



UPDATE ON ACTIVITIES OF THE TECHNICAL PANEL FOR THE GLOSSARY FROM MAY 2015 TO APRIL 2016

(Submitted by the IPPC Secretariat with input from the TPG Steward)

BACKGROUND

[1] The IPPC Secretariat support for the Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG) are:

- Ms Eva Moller (lead)
- Ms Céline Germain (support).

[2] Membership of the TPG as of April 2016:

Name	Language	End of term
Ms Stephanie BLOEM (NAPPO)	English	2018
Ms Laurence BOUHOT-DELDUC (Steward) (