expressed that both pests and regulated articles are present unintentionally.

– “or on” was added to “present in” because ,for example, a *contaminating pest* may be present in “or on” a container.

[35] – “not constituting an infestation” and “(see infestation)” were deleted because this concept is covered in the definition of *contaminating pest* by the term *infest* (now bolded to cross-refer to the definition of *infestation*).

#### Original definitions

<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 <b>infest</b> those <b>plants</b> or <b>plant products</b> [CEPM, 1996; revised CEPM, 1999]
<b>contamination</b>	Presence in a <b>commodity</b> , storage place, conveyance or container, of <b>pests</b> or other <b>regulated articles</b> , not constituting an <b>infestation</b> (see <b>infestation</b> ) [CEPM, 1997; revised CEPM, 1999]

#### Proposed revisions

<b>contaminating pest</b>	A <b>pest</b> that is <del>carried by</del> <u>present in or on</u> a <b>commodity</b> , <u>storage place, conveyance or container</u> , and <u>that</u> , in the case of <b>plants</b> and <b>plant products</b> , does not <b>infest</b> <del>those</del> <u>plants or plant products</u>
<b>contamination</b>	Presence of <b>pests</b> <u>a <b>contaminating pest</b></u> or <del>other</del> <u>unintended presence of a regulated articles in or on a commodity</u> , storage place, conveyance or container <del>not constituting an infestation</del> (see <b>infestation</b> )

### 2.3 *endangered area* (2014-009)

[36] The term *endangered area* was first added to the *List of topics for IPPC standards* by the SC April 2012 (with the topic number 2012-002) based on a TPG November 2011 proposal. In October 2012, the TPG recommended the term be deleted from the draft *Amendments to the Glossary* (2012). SC May 2013 agreed and removed the term from the List of topics for IPPC standards. However, the General IPPC Survey 2012–2013 undertaken by the Implementation Review and Support System (IRSS) and shared with CPM-9 (2014) indicated evidence of misinterpretation of the term, and therefore the SC May 2014 reinstated *endangered area* (2014-009) to the List of topics for IPPC standards. A revised definition was proposed by the TPG in December 2014 and reviewed by the SC in May 2015.

[37] The following points may be considered when reviewing the revision:

[38] - the General IPPC Survey 2012-2013 showed that some countries understood the term to mean an environmentally protected area in the ecological conservation sense. In the IPPC context, “endangered area” is used only in relation to PRA. The proposed definition now clearly states that the term refers to a PRA area.

[39] - “ecological factors” were changed to “abiotic and biotic conditions” in order to de-emphasize the same misconception. The wording “abiotic and biotic” adequately covers the intended meaning in the framework of the definition.

[40] - “the area” was changed to “that area” so that it is clear reference is made to the PRA area mentioned earlier in the definition.

[41] - “Part or all” was added in line with ISPM 11, to clarify that the endangered area is not necessarily the whole PRA area, but often is only a portion of it.

**Original definition**

<b>endangered area</b>	An <b>area</b> where ecological factors favour the <b>establishment</b> of a <b>pest</b> whose presence in the <b>area</b> will result in economically important loss [FAO, 1995]
------------------------	---

**Proposed revision**

<b>endangered area</b>	<del>An</del> Part or all of the <b>PRA area</b> where <u>abiotic and biotic conditions</u> <del>ecological factors</del> favour the <b>establishment</b> of a <b>pest</b> whose presence in <u>that</u> <b>area</b> will result in economically important loss
------------------------	---

**3. DELETIONS****3.1 kiln-drying (2013-006)**

- [42] The term *kiln-drying* was added to the *List of topics for IPPC standards* by the SC May 2013 based on a TPG proposal. The TPG February 2014 proposed a revised definition in the *Amendments to the Glossary (2014)*, which was not accepted by the SC May 2014. There was agreement that kiln-drying is an industrial process but diverging views on whether a definition was needed and, if so, whether the term should be defined specifically for the phytosanitary context. Deletion of *kiln-drying* was proposed by the TPG in December 2014 and reviewed by the SC in May 2015. The following explanatory points may be considered:
- [43] - kiln-drying is an industrial process without a specific IPPC meaning. It is used for various purposes in the wood industry, not only to comply with phytosanitary import requirements, but to meet quality requirements.
- [44] - Where the process is used as a phytosanitary measure, it is a heat treatment method which should conform with a required heating schedule. For example, in the case of ISPM 15, kiln-drying only qualifies as a phytosanitary measure when it satisfies the requirement that the core temperature reaches a minimum temperature of 56° C for a minimum duration of 30 continuous minutes. In that case, it will be referred to as a heat treatment (code HT) and not as kiln-drying.
- [45] - In the current Glossary definition, “or humidity control” is incorrect as there is always humidity control.
- [46] - There is no particular need for the term to be defined in the phytosanitary context. It is noted that the draft ISPM on the *International movement of wood (2006-029)* explains kiln-drying in a phytosanitary context, which will serve as a sufficient reference to the term. In ISPM 15, the requirements are clearly explained.

**Proposed deletion**

<b>kiln-drying</b>	A process in which <b>wood</b> is dried in a closed chamber using heat and/or humidity control to achieve a required moisture content [ISPM 15:2002]
--------------------	--

## APPENDIX 6: General recommendations on consistency

(first developed at TPG 2010; noted by the SC 2011-05; modified by the TPG 2012 and TPG 2013; noted by the SC 2013-05; modified by the TPG 2014-02; noted by SC 2014-05; modified by TPG 2014-12 for noting by SC 2015-05)

*The SC in 2013 took the general decisions suggested by the TPG in relation to these recommendations:*

*In May “encouraged the implementation of those recommendations by expert drafting groups and others directly involved in drafting ISPMs.”*

*In November “noted that the General recommendations on consistency, as developed and regularly updated by the TPG and noted or by the SC, are important to ensure proper use of terms in future ISPMs, and ask the Secretariat to make them available to expert drafting groups and others directly involved in drafting ISPMs (editor etc.).”*

One task of the Technical Panel for the Glossary is to review ISPMs, adopted or draft, for consistency in the use of terminology, especially of the Glossary terms. The TPG has identified a number of points where greater consistency is needed. General recommendations on these points are set out in this document. They have been applied to the ISPMs reviewed, and should also be taken into consideration in drafting new ISPMs.

These recommendations mainly concern two related principles:

- (1) to use Glossary terms wherever they are appropriate, rather than other terminology, and to use them as such, without abbreviation or substitution;
- (2) not to use Glossary terms in inappropriate contexts, but instead substitute and use more neutral language.

### List of terms considered below

Acceptable level of risk, appropriate level of protection	Phyto-sanitary import requirements
<u>Accredit, authorize, certify</u>	Phyto-sanitary measures, phyto-sanitary actions
Contamination, <u>contamination pest</u>	Phyto-sanitary status
Country, contracting party, NPPO	Point of entry
Efficacy, effectiveness	Presence, occurrence
Inspection	Prevalence
Intended use	Restriction
(Non-)compliance, (non-)conformity	Security, phyto-sanitary security
Official	Shipment
Pest-free	<u>Trading partners</u>
Pest lists	and/or
Pest risk management	References to the text of the IPPC
Phyto-sanitary certificate, certificate	“/” and “(s)”

### Recommendations on use of terms

*Acceptable level of risk, appropriate level of protection*

These terms are not defined in the Glossary, but are taken from the SPS Agreement. They should only be used in that context, and ~~in~~ with that exact wording. In particular, exporting countries have to satisfy the “phyto-sanitary import requirements” of ~~the~~ importing countries, not their “appropriate level of protection”. To avoid confusion, it is best not to use the terms “level of risk” or “level of protection” at all.

Accredit, authorize and certify

These terms are used by many bodies and organisations in ways that may make them appear to have the same or similar meanings. In ISPMs and other IPPC documents, it is recommended the terms be

used with the following restriction. When the concepts correspond, these three terms should be used in preference:

Accredit – to give authority to a person or a body to do something when certain requirements have been met.

Authorize – to give authority to a person or a body to do something.

Certify – to state that a product or article meets certain requirements.

#### *Contamination and contaminating pest*

These are ~~is the~~ Glossary terms, ~~defined in relation to commodities,~~ and ~~it~~ they should be used in preference to “contaminant”.

#### *Country, contracting party, NPPO*

Countries are variously specified in ISPMs as “contracting parties”, “NPPOs” or just “countries”. These terms should be used with discrimination. The term “contracting party” should be limited to cases where reference is being made specifically to the text of the IPPC and its obligations. The term “NPPO” should be used if the responsibility falls among those specified in Article IV of the IPPC. Otherwise, “country” should be used, in particular because IPPC Art. XVIII explicitly encourages non-contracting parties to apply phytosanitary measures consistent with the provisions of the IPPC and ISPMs. When “NPPO” is used, the text should avoid such inappropriate expressions as “the importing NPPO”, and use instead “the NPPO of the importing country”.

#### *Efficacy, effectiveness*

“Efficacy” is a special concept linked to ~~efficacy of~~ treatments, and the terms “efficacy” and “efficacious” should be used only in this context. In this sense, ~~the~~ term “efficacy (of a treatment)” is correctly defined in the glossary ~~in this sense~~. In other cases, the term “effectiveness” and its derived form “effective” may be used, e.g. an effective measure, effectiveness of measures. The general accepted understanding ~~adopted~~ is that efficacy refers to results under controlled conditions, whereas effectiveness refers to results in practice under natural conditions.

#### *Intended use*

This is the Glossary term, which should be used in preference to other wordings such as “end use”.

#### *Inspection*

This is the Glossary term. “Visual inspection” should not be used in ISPMs, as “inspection” is already defined as a visual examination.

#### *(Non-)compliance, (non-)conformity*

According to IPPC Art. VII (2f), “Importing contracting parties shall...inform...of instances of non-compliance with phytosanitary certification...”. Furthermore, “Compliance procedure (for a consignment)” has been defined in the Glossary. Thus, in those cases, compliance and non-compliance are clearly linked to consignments and thus to import. For other cases of correct/incorrect implementation of measures (e.g. regarding requirements prescribed for an entire place of production) it might be more appropriate to use other terms such as (non-)conformity.

#### *Official*

Anything “established, authorized or performed by an NPPO” is by definition “official”. Many Glossary terms are defined as “official” (e.g. area, inspection, phytosanitary action, phytosanitary measure, quarantine, surveillance, test, treatment). It is accordingly therefore recommended not to use the word “official” where it is redundant.

#### *Pest list*

There are different types of pests lists, and the terms “pest list”, “list of pests” or “pest listing” used on their own may be ambiguous, especially where they may be read as referring to the pests *regulated* by a country or the pests *present* in a country. Therefore the terms “pest list”, “list of pests” or “pest listing” should not be used alone, but should always be qualified.

The defined terms “commodity pest list” or “host pest list” should be used where appropriate.

In relation to the pests regulated by a country, proper wording would be, for example, “list of regulated pests” or “regulated pests list” (or, where applicable, the ~~more narrow~~ narrower “list of

quarantine pests”, or “list of regulated non-quarantine pests”). In relation to the pests present in a country, “list of pests present in the country” may be used. The terms “national pest list” or “categorized pest list” are ambiguous and should be avoided.

#### *Pest risk management*

“Pest risk management” is defined as being part of “pest risk analysis”. It relates to the selection and evaluation of phytosanitary measures before they are implemented. Accordingly, the term should only be used in the strict context of PRA. It is not appropriate in referring to activities involving the actual implementation of phytosanitary measures. “Pest management” or “reduction of pest risk” may, in this case, be the suitable alternate term. In general, it is preferable to refer to “risk” or “risk management” only in the PRA context.

#### *Pest free*

In the Glossary, this term is not defined as such, and is used only in combination (e.g. pest free area). It should not be used alone, but re-arranged, for example, as “free from... (whatever pest or pests are concerned)”. The term “pest freedom” is also used in ISPMs and accepted.

#### *Phytosanitary certificate, certificate*

Where “certificate” or “certification” refers to phytosanitary certificate or phytosanitary certification, these terms should be used, to distinguish from other instances where certificate and certification may relate to other situations (e.g. CITES certificates, certification scheme, certification of facilities). In ISPM 12:2011, the plural term “phytosanitary certificates” refers to export and re-export certificates.

#### *Phytosanitary import requirements*

This is the defined Glossary term, and should be used whenever possible (rather than alternative wordings, such as “requirements of the importing country”). See also “restriction”.

#### *Phytosanitary measures, phytosanitary actions*

Care should be taken to use these terms correctly. Though in common language, “measures” can be “actions”, this is not so in the Glossary. “Measures” are “legislation, regulations or procedures” (in accordance also with the use of term in the SPS Agreement), while “actions” are “operations”. For a fuller explanation, see Note 10 of the Annotated Glossary.

#### *Phytosanitary status*

The use of *phytosanitary status* should be avoided as it presents a problem for the understanding of ISPMs, and creates conflicts of meaning between existing ISPMs. The defined terms “pest status” or “pest risk” may be used in some contexts. Note: The TPG is considering developing a definition for one specific situation linked to the use of *phytosanitary status*, namely in relation to a consignment.

#### *Point of entry*

This is the Glossary term. Firstly, “point of entry” should be used in preference to other wordings such as “port of entry”. Secondly, “point of entry” should not be used in relation to entrance points into a pest free area (PFA) or area of low pest prevalence (ALPP).

#### *Presence, occurrence*

The terms “presence” and “occurrence” have both been used in ISPMs in relation to pest status. In future ISPMs, it is recommended that the term “presence” should be preferred to the term “occurrence”. A proposal is under consideration in the *Amendments to the glossary* (2013) to delete the definition of occurrence, and confirm that the term “presence” does not need a specific IPPC definition.

#### *Prevalence*

The word “prevalence” only exists in the Glossary within the term “area of low pest prevalence”. It should only be used in this context. Use of the term “prevalence” on its own should be avoided, and as it is sometimes wrongly used in draft ISPMs to mean “incidence” (~~the~~ a term that is defined in the Glossary).

#### *Restriction*

Whereas this current Glossary term has been used in ISPMs, it has mainly been used in the meaning of another Glossary term, “phytosanitary import requirements”. For that meaning only, “phytosanitary

import requirements” should be used in the future. The Glossary term “restriction” is proposed for deletion in the *Amendments to the glossary* (2013) and could be used with its general English meaning in the future.

#### *Security, phytosanitary security*

Only “phytosanitary security” is defined in the Glossary. ~~Theis~~ full term should be used when ~~it~~ is inappropriate.

#### *Shipment*

“Shipment” is used in ISPMs in different contexts. Where it is intended to mean “consignment” (defined in the Glossary) or “dispatch”, these terms should preferably be used, and “shipment” should be avoided.

#### *Trading partner*

“Trading partner” (or “trade partner”) has been used in ISPMs in different contexts. This term should be avoided as it causes confusion. In ISPMs, it has often been used to make reference to an “importing country”, and does not cover the broader understanding of the term, which may include stakeholders and private companies. Where it is intended to mean “importing country”, this expression should be used. Otherwise a more precise wording should be used.

### **Other recommendations**

#### *and/or*

Use of and/or should be avoided as it may confuse understanding and cause problems in translation. Usually, “and/or” can be replaced by “or”, without loss of meaning. “Or” means that both options can apply at the same time or either of the options can apply. Only when a sentence reads either ... or ..., does it mean that the two options cannot occur at the same time.

#### *References to the text of the IPPC*

ISPMs frequently include references to the text of the IPPC. If it is necessary to explain the reference, this should not be done by providing an interpretation or abridgement of the IPPC text. The relevant text of the IPPC should be exactly quoted.

#### *“/” and “(s)”*

The use of “/” (e.g. “insects/fungi”) and nouns with “(s)” (e.g. “the consignment(s) are”) introduces confusion, and should preferably be avoided:

- “and” or “or” may be used instead of “/” depending on what is meant in the context (e.g. “insects and fungi”, “insects or fungi”).
- single or plural can normally be used instead of (s), e.g. “the consignment is” or “the consignments are”. In some cases, it may be necessary to keep both, separated by “or” (e.g. “the consignment or consignments”).



## APPENDIX 7: *Phytosanitary status* (2010-004) – Proposed changes to ISPM 12, section 5

### BACKGROUND

- [47] The SC May 2014 approved a number of ink amendments in order to replace *phytosanitary status* across ISPMs, but also noted the TPG recommendation that work continued on the need for, and content, of a definition of *phytosanitary status* (of a consignment), based upon a few cases where the term could usefully remain in use. This was based on suggestions made by the TPG February 2013, specifically regarding cases where the term was used in relation to consignments in ISPM 12.
- [48] The TPG in their December 2014 meeting analysed the uses of the term in section 5 “Place of Origin” of ISPM 12 and consequently re-discussed the need for a definition for the term. Generally, the TPG found that in section 5 of ISPM 12, the term refers to the presence or absence of regulated pests (infestation or contamination) in the consignment and not to pest risk factors. The TPG proposed not to define the term, because a definition would be applied only to two specific cases. Instead, it proposed changes to section 5 of ISPM 12, which would solve the issue.
- [49] The proposed changes to ISPM 12 are presented in Table B.2, followed by justifications.

### Recommendation

- [50] The SC is *invited* to consider the proposed changes and ask the Secretariat to submit the proposals when ISPM 12 will be revised.

Table B.2 – Pertaining to consignment, plant and commodity in ISPM 12 (Phytosanitary Certificates), section 5, place of origin			
ISPM	Section	Para	Proposed text
12	5	Place of origin	<p>The place of origin refers to places where the commodity was grown or produced and where it was possibly exposed to infestation or contamination by regulated pests. In all cases, the name of the country or countries of origin should be stated. <del>Normally a consignment gains its phytosanitary status from the place of origin.</del> Countries may require that the name or code of the pest free area, pest free place of production or pest free production site be identified. Further details on the pest free area, pest free place of production or pest free production site may be provided in the additional declaration section.</p> <p><b>Justification:</b> Section 5 describes the information to be included in the section “Place of Origin” in the phytosanitary certificate, so the sentence proposed for deletion is not needed. What is important is that place of origin in a phytosanitary certificate refers to the places where the commodity was grown or produced, as stated in the first sentence.</p> <p><del>If a commodity is repacked, stored or moved, it its phytosanitary status may change over a period of through be exposed to the possible infestation or contamination by regulated pests as a result of its new location. Phytosanitary status may also be changed by In contrast, In addition processing, disinfecting or treating a commodity that results in removing may remove possible infestation or contamination. Thus a commodity may gain its phytosanitary status from more than one place. Thus the risk of infestation or contamination of the commodity may be affected by more than one place.</del> In such cases, each country and place should be declared with the initial place of origin in brackets, e.g. declared as “country X of export (country Y of origin)”.</p> <p><b>Justification:</b> This paragraph should be revised taking into account that the place of origin refers to the places where the commodity was produced. The second sentence of this paragraph seems to refer to cases of re-export because at the end of the paragraph mentions the country of origin and the country of export, so the country where it was produced and the country from where it is exported, respectively. According to the outline of requirements, the country of re-export is a country where the commodity has not been grown or processed. This country of re-export can issue a PC for re-export when the consignment has not been subjected to the risk of infestation or contamination and complies with phytosanitary import requirements of importing country.</p> <p>If different lots within a consignment originate in different places or countries, all countries and places where necessary should be indicated. To assist with trace-back in such cases, the most relevant place for undertaking trace-back may be identified, for example the exporting company where records are stored.</p> <p>If plants were imported to or moved within a country and have been grown for a specific</p>

			<p>period of time (depending on the commodity concerned, but usually one growing season or more), these plants may be considered to have changed their country or place of origin, provided that the <del>pest risk - phytosanitary status</del> is determined only by that country or place of further growth.</p> <p><b>Justification: Deleted text is confusing and contradictory, with was expressed above.</b></p>
--	--	--	---

## APPENDIX 8: Consistency changes across standards - *Trading partners* (2013-009)

(Agreed by TPG December 2014; to be presented to the SC May 2015)

### Background

- [1] In reviewing ISPM 17 (*Pest reporting*) for consistency, in its October 2012 meeting, the TPG noted that the term *trading partners* was used in an unclear manner in this standard. Where ISPMs normally intend trading partners to be countries, the mention here could refer to a commercial trading company. In order to clarify the meaning of the term, the TPG asked that it be added as a subject on the TPG work programme.
- [2] The SC May 2013 agreed and added the term to the *List of topics for IPPC standards*.
- [3] The TPG in its February 2014 meeting discussed the term.
- [4] Where it had previously been envisaged that this term in ISPMs covered both importing and exporting countries, the analysis presented to the meeting demonstrated that:
- in most cases the intended meaning of *trading partners* is *importing countries*. However, the TPG believed that the term *trading partners* potentially creates serious misunderstandings. In particular, it could be read to cover exporting countries and private companies, which was not intended in most cases.
- The TPG noted that a definition of *trading partners* would not be useful. It recommended that this term be avoided in ISPMs in the future, and text to this effect was added to the *General recommendation on consistency* (agenda item 7.1 and Appendix 7). Because its use caused serious misunderstanding of ISPMs, the TPG proposed that the process for consistency across standards be used to correct existing ISPMs. Proposals were made to replace *trading partners* where it is used in ISPMs, to be presented to the SC in May 2014.
- [5] The SC May 2014 discussed the consistency proposals (under agenda item 8.2) but since “there were some concerns regarding the proposal for replacing all the uses of *trading partners* with *importing countries*”, the TPG was asked to review the proposed ink amendments.
- [6] The TPG December 2014 discussed the proposed ink amendments and made changes to address the SC concerns, see Table 1.
- [7] The TPG found that in the great majority of cases in ISPMs, trading partner (or trade partner) can be replaced by “importing countries”, or a very slightly different rewording can be done, without any apparent change of meaning. In a few cases, trading partner is understood to have another meaning and different rewording is proposed. In ISPM 4 and ISPM 29, “trade partners” was thought superfluous whereas the text was modified to clarify that the pest free area would be in the exporting country. In ISPM 8 (on pest status), the reporting of pest status may concern exporting countries as well as importing countries. In ISPM 14, the modification clarifies that the process of developing systems approaches may include consultation with NPPOs of both importing and exporting countries. In one case of ISPM 24 (on equivalence), the procedures are specifically followed by one exporting country and one importing country, and it is enough to write “countries”.
- [8] The SC is invited to *review and approve* proposed ink amendments (Table 1) for noting by CPM.

[9]

**TABLE 1: Proposed changes across ISPMs in relation to the use of trading partners**

ISPM	Section	Para	Current text	Proposed text
4	2.3.4	-	Documentation may include supporting evidence describing official controls such as survey results, phytosanitary regulations and information on the NPPO as noted in section 1.3. As this type of PFA is likely to involve an agreement between trade partners, its implementation would need to be reviewed and evaluated by the NPPO of the importing country.	Documentation may include supporting evidence describing official controls such as survey results, phytosanitary regulations and information on the NPPO as noted in section 1.3. As this type of PFA <u>in the exporting country</u> is likely to involve an agreement, <u>between trade partners</u> , its implementation would need to be reviewed and evaluated by the NPPO of the importing country.
8	4	3, 3 <sup>rd</sup> indent	To observe good reporting practices, NPPOs should: .... inform the NPPO of trading partners as soon as possible, and their regional plant protection organization (RPPO) where appropriate, of relevant changes in pest status and especially reports of newly established pests	To observe good reporting practices, NPPOs should: .... inform the NPPO of <u>trading partners countries that are traded with</u> as soon as possible, and their regional plant protection organization (RPPO) where appropriate, of relevant changes in pest status and especially reports of newly established pest
9	<b>Outline of Requirements</b>	4	When an eradication programme is completed, the absence of the pest must be verified. The verification procedure should use criteria established at the beginning of the programme and should be supported by adequate documentation of programme activities and results. The verification stage is integral to the programme, and should involve independent analysis if trading partners require this reassurance. Successful programmes result in a declaration of eradication by the NPPO. When unsuccessful, all aspects of the programme should be reviewed, including the biology of the pest to determine if new information is available, and the cost-benefit of the programme.	When an eradication programme is completed, the absence of the pest must be verified. The verification procedure should use criteria established at the beginning of the programme and should be supported by adequate documentation of programme activities and results. The verification stage is integral to the programme, and should involve independent analysis if <u>trading partners-importing countries</u> require this reassurance. Successful programmes result in a declaration of eradication by the NPPO. When unsuccessful, all aspects of the programme should be reviewed, including the biology of the pest to determine if new information is available, and the cost-benefit of the programme.
9	<b>2.3.2</b>	4	In cases where survey data are to provide the basis for establishing a pest free area for export purposes, it may be desirable to consult trading partners in advance to determine the quantity and quality of data necessary to meet their phytosanitary import requirements.	In cases where survey data are to provide the basis for establishing a pest free area for export purposes, it may be desirable to consult <u>trading partners-importing countries</u> in advance to determine the quantity and quality of data necessary to meet their phytosanitary import requirements.
9	<b>3</b>	2	Direction and coordination should be provided by an official	Direction and coordination should be provided by an official management

ISPM	Section	Para	Current text	Proposed text
			management authority, ensuring that criteria are established to determine when eradication has been achieved and that appropriate documentation and process controls exist to provide sufficient confidence in the results. It may be necessary to consult with trading partners over some aspects of the eradication process.	authority, ensuring that criteria are established to determine when eradication has been achieved and that appropriate documentation and process controls exist to provide sufficient confidence in the results. It may be necessary to consult with <a href="#">importing countries trading partners</a> over some aspects of the eradication process.
9	3.4	-	NPPOs should ensure that records are kept of information supporting all stages of the eradication process. It is essential that NPPOs maintain such documentation in case trading partners request information to support claims of pest freedom.	NPPOs should ensure that records are kept of information supporting all stages of the eradication process. It is essential that NPPOs maintain such documentation in case <a href="#">trading partners-importing countries</a> request information to support claims of pest freedom.
11	2.3.1.2	1 <sup>st</sup> parag., 1 <sup>st</sup> indent	effects on domestic and export markets, including in particular effects on export market access (The potential consequences for market access which may result if the pest becomes established, should be estimated. This involves considering the extent of any phytosanitary regulations imposed (or likely to be imposed) by trading partners.)	effects on domestic and export markets, including in particular effects on export market access (The potential consequences for market access which may result if the pest becomes established, should be estimated. This involves considering the extent of any phytosanitary regulations imposed (or likely to be imposed) by <a href="#">importing countries trading partners</a> .)
14	8	1	The development of a systems approach may be undertaken by the importing country, or by the exporting country, or ideally through the cooperation of both countries. The process of developing systems approaches may include consultation with industry, the scientific community, and trading partner(s). However, the NPPO of the importing country decides the suitability of the systems approach in meeting its requirements, subject to consideration of technical justification, minimal impact, transparency, non-discrimination, equivalence and operational feasibility.	The development of a systems approach may be undertaken by the importing country, or by the exporting country, or ideally through the cooperation of both countries. The process of developing systems approaches may include consultation with industry, the scientific community, and <a href="#">NPPOs of importing and exporting countries-trading partner(s)</a> . However, the NPPO of the importing country decides the suitability of the systems approach in meeting its requirements, subject to consideration of technical justification, minimal impact, transparency, non-discrimination, equivalence and operational feasibility.
14	9.1	2	Where the systems approach has been found unacceptable, the rationale for this decision should be described in detail and made available to trading partners to facilitate the identification of possible improvements.	Where the systems approach has been found unacceptable, the rationale for this decision should be described in detail and made available to <a href="#">importing countries trading partners</a> to facilitate the identification of possible improvements.
15	3.3	-	NPPOs may accept measures other than those listed in Annex	NPPOs may accept measures other than those listed in Annex 1 by

ISPM	Section	Para	Current text	Proposed text
			1 by bilateral arrangement with their trading partners. In such cases, the mark shown in Annex 2 must not be used unless all requirements of this standard have been met.	bilateral arrangement <del>with their trading partners</del> . In such cases, the mark shown in Annex 2 must not be used unless all requirements of this standard have been met.
17	<b>Outline of requirements</b>	1	The International Plant Protection Convention requires contracting parties to report on the occurrence, outbreak and spread of pests with the purpose of communicating immediate or potential danger. National plant protection organizations (NPPOs) have the responsibility to collect pest information by surveillance and to verify the pest records thus collected. Occurrence, outbreak or spread of pests that are known (on the basis of observation, previous experience, or pest risk analysis (PRA)) to be of immediate or potential danger should be reported to other countries, in particular to neighbouring countries and trading partners.	The International Plant Protection Convention requires contracting parties to report on the occurrence, outbreak and spread of pests with the purpose of communicating immediate or potential danger. National plant protection organizations (NPPOs) have the responsibility to collect pest information by surveillance and to verify the pest records thus collected. Occurrence, outbreak or spread of pests that are known (on the basis of observation, previous experience, or pest risk analysis (PRA)) to be of immediate or potential danger should be reported to other countries, in particular to neighbouring countries and <del>trading partners</del> <a href="#">importing countries</a> .
17	<b>2</b>		The main purpose of pest reporting is to communicate immediate or potential danger. Immediate or potential danger normally arises from the occurrence, outbreak or spread of a pest that is a quarantine pest in the country in which it is detected, or a quarantine pest for neighbouring countries and trading partners.	The main purpose of pest reporting is to communicate immediate or potential danger. Immediate or potential danger normally arises from the occurrence, outbreak or spread of a pest that is a quarantine pest in the country in which it is detected, or a quarantine pest for neighbouring countries and <del>trading partners</del> <a href="#">importing countries</a> .
17	<b>4.1</b>	4	Contracting parties have an obligation to report occurrence, outbreak or spread of pests that are not of danger to them but are known to be regulated by or of immediate danger to other countries. This will concern trading partners (for relevant pathways) and neighbouring countries to which the pest could spread without trade.	Contracting parties have an obligation to report occurrence, outbreak or spread of pests that are not of danger to them but are known to be regulated by or of immediate danger to other countries. This will concern <del>importing countries</del> <a href="#">trading partners</a> (for relevant pathways) and neighbouring countries to which the pest could spread without trade.
17	<b>5.1</b>	-	Occurrence should normally be reported where the presence of a pest is newly determined, which is known to be a regulated pest by neighbouring countries or trading partners (for relevant pathways).	Occurrence should normally be reported where the presence of a pest is newly determined, which is known to be a regulated pest <del>by in</del> <a href="#">neighbouring countries or importing countries</a> <del>trading partners</del> (for relevant pathways).
17	<b>5.2</b>	2	The term outbreak also applies to an unexpected situation associated with an established	The term outbreak also applies to an unexpected situation associated with an established pest which results in a

ISPM	Section	Para	Current text	Proposed text
			pest which results in a significant increase in phytosanitary risk to the reporting country, neighbouring countries or trading partners, particularly if it is known that the pest is a regulated pest. Such unexpected situations could include a rapid increase in the pest population, changes in host range the development of a new, more vigorous strain or biotype, or the detection of a new pathway.	significant increase in phytosanitary risk to the reporting country, neighbouring countries or <a href="#">importing countries</a> . <del>trading partners</del> , particularly if it is known that the pest is a regulated pest. Such unexpected situations could include a rapid increase in the pest population, changes in host range the development of a new, more vigorous strain or biotype, or the detection of a new pathway.
17	5.3		Spread concerns an established pest that expands its geographical distribution, resulting in a significant increase in pest risk to the reporting country, neighbouring countries or trading partners, particularly if it is known that the pest is regulated.	Spread concerns an established pest that expands its geographical distribution, resulting in a significant increase in pest risk to the reporting country, neighbouring countries or <a href="#">importing countries</a> <del>trading partners</del> , particularly if it is known that the pest is regulated.
24	Annex 1	1	The interactive procedure described below is recommended for assessing phytosanitary measures in order to make a determination as to their equivalence. However, the procedure that trading partners utilize to determine equivalence may vary depending on the circumstances.	The interactive procedure described below is recommended for assessing phytosanitary measures in order to make a determination as to their equivalence. However, the procedure that <a href="#">countries</a> <del>trading partners</del> utilize to determine equivalence may vary depending on the circumstances.
24	Annex 1	2	Recommended steps are: (1) The exporting contracting party communicates its interest in an equivalence determination to its trading partner, indicating the specified commodity, the regulated pest of concern and the existing and proposed alternative measures, including relevant data. At the same time it may request from the importing contracting party the technical justification for the existing measures. In discussions on the determination of equivalence, an agreement including an outline of the steps involved, an agenda and a possible timetable may be established.	Recommended steps are: (1) The exporting contracting party communicates its interest in an equivalence determination to <a href="#">the importing country</a> <del>its trading partner</del> , indicating the specified commodity, the regulated pest of concern and the existing and proposed alternative measures, including relevant data. At the same time it may request from the importing contracting party the technical justification for the existing measures. In discussions on the determination of equivalence, an agreement including an outline of the steps involved, an agenda and a possible timetable may be established.
29	1	3	ISPM 4:1995 points out that, since certain PFAs are likely to involve an agreement between trading partners, their implementation would need to be reviewed and evaluated by the national plant protection organization (NPPO) of the importing country (section 2.3.4).	ISPM 4:1995 points out that, since certain PFAs <a href="#">in the exporting country</a> are likely to involve an agreement <a href="#">between trading partners</a> , their implementation would need to be reviewed and evaluated by the national plant protection organization (NPPO) of the importing country (section 2.3.4). <i>[note: this is a direct quote of ISPM 4,</i>



ISPM	Section	Para	Current text	Proposed text
				<i>with the same change as proposed above]</i>
30	2.1.1	2 <sup>nd</sup> paragraph, 1 <sup>st</sup> indent	Individual NPPOs may draw on a variety of different factors when determining exactly what an appropriate level of pest prevalence should be for a given FF-ALPP. Some commonly considered factors include the following: levels stipulated by trading partners in order for trade to proceed	Individual NPPOs may draw on a variety of different factors when determining exactly what an appropriate level of pest prevalence should be for a given FF-ALPP. Some commonly considered factors include the following: - levels stipulated by <del>trading partners</del> <a href="#">importing countries</a> in order for trade to proceed

**APPENDIX 9: TPG Work plan 2015-2016***(Prepared by the Secretariat, last updated 2015-02-24)*[Table 1: Regular tasks](#)[Table 2: One-off tasks](#)[Table 3: Terms on the TPG work programme as subjects](#)[Table 4: Chronological summary of deadlines](#)**The next TPG meeting is tentatively scheduled for 7-11 December 2015. Deadline for submitting meeting documents is 7 October 2015.****TABLE 1 - REGULAR TASKS**

Regular tasks		Detailed task	Responsible	Deadline	Comments
1. Meeting reports: preparation and update to SC	December 2014	Draft report to Steward and rapporteur	Secretariat	2014-12-31	
		Steward and rapporteur send back draft report	Steward & rapporteur	2015-01-30	
		Secretariat finalizes report and sends to TPG	Secretariat	2015-02-04	
		TPG review report and sends comments	All	2015-02-18	
		Final report	Secretariat	2015-02-20	(10 weeks after meeting)
	Update for SC May 2015	Prepare update (incl. decisions) from December 2014 meeting for SC May 2015	Secretariat with steward	2015-02-20	(Tentative)
2. Draft ISPMs in member consultation (for Amendments, see 3)	2014 MC (except Amendments, see 3)	Check accuracy of translation of definitions in draft ISPMs. Members receive draft definitions for their language	French, Spanish	2014-10-08	These will be submitted to translation-services when drafts go for translation before CPM
		Proposals of translations for Chinese, Arabic and Russian in draft ISPMs	Russian, Chinese, Arabic	2014-10-08	These will be submitted to translation-services when drafts go for translation before CPM
		Terms and consistency comments extracted	Secretariat	2014-12-04	
		Review for possible inconsistencies and consideration of comments	All	TPG meeting	
		Reactions to comments/consistency review integrated in tables: all drafts, and send to stewards via Secretariat	Secretariat with steward	2014-12-31	Comments from TPG on these will not be solicited, documents will be finalized by Secretariat and Steward (15/2 deadline for stewards to send Sec. responses to comments and

Regular tasks	Detailed task	Responsible	Deadline	Comments	
				revised draft)	
	Reactions on translation of terms sent to Secretariat for consideration at next translation phase	Secretariat	2015-12	When submitting drafts for translation before CPM	
	Reactions to requests for new terms and definitions in member comments	Secretariat with <b>steward</b>	Tbd	After TPG meeting	
2015 MC (except Amendments, see 3)	Check accuracy of translation of definitions in draft ISPMs. Members receive draft definitions for their language	French, Spanish	2015-10-07	These will be submitted to translation-services when drafts go for translation before CPM	
	Proposals of translations for Chinese, Arabic and Russian in draft ISPMs	Russian, Chinese, Arabic	2015-10-07	These will be submitted to translation-services when drafts go for translation before CPM	
	Terms and consistency comments extracted	Secretariat	2015-12-04		
	Review for possible inconsistencies and consideration of comments	All	TPG meeting		
	Reactions to comments/consistency review integrated in tables: all drafts, and send to stewards via Secretariat	Secretariat with <b>steward</b>	2015-12-22	Comments from TPG on these will not be solicited, documents will be finalized by Secretariat and Steward (15/2 deadline for stewards to send Sec. responses to comments and revised draft)	
	Reactions on translation of terms sent to Secretariat for consideration at next translation phase	Secretariat	2016-12	When submitting drafts for translation before CPM	
	Reactions to requests for new terms and definitions in member comments	Secretariat with <b>steward</b>	Tbd	After TPG meeting	
3. Terms and definitions (incl. Amendments to the Glossary)	2013 Amendments	Volunteer sends draft meeting paper to Secretariat	As allocated in Table 3	2012-12-31	TPG 2013
		Draft amendments 2013 completed based on discussions at Feb 2013, to SC	Secretariat, Steward	2013-03-20	
		Draft amendments in member consultation (possibly)		2013-07 to 12	
		Draft amendments and member comments considered by TPG	As per steps in task 2		TPG 2014
		Amendments and responses finalized and send to TPG for comment	Secretariat with steward	2014-03-28	

Regular tasks	Detailed task	Responsible	Deadline	Comments
	TPG sends back comments	ALL	2014-04-08	
	Amendments and responses processed for SC-7	Secretariat and steward	2014-04-10	
	Consultation by email on SCCP comments Amendments to the Glossary	ALL	Sometime 2014-10-01/25	
	Check translations of draft Amendments going for adoption (i.e. after SC November and when it has been revised/translated into all languages)	Members for languages	2015-01-28	Translations will be ready for review on 24 January and must be posted by 2 February for CPM (6 weeks before).
<b>2014 Amendments</b>	Volunteers sends draft meeting papers to Secretariat	ALL, as allocated in Table 3	2013-12-31	TPG 2014
	Draft amendments 2014 compiled based on discussions at Feb 2014, and finalized with steward, and sent to TPG for comment	Secretariat and steward	2014-03-28	
	TPG sends back comments	ALL	2014-04-08	
	Amendments processed for SC	Secretariat	2014-04-10	
	Draft amendments in member consultation		2013-07 to 12	
	Draft amendments and member comments considered by TPG		TPG meeting	
	Finalize amendments and responses with steward	Secretariat and steward	2014-12-31	Secretariat will send drafts to steward by 17-12-2014
	Amendments and responses for TPG comments	ALL	2015-02-15	Draft Amendments and responses to compiled comments to be posted by 1 March for SC-7 / SCCP
	Consultation by email on SCCP comments	ALL	Tbd, in 2015-10	(SCCP is from 07 to 09)
	Check of translations of draft Amendments going for adoption (i.e. after SC November and when it has been revised/translated into all languages)	Members for languages	Tbd, in 2016-01	The translations will be ready for review around the beginning of January and must be posted by 1 March for CPM.
<b>2015 Amendments</b>	Volunteers sends draft meeting papers to Secretariat	ALL (as allocated in Table 3)	2014-10-08	TPG meeting
	Draft amendments 2015 compiled based on discussions at TPG sends to Steward for finalization	Secretariat	2014-12-23	
	Steward sends comments	Steward	2015-01-31	

Regular tasks		Detailed task	Responsible	Deadline	Comments
		Draft Amendments for TPG comments	ALL	2015-02-15	Posting deadline for SC May 2015 is 1 March
		Draft amendments in member consultation		2015-07 to 12	
		Draft amendments and member comments considered by TPG		TPG meeting	
		Finalize amendments and responses with steward	Secretariat and <b>steward</b>	2015-12-18	
		Amendments and responses for TPG comments	ALL		Draft Amendments and responses to compiled comments to be posted by 1 March for SC-7 / SCCP
		Consultation by email on SCCP comments	ALL		(SCCP is from 07 to 09)
		Check of translations of draft Amendments going for adoption (i.e. after SC November and when it has been revised/translated into all languages)	Members for languages	Tbd, in 2017-01	
	<b>Translation of terms</b>	Secretariat to solicit TPG members' help to translate new terms in languages for the List of topics (LOT)	Secretariat	Tbd	Normally, in the TPG meeting as terms would be agreed for inclusion on LOT in SC May meeting. No new terms in 2014.
<b>4. Annotated glossary – (to be published every 3 years)</b>	2014 (intermediate)	To prepare intermediate update based on outcome of CPM 2013, SC 2013 (May and Nov.), TPG 2014, CPM 2014, SC May 2014, and consistency	Ian Smith	2014-08-30	
		To review intermediate update and send comments	All	2014-10-01	
	2015 (intermediate)	To prepare intermediate update based on TPG comments, outcome of SC Nov 2014, TPG 2015, CPM 2015, SC May 2015	Beatriz Melcho	2015-08-28	
		To review intermediate update	All	2015-10-07	Draft including comments to be reviewed at TPG 2015 meeting
		To modify and finalize based on outcome of SC Nov 2015 and on the outcome of TPG 2015 meeting	Beatriz Melcho	2016-01-29	(Tentative deadline)
		To comment	All	2016-02-12	(Tentative deadline)
		To finalize for publication	Beatriz Melcho	2016-02-30	(Tentative deadline)
<b>5. Explanation of glossary terms</b>	Members to identify before the meeting some glossary terms/definitions requiring further explanations (and not already explained in other places, such as the annotated glossary).	All to send to Secretariat	2015-10-07		

Regular tasks	Detailed task	Responsible	Deadline	Comments
6. Review of membership	Annual review of membership to make recommendations to SC on new members needed		TPG meeting	

**TABLE 2 - ONE-OFF TASKS (FOR INDIVIDUAL TERMS TO BE WORKED ON, SEE TABLE 3)**

One-off tasks	Detailed task	Responsible	Deadline	Comments
7. Review of ISPMs for consistency and style (other than in draft ISPMs)	General recommendations on consistency: yearly updates 2015 as needed	All before meeting	2015-10-07	TPG meeting
		Secretariat and steward to SC		In TPG report
	Procedure for consistency changes across standards, mechanisms	Secretariat, steward	2012-12-31	TPG 2013
	Consistency across standards: phytosanitary status: main paper (from Feb 2013 meeting) and additions from Feb 2013 meeting; revisions to ISPM 12 in TPG update 2015	Secretariat and steward	2015-02-20	To SC 2015-05
	Consistency across standards: trading partners	Secretariat and steward	2014-12-31	To SC 2015-05
	Consistency of ISPM 5: definitions of commodity classes	Secretariat and steward	2014-03-28	As SC paper
	Ink amendments to ISPM 5 Spanish	Beatriz Melcho	2015-10-07	TPG meeting (then SC May)
	Ongoing consistency review	All during TPG meeting		TPG meeting
	Present all ink amendments / proposals for revision made so far	Secretariat	Ongoing	TPG meeting

**TABLE 3 - TERMS AND SUBJECTS ON THE TPG WORK PROGRAMME**

Green text: subjects under or being submitted to member consultation

Orange text: subjects under or being submitted to SC-7 / substantial concerns commenting period

Black text: subjects submitted for adoption at the next CPM session

Blue shading: active subjects on the List of topics

Red shading: consequential changes to terms

Green shading: pending subjects on the List of topics

Term	Status	Lead	Comments & next steps
1. additional declaration (2010-006)	To SC-7 / SCCP 2015	John Hedley	<p>SC 2010-11 - Deletion of "soil or other" was proposed, as the definition for additional declaration includes the wording "in relation to regulated pests". On the other hand it was noted that the AD is the only place on the phytosanitary certificate where statements for specific situations, such as soil freedom, can be made. The SC requested the TPG to consider revision of the definition of <i>additional declaration</i>.</p> <p>Paper discussed at TPG 2013</p> <p>No agreement found on how the definition should be revised, submitted to SC May 2013 for decision on how to proceed.</p> <p>SC 2013-05 gave guidance, Secretariat to compile</p> <p>Discussed at TPG 2014-02.</p> <p>Incorporate to Amendments to the Glossary (2014) for SC 2014-05.</p> <p>SC 2014-05 approved for member consultation.</p> <p>Member consultation 1 July – 30 Nov. 2014</p> <p>TPG 2014-12 reviewed member comments. No additional changes to the revision.</p>
2. area of low pest prevalence (2013-014)	To CPM-10 (2015)	Secretariat	<p>Additional change requested at SC 2013-05, already made in MC version. Revision to correct the use of the terms <i>occurring</i> and <i>control</i> is now proposed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Discussed at TPG 2014-02, SC 2014-05 noted and agreed. Note added to Amendments to the Glossary (2013) to SC7</li> <li>- SC-7 / SCCP 2014</li> </ul>
3. authorize, accredit, certify (Use of the terms) (2013-004)	To SC 2015-05	John Hedley	<p>TPG 2013: added SC 2013-05. To review the use of these terms in ISPMs and draft ISPMs, as well as terminology as used in other domains, and make proposal on use of terms.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Analyse use of terms in ISPMs</li> <li>-Enquire on terminology from maritime area</li> <li>- Investigate harmonized terminology in other domains</li> </ul>



Term	Status	Lead	Comments & next steps
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Details in 2013-02 report</li> <li>- Discussed at TPG 2014-02</li> <li>- SC 2014-05 noted that steward for topic Authorization of non-NPPO...(2014-002) will consider adding task.</li> <li>- TPG 2014-12 discussed; added note in <i>General recommendations for consistency</i>. Consistency across standards may be needed, but no recommendation made.</li> </ul>
4. bark (as a commodity) (2013-005)	To SC-7 / SCCP 2015	Andrei Orlinski	<p>TPG 2013.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- SC 2013-05 added subject to List of topics</li> <li>- TPG 2014-02 discussed: define bark as a commodity and create a new commodity class for wood</li> <li>- SC 2014-05 discussed and modified term / definition and approved it for Member consultation 1 July – 30 Nov.</li> <li>- TPG 2014-12 discussed; no additional changes to the addition made.</li> </ul>
5. bulbs and tubers	To CPM-10 (2015)	Consequential change or ink amendment	<p>TPG 2014-02; During discussion on <i>grain</i> (2013-018) and <i>wood</i> (2013-011), TPG noted that the terms and definitions for commodity classes in ISPM 5 do not follow the current practice where descriptive or delimiting elements (here: “as a commodity class”) belong to the term and not to the definition. SC 2014-05 approved. To transfer the descriptive element to the term, i.e. add (as a commodity class) in the term. To be presented to CPM-10 (2015)</p>
6. commodity pest list	To CPM-10 (2015)	Consequential change or ink amendment	<p>TPG 2013-02, Consequential change due to proposed deletion of <i>occurrence</i> (2010-026)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Approved by SC 2013-05</li> <li>- SC-7 / SCCP 2014</li> </ul>
7. containment (2011-004)	Pending SC decision on phytosanitary measure	Ebbe Nordbo Secretariat	<p>To be considered together with <i>suppression</i> (2011-002), <i>eradication</i> (2011-003), <i>exclusion</i> (2010-008), <i>control</i> (2011-005)</p> <p>TPG 2010-10</p> <p>Proposed for addition to the work programme in order to consider the use of <i>phytosanitary measures</i> in these definitions.</p> <p>For revision in amendments 2013</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- SC 2013-05 agreed</li> <li>- TPG 2014-02 reviewed member comments</li> <li>- SC 2014-05 withdrew from Amendments (2013)</li> </ul> <p>After SC discussion on phytosanitary measure, the TPG will be able to review the term and definition.</p>
8. contaminating pest, contamination (2012-001)	To SC 2015-05	Laurence Bouhot	<p>SC 2012-04 added contaminating pest; definition to be reviewed to make sure that it covers the concepts normally expressed by a hitch-hiker pest. (see report of 2011 TPG meeting)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- deletion proposed in Amendments 2013</li> <li>- SC 2013-05 agreed with proposal</li> <li>- TPG 2014-02 reviewed member comments</li> <li>- TPG 2014-02 proposed to remove <i>contaminating pests</i> from the Amendments to the Glossary, and to reconsider the term in conjunction with <i>contamination</i> at the next meeting</li> <li>- SC 2014-05 agreed to withdraw from Amendments (2013) for the TPG to reconsider with <i>contamination</i>.</li> </ul>

Term	Status	Lead	Comments & next steps
			- TPG 2014-12 discussed and proposed revisions to both terms in 2015 Amendments; to SC 2015-05 for approval for member consultation.
9. control (2011-005)	Pending SC decision on phytosanitary measure	Ebbe Nordbo Secretariat	To be considered together with suppression (2011-002), eradication (2011-003), containment (2011-004), exclusion (2010-008) TPG 2010-10 Proposed for addition to the work programme in order to consider mentioning exclusion in the definition. - All for revision in amendments 2013 - SC 2013-05 agreed - TPG 2014-02 reviewed member comments - SC 2014-05 withdrew from Amendments (2013) After SC discussion on phytosanitary measure, the TPG will be able to review the term and definition (incl. amendments as presented to SC and SC discussion on phyto measure).
10. country of origin (2006-016)	Pending for ISPM 11 and ISPM 20		In standard setting programme presented to CPM-4: SC 2006-05 decided that this would be taken up under the review of ISPMs 7 and 12 and the review of adopted ISPMs: "The SC thought that the modifications to ISPMs No. 11 and 20 were better addressed by a consultant and the TPG in their review of ISPMs, and the steward provided text for a new task which was added to the specification for the review of all adopted ISPMs. The SC thought that the changes to be made to ISPMs No. 7 and 12 should be taken up by the expert working group on the revision of ISPMs No. 7 and 12.  Past TPG meetings; SC 2010-11 made pending the outcome of revision to ISPM 7 and 12.  Review done for ISPM 7 and 12. Excerpt from the <i>EWG on ISPM 7 and 12</i> : "Place of origin. Although the SC instructed the EWG to discuss the term "country of origin," it was noted that phytosanitary certificates only have a heading entitled "place of origin" The group agreed that clarification was required as the text of ISPMs No. 7 and 12 refers to "country of origin" while the model phytosanitary certificate uses the phrase "place of origin." The group noted that "place of origin," as described in section 2.1 of ISPM No. 12 refers to the country of origin or in some cases a more specific location such as a region or pest free area within that country. After reviewing the suggestions submitted to the EWG by the Glossary Working Group and the Standards Committee (May 2006), the EWG established that "place of origin" referred to the place where plants were grown (which could refer to a country, or a more specific area within a country). It was agreed that when a consignment is exported or re-exported, the country of origin should always be noted on the phytosanitary certificate under the heading "place of origin". After recognizing that place of origin could be more specific than country of origin, the group noted that the phytosanitary status of a consignment related to both its place of origin as well as the country of re-export (depending on possible contamination or infestation). When the "place of origin" heading of ISPM No. 12 was reviewed in detail, text was included to reflect the group's agreement that several places affect a commodity's phytosanitary status, and that each place should be indicated while always including the country of origin.

Term	Status	Lead	Comments & next steps
			Needs to be addressed in 11 and 20.
11. cut flowers and branches	To CPM-10 (2015)	Consequential change or ink amendment	TPG 2014-02; During discussion on <i>grain</i> (2013-018) and <i>wood</i> (2013-011), TPG noted that the terms and definitions for commodity classes in ISPM 5 do not follow the current practice where descriptive or delimiting elements (here: "as a commodity class") belong to the term and not to the definition. SC 2014-05 approved. To transfer the descriptive element to the term, i.e. add (as a commodity class) in the term. To be presented to CPM-10 (2015) Also under revision
12. cut flowers and branches (2012-007)	Pending EWG Cut flowers	Pending until EWG on International movement of cut flowers and branches (2008-005)	Added SC 2012-04. -Discussed by the SC in relation to the specification for the topic of <i>International movement of cut flowers and branches</i> . The SC asked the TPG to review the current definition of cut flowers and branches - TPG 2013 proposal submitted to SC May 2013 as part of Amendments to the glossary 2013 - SC 2013-05 <i>postponed</i> the consideration of the revised definition of <i>cut flowers and branches</i> (2008-005), and <i>requested</i> the Secretariat to transmit the proposed revised definition (and associated explanations) to the EWG on <i>International movement of cut flowers and branches</i> (2008-005) for further consideration. One issue is whether the ISPM should be restricted to fresh material.
13. effective dose (2013-017)	Pending SC decision based on TPPT proposal.	Secretariat	SC 2013-11 added based on paper submitted by the TPPT for a proposed definition TPG 2014-02 reviewed and made a revised proposal to SC 2014-05 SC 2014-05 agreed with TPG and asked TPPT to review the proposed addition at their June 2014 meeting. TPPT reviewed and will finalize decision tent. in virtual meeting February 2015, proposal developed based on input in June meeting.
14. endangered area (2014-009)	To SC 2015-05	Stephanie Bloem & input from SC member (Forest)	SC 2014-05 added. 2014-12 TPG discussed and made proposal for revision; added to 2015 Amendments to be presented to SC 2015-05
15. eradication (2011-003)	Pending SC decision on phytosanitary measure	Ebbe Nordbo  Secretariat	To be considered together with <i>suppression</i> (2011-002), <i>containment</i> (2011-004), <i>exclusion</i> (2010-008), <i>control</i> (2011-005) TPG 2010-10 Proposed for addition to the work programme in order to consider the use of <i>phytosanitary measures</i> in these definitions. For revision in amendments 2013 - SC 2013-05 agreed - TPG 2014 reviewed member comments - SC 2014-05 withdrew from Amendments (2013) After SC discussion on phytosanitary measure, the TPG will be able to review the term and definition.

Term	Status	Lead	Comments & next steps
16. exclusion (2010-008)	Pending SC decision on phytosanitary measure	Ebbe Nordbo Secretariat	Addition be considered together with <i>suppression</i> (2011-002), <i>eradication</i> (2011-003), <i>containment</i> (2011-004), <i>control</i> (2011-005) TPFF 2009, but not considered by TPG 2009. TPFF 2010 resubmitted a definition to TPG. TPG 2010 modified definition. SC 2011-05 decided to send for MC. Based on comments received, TPG 2011 advised that the draft definition should be reconsidered together with <i>suppression</i> , <i>eradication</i> , <i>containment</i> , <i>control</i> . For revision in Amendments (2013) as addition - SC May 2013 agreed - TPG 2014 reviewed member comments - SC May 2014 withdrew from Amendments (2013) After SC discussion on phytosanitary measure, the TPG will be able to review the term and definition.
17. fruits and vegetables	To CPM-10 (2015)	Consequential change or ink amendment	TPG 2014-02; During discussion on grain (2013-018) and wood (2013-011), TPG noted that the terms and definitions for commodity classes in ISPM 5 do not follow the current practice where descriptive or delimiting elements (here: "as a commodity class") belong to the term and not to the definition. SC 2014-05 approved. To transfer the descriptive element to the term, i.e. add (as a commodity class) in the term. To be presented to CPM-10 (2015) Also under revision
18. grain	To CPM-10 (2015)	Consequential change or ink amendment	TPG 2014-02; During discussion on <i>grain</i> (2013-018) and <i>wood</i> (2013-011), TPG noted that the terms and definitions for commodity classes in ISPM 5 do not follow the current practice where descriptive or delimiting elements (here: "as a commodity class") belong to the term and not to the definition. SC 2014-05 approved. To transfer the descriptive element to the term, i.e. add (as a commodity class) in the term. To be presented to CPM-10 (2015) Also under revision
19. grain (2013-018)	To SC-7 / SCCP 2015	Secretariat	SC 2013-11 added in relation to the consideration of the draft specification on International movement on grain. TPG 2014-02 discussed Incorporated into Amendments (2014) for SC 2014-05, together with consequential change for "seeds" SC 2014-05 approved for member consultation Member consultation 1 July – 30 Nov. TPG 2014-12 reviewed member comments, no changes to the proposed revision.
20. habitat	To CPM-10 (2015)	Consequential change or ink amendment	Consequential change due to proposed deletion of <i>occurrence</i> (2010-026). - TPG 2013-02; reviewed by SC 2013-05 - SC-7 / SCCP 2014
21. identity (2011-001)	To SC 2015-05 (if agreed by TPG in e-decision)	Ebbe Nordbo	Added SC 2011-05 based on CPM-6 discussion. At CPM-6, in relation to the revised ISPM 12, some members suggested that the SC consider whether there is a need to define the term "identity", and the SC added the term to the work programme as TPG subject. TPG 2012 suggested an approach, but asked SC to validate before further work. SC agreed (see TPG 2012-10 report and SC 2013-05 report)

Term	Status	Lead	Comments & next steps
			TPG 2014 discussed and incorporated into Amendments (2014). SC 2014-05 withdrew from Amendments (2014) for TPG to reconsider <i>identity, integrity (of a consignment), phytosanitary security (of a consignment)</i> and section 6.1 of ISPM 12 be reviewed together, and possibly propose revised definitions of the terms and possible consistency changes to section 6.1 of ISPM 12. TPG 2014-12 reviewed; deferred final decision to e-forum discussion (scheduled for 15-1-15/2 2015) but agreed that terms and ISPM 12 will be processed combined only (for SC May 2015 potentially).
22. integrity (of a consignment) consequential	To SC 2015-05 (if agreed by TPG in e-decision)	Ebbe Nordbo (see <i>identity</i> )	See <i>identity</i> SC 2014-05 withdrew from Amendments (2014). TPG to reconsider. TPG 2014-12 reviewed; deferred final decision to e-forum discussion (scheduled for 15-1-15/2 2015) but agreed that terms and ISPM 12 will be processed combined only (for SC 2015-05 potentially).
23. kiln-drying (2013-006)	To SC 2015-05	Andrei Orłinski Secretariat	TPG 2012-10, SC 2013-05 added TPG 2014 discussed and added to incorporate to Amendments (2014) SC 2014-05 withdrew the proposal from the Amendments (2014) and asked TPG to rediscuss. TPG 2014-12 discussed and agreed to propose for deletion from Glossary (in Amendments 2015).
24. mark (2013-007)	To SC-7 / SCCP 2015	Secretariat	TPG 2013, added SC 2013-05. To remove “phytosanitary status” in the definition. Proposal already exists. To be extracted from relevant document Propose addition to the List of topics to SC 2013-05. SC 2013-05 agreed TPG 2014-02 discussed and incorporated to Amendments to the Glossary (2014) SC 2014-05 approved for MC Member consultation 1 July – 30 Nov. 2014 TPG 2014-12 reviewed member comments; no changes to the proposed revision.
25. naturally occurring (2010-023)	To CPM-10 (2015)	Ian Smith	TPG discussion 2009. Review three definitions (pest, organism and naturally occurring) Deletion of organism and naturally occurring proposed in Amendments 2013 - SC 2013-05 approved proposals in Amendments - TPG 2014-02 reviewed member comments - SC-7 / SCCP 2014
26. occurrence (2010-026)	To CPM-10 (2015)	Ebbe Nordbo and Ian Smith	TPG 2009, added SC 2010-04. To review the use in English ISPMs and in languages to make sure consistent. TPG 2010 discussed. Outcome detailed in the 2010 report - Deletion of <i>occurrence</i> in Amendments 2013 - add general consistency recommendation - revision of defs containing <i>occur</i> in Amendments - SC 2013-05 agreed - TPG 2014-02 reviewed member comments - SC-7 / SCCP 2014

Term	Status	Lead	Comments & next steps
27. organism (2010-021)	To CPM-10 (2015)	Ian Smith	TPG discussion 2009. Review three definitions (pest, organism and naturally occurring) Deletion of organism and naturally occurring proposed in Amendments 2013 - SC 2013-05 approved proposals in Amendments - TPG 2014-02 reviewed member comments - SC-7 / SCCP 2014
28. pest free area	To CPM-10 (2015)	Consequential change or ink amendment	Consequential change due to proposed deletion of <i>occurrence</i> (2010-026). - TPG 2013-02; reviewed by SC 2013-05 - SC-7 / SCCP 2014
29. pest free place of production	To CPM-10 (2015)	Consequential change or ink amendment	Consequential change due to proposed deletion of <i>occurrence</i> (2010-026). TPG 2013-02; reviewed by SC 2013-05 - SC-7 / SCCP 2014
30. pest free production site	To CPM-10 (2015)	Consequential change or ink amendment	Consequential change due to proposed new definition for <i>production site</i> (2012-004) - TPG 2012-10; reviewed by SC 2013-05 - SC-7 / SCCP 2014
31. phytosanitary security (of a consignment) (2013-008)	To SC 2015-05 (if agreed by TPG in e-decision)	Ebbe Nordbo	<b>See identity.</b> TPG 2012, added SC 2013-05. Details in TPG 2012-10 report SC 2013-05 added term to List of topics TPG 2014 incorporated to Amendments (2014) SC 2014-05 withdrew from Amendments (2014) TPG to reconsider TPG 2014-12 reviewed; deferred final decision to e-forum discussion (scheduled for 15-1-15/2 2015) but agreed that terms and ISPM 12 will be processed combined only (for SC May 2015 potentially).
32. phytosanitary status (2010-004)	To SC 2015-05	Ebbe Nordbo Beatriz Melcho	TPG 2010, SC 2010-11 added. To review the use in ISPMs and consider if the term needs to be clarified. Raised in TPG 2010 in relation to the draft ISPM on plants for planting. TPG 2012-2013 developed proposals across standards. Paper on consistency across standards presented to the SC 2013-05, but discussion postponed to 2013-11, then to 2014-05. Proposed actions in the paper on consistency across standards (incl. general consistency recommendation) TPG 2014-02 discussed. SC 2014-05 agreed with the proposals for Tables A and B and noted that work is still needed for the definition of the term. <b>These tables will be presented to CPM-10 as ink amendments for noting.</b> TPG to continue work on a possible definition for a few cases. - definition for phytosanitary status (of a consignment accompanied by a PC) to be developed. TPG 2014-12 discussed need for new definition but agreed that this was not necessary (as only for two cases in ISPM 12). Instead, TPG proposed changes to ISPM 12 to be considered by SC – possibly to consider when ISPM will be revised.

Term	Status	Lead	Comments & next steps
33. plants <i>in vitro</i>	To CPM-10 (2015)	Consequential change or ink amendment	TPG 2014-02; SC 2014-05 approved. To transfer the descriptive element to the term, i.e. add (as a commodity class) in the term.
34. point of entry (2010-005)	To CPM-10 (2015)	Beatriz Melcho	From the review of the draft annotated glossary, TPG 2010, added SC November 2010. This definition is now out of date and does not allow for the current practice of having <b>points of entry</b> inside countries. - Revised def in Amendments 2013, and informed the SC 2013-05 that revision needed in 3 ISPMs. - add to general consistency recommendations - all agreed by SC 2013-05 - TPG 2014-02 reviewed member comments - SC-7 / SCCP 2014
35. place of production	To CPM-10 (2015)	Consequential change or ink amendment	Consequential change due to proposed new definition for <i>production site</i> (2012-004) - TPG 2012-10; reviewed by SC 2013-05. - SC-7 / SCCP 2014
36. practically free	Paper for next meeting	Consequential change or ink amendment	TPG 2014-12 discussed the term (see 8 of the TPG report) and suggested adding a qualifier "of a consignment, field or place of production" to the term and consequently remove this text from the definition. The TPG considered this an ink amendment (not to be added to the List of topics).
37. pre-clearance (2013-016)	Added by SC May 2013 as pending	Pending until SC decides	Concepts are being considered by the SC. Work on the definition will start only when the concepts are clarified. However, the SC decided to add pre-clearance as pending. An ISPM is being developed.
38. production site (2012-004)	To CPM-10 (2015)	Ian Smith	Added SC 2012-04. To clarify the ambiguity linked to place of production (see report of 2011 TPG meeting) - new definition in Amendments 2013 - consequential: change to place of production and pest-free production site (both in Amendments 2013) - SC 2013-05 agreed with proposals - TPG 2014-02 reviewed member comments - SC-7 / SCCP 2014
39. protected area (2012-003)	To CPM-10 (2015)	Ian Smith	Added SC 2012-04. To consider whether the current definitions should be revised to be consistent with the current definition of <i>quarantine pest</i> , and to review the use of the term in ISPMs, especially those on PRA (see report of 2011 TPG meeting) - deletion of <i>protected area</i> in Amendments 2013 - propose to SC that <i>endangered area</i> be deleted from list of topics - SC 2013-05 agreed with proposals - TPG 2014-02 reviewed member comments - SC-7 / SCCP 2014
40. quarantine area (2012-006)	Pending revision of ISPM 8	Pending until revision of	TPFF 2011. Added SC 2012-04 - To be considered based on a draft revised definition proposed by the TPFF.



Term	Status	Lead	Comments & next steps
		ISPM 8	- TPG 2012-2013 considered definition, but proposed it should be postponed until ISPM 8 is revised. (details in TPG 2012 and 2013 reports) - SC 2013-05 changed the status to pending until after the revision of ISPM 8 (Determination of pest status in an area)
41. quarantine station (2010-013)	To CPM-10 (2015)	Secretariat	TPG 2009-06, added SC 2010-04. To revise. Based on ISPM 3, change the definition for <i>quarantine station</i> in the Glossary to refer also to organisms or other regulated articles in quarantine instead of only referring to plants or plant products. TPG 2010 proposed revision. Member consultation in 2011. TPG 2011 modified definition. SC November 2011 sent back to TPG (details in SC report) - revision in Amendments 2013 (as sent for MC in 2011) - SC 2013-05 agreed with proposal - TPG 2014-02 reviewed member comments - SC-7 / SCCP 2014
42. restriction (2010-027)	To CPM-10 (2015)	Ian Smith	TPG 2009, added SC 2010-04. Review the use of restriction in ISPMs, as well as the use of restrictive. Used in inconsistent way. - deletion (amendments 2013) - add general consistency recommendation - SC May 2013 accepted - TPG 2014-02 reviewed member comments - SC-7 / SCCP 2014
43. seeds	To CPM-10 (2015)	Consequential change or ink amendment	TPG 2014-02; SC 2014-05 approved. To transfer the descriptive element to the term, i.e. add (as a commodity class) in the term. This ink amendment will go to CPM-10 (2015).
44. seeds	To SC-7 / SCCP 2015	Consequential change or ink amendment	When reviewing draft specification in international movement of grain (2008-007), the SC tasked TPG to review the definition for <i>grain</i> , particular to include the explanatory words "(in the botanical sense)" in the definition. Consequential changes to seeds were proposed at this time. TPG 2014-12 reviewed member comments and agreed to a member comment suggesting to delete "processing or consumption" because treatment could be misunderstood as a type of processing.
45. suppression (2011-002)	Pending SC decision on phytosanitary measure	Ebbe Nordbo Secretariat	To be considered together with eradication (2011-003), containment (2011-004), exclusion (2010-008), control (2011-005) TPG October 2010 Proposed for addition to the work programme in order to consider the use of <i>phytosanitary measures</i> in these definitions. For revision in amendments 2013 - SC May 2013 agreed - TPG 2014 reviewed member comments - SC May 2014 withdrew from Amendments (2013)

Term	Status	Lead	Comments & next steps
			After SC discussion on phytosanitary measure, the TPG will be able to review the term and definition.
46. surveillance	To CPM-10 (2015)	Consequential change or ink amendment	Consequential change due to proposed deletion of <i>occurrence</i> (2010-026). - TPG 2013-02; reviewed by SC 2013-05 - TPG 2014-02 reviewed member comments - SC-7 / SCCP 2014
47. survey	To CPM-10 (2015)	Consequential change or ink amendment	Consequential change due to proposed deletion of <i>occurrence</i> (2010-026). TPG 2013-02; reviewed by SC 2013-05 TPG 2014-02 reviewed member comments - SC-7 / SCCP 2014
48. survey (2013-015)	Pending EWG on ISPM 6		See SC May 2013. TPG 2014 discussed. Proposed to SC May 2014 to classify as “pending” until progress made with revision of ISPM 6. SC May 2014 reviewed TPG recommendation and made term pending till draft revised ISPM 6 is available.
49. systems approach(es) (2010-002)	To CPM-10 (2015)	Beatriz Melcho	TPG 2010. Added SC November 2010. To consider the pros and cons of redefining/revising. Need to review use in standards and consider whether to revise. Two issues to be considered for possible revision of the definition: “risk management measures” (should it be “pest risk management measures”) meeting “appropriate level of protection” (“should it be “phytosanitary import requirements”) - Revision in amendments 2013 - TPG agreed that not needed to define integrated measures (details to TPG report). - SC May 2013 agreed with proposal - TPG 2014-02 reviewed member comments - SC-7 / SCCP 2014
50. The concept of the IPPC coverage of “plants” (2013-012)	To CPM-10 (2015)	Ian Smith	TPG discussions 2012 & 2013. Added by SC May 2013 - TPG 2012 and 2013 developed proposal for a modification of the scope of ISPM 5 in Amendments to the glossary 2013  - SC agreed to proposal  - TPG 2014-02 reviewed member comments - SC-7 / SCCP 2014
51. tolerance level (2012-005)	TPFF 2010. Added SC April 2012,	Pending until SC in 2015	-To be considered based on a draft revised definition proposed by the TPFF. -TPG 2012-2013 finalized a revised definition.

Term	Status	Lead	Comments & next steps
	pending SC May 2013		- Proposed to SC May 2013 to decide whether to add to the amendments 2013 or not revise for the moment (details and proposed def in 2013 TPG report) because it was felt too early to revise. -SC May 2013 changed the status of tolerance level (of a pest) to pending, to be reconsidered by the SC in 2015 (Note: not by the TPG)
52. trading partner (2013-009)	To SC 2015-05	Ian Smith  Secretariat	TPG 2012, added SC 2013-05. Details in 2012-10 TPG report Propose addition to the List of topics to SC 2013-05 SC 2013-05 agreed TPG 2014-02 discussed: -Not define - Proposals for consistency across standards to SC -General recommendation on consistency SC 2014-05 reviewed and asked TPG to reconsider. TPG 2014-12 discussed and revised the proposals for consistency across standards to be presented to SC.
53. 2 visual examination (2013-010)	To SC-7 / SCCP 2015	Shaza Omar	TPG 2012, added SC May 2013 Details in Oct 2012 TPG report Propose addition to the List of topics to SC May 2013. SC May 2013 agreed TPG 2014 discussed, incorporated to Amendments to the Glossary (2014) for May 2014 SC, - General recommendation on consistency (on visual inspection), - note to SC that occurrences of visual inspection in stds will need to be corrected at revision SC May 2014 approved for MC Member consultation 1 July – 30 Nov. 2014 TPG 2014-12 reviewed member comments and agreed to delete "without testing" from the proposed revision because of member comments suggesting that visual examination, testing and inspection create confusion.
54. wood	To CPM-10 (2015)	Consequential change or ink amendment	TPG 2014-02; SC 2014-05 approved. To transfer the descriptive element to the term, i.e. add (as a commodity class) in the term. Also under revision (see above)
55. wood (2013-011)	To SC-7 / SCCP 2015	Andrei Orliński	TPG 2013, added SC May 2013. See details in February 2013 report Propose addition to the List of topics to SC May 2013. SC May 2013 agreed TPG 2014 discussed, incorporate to Amendments to the Glossary (2014) SC May 2014 approved for MC with revised term/ definition. Member consultation 1 July – 30 Nov. 2014 TPG 2014-12 reviewed member comments and agreed to change "wood waste" to "wood residue" as suggested

Term	Status	Lead	Comments & next steps
by member comments.			
Related to consistency			
56.	Review of the use of and/or in adopted ISPMs (2010-030)	Ongoing	Stays on the work programme to be implemented during the consistency review
			TPG discussion 2009 Modified SC November 2010. Consistent with general recommendations on consistency, but require a review of every occurrence. Will be considered during consistency study.

**TABLE 4: MAIN DEADLINES FOR TPG MEMBERS (EXCEPT TASKS ONLY FOR STEWARD AND SECRETARIAT) - FOR DETAILS ON TASKS, SEE TABLES ABOVE****Only deadlines until the next meeting are listed below**

Deadline	Activity in tables	Resp.	Task
2015-01-09	3. Terms and def.	Ebbe Nordbo	Provide revised rationale for and amendments to ISPM 12, section 6.1 in combination with <i>identity, integrity, phytosanitary security</i>
2015-01-28	3. Terms and defs	ALL	Check translations of draft Amendments (2013) going for adoption (i.e. after SC November and when it has been revised/translated into all languages)
2015-02-15	3. Terms and def.	ALL	Discuss and decide via e-decision on the IPP on <i>identity, integrity, phytosanitary security and section 6.1 of ISPM 12</i> . E-decision will be opened on 15-01-2015 and will close on 15-02-2015. If agreement is reached, the terms will be included in the draft Amendments 2015 which will be presented to SC 2015-05 together with a separate paper on proposed changes to ISPM 12.
2015-02-15	3. Terms and def.	ALL	Draft Amendments to the Glossary 2014: comment on modified draft and on responses to comments (as modified after the TPG meeting, going to SC-7 and SCCP)
2015-02-15	3. Terms and def.	ALL	Draft Amendments to the Glossary 2015: comment on draft (as assembled following the TPG meeting, going to SC May for approval for MC)
2015-02-18	1. Meeting report	ALL	Comment on draft TPG report (two weeks from receiving draft)
2015-08-28	4. Annotated glossary	Beatriz Melcho	To prepare 2015 intermediate update based on outcome of: CPM 2013, SC 2013 (May and Nov.), TPG 2014, CPM 2014, SC 2014 (May and Nov.), CPM 2015, SC 2015 (May) and consistency in the use of terms
2015-10-01/25	3. Terms and def.	ALL	Draft Amendments to the Glossary 2014 in SCCP: consultation by email on SCCP comments, as necessary
2015-10-07	4. Annotated glossary	ALL	To review and comment on intermediate update 2015
2015-10-07	5. Explanations of terms	ALL	Members to identify some glossary terms/definitions requiring further explanations (and not already explained in other places, such as the annotated glossary).
2015-10-07	3. Terms and defs	TBD – only if SC 2015-05 adds term to the List of topics	Paper on <i>confinement facility</i> (addition)
2015-10-07	3. Terms and	TBD – only if SC	Paper on <i>containment</i> (2011-004), <i>control</i> (2011-005), <i>eradication</i> (2011-003), <i>exclusion</i> (2010-008)

Deadline	Activity in tables	Resp.	Task
	def.	discusses and decides on phytosanitary measure	
2015-10-07	3. Terms and def.	Secretariat + TBD	Paper on <i>country of origin</i> (2006-016)
2015-10-07	3. Terms and def.	TBD – only if SC decides on TPPT proposal	Paper on <i>effective dose</i> (2013-017)
2015-10-07	3. Terms and defs	TBD – only if SC 2015-05 adds term to the List of topics	Paper on <i>harvesting residues</i> (addition)
2015-10-07	3. Terms and defs	TBD – only if SC 2015-05 adds term to the List of topics	Paper on <i>hogwood</i> (addition)
2015-10-07	3. Terms and defs	TBD – only if SC 2015-05 adds term to the List of topics	Paper on <i>post-consumer scrap wood</i> (addition)
2015-10-07	3. Terms and def.	TBD	Paper on <i>practically free</i> (ink amendment)
2015-10-07	3. Terms and def.	TBD – only if SC decides on the draft ISPM	Paper on <i>pre-clearance</i> (2013-016)
2015-10-07	3. Terms and defs	TBD – only if SC 2015-05 adds term to the List of topics	Paper on <i>processing wood residues</i> (addition)
2015-10-07	3. Terms and defs	TBD – only if SC 2015-05 adds term to the List of topics	Paper on <i>quarantine</i> (revision)
2015-10-07	3. Terms and def.	TBD – only if SC decides to revise	Paper on <i>tolerance level</i> (2012-005)
2015-10-07	3. Terms and defs	TBD – only if SC 2015-05 adds term	Paper on <i>test</i> (revision)

Deadline	Activity in tables	Resp.	Task
		to the List of topics	
2015-10-07	3. Terms and defs	TBD – only if SC 2015-05 adds term to the List of topics	Paper on <i>wood chips</i> (addition)
2015-10-07	3. Terms and defs	TBD – only if SC 2015-05 adds term to the List of topics	Paper on <i>wood residue</i> (addition)
2015-10-07	2. Draft ISPMs in MC	ALL	Draft ISPMs in 2014 MC (except Amendments, see 4). - Check accuracy of translation of definitions in draft ISPMs/propose translations - Review for possible inconsistencies and consideration of comments
2015-10-07	7. Consistency	ALL	Review general recommendations on consistency and need for adjustments
2015-12-07 to 11			TPG Meeting



## APPENDIX 10: TPG Medium term plan

The below medium term plan lists the TPG activities as updated after the TPG December 2014 meeting, in response to the SC task for the TPG to “review their work programme and the continued need for their work, and develop a medium term plan for their work, identify key areas that may need addressing, set a completion date if possible, and report back to the SC”.

- Continued need for TPG work: As long as standards are developed, in relation to terms and definition, consistency of standards and any issue necessitating input relating to definitions.
- Key areas that may need addressing: The TPG considers that the key area for its work is the consideration of draft ISPMs (new terms and definitions, consistency in the use of terms, and review of translations of terms and definitions).
- TPG activities and medium term plan/completion date/comments:

Draft ISPMs for member consultation: - consideration of member comments on terms, - review of drafts for consistency in the use of terms - review of translations of terms/definitions	continuing	
Development and revision of terms and definitions	continuing	
Annotated glossary - yearly updates, including explanations as needed - finalization for publication every three years	continuing	Next publication 2016
Review of adopted ISPMs for consistency in the use of terms: - consistency changes to several ISPMs (ink amendments)	ongoing	
- Procedures for consistency standard-by-standard and consistency across standards	2010&2013	Providing the frame of the consistency study
- adjustments as needed (standard-by-standard or across standards)	continuing	To address necessary changes as needed
- <i>General recommendations on consistency</i>	continuing	To be consolidated as needed at each meeting, and presented to the SC for noting
Work of the TPG in relation to languages: - general (e.g. definitions) - Review of amendments in languages - Translation of new subjects added to the List of topics	continuing continuing continuing	Linked to draft ISPMs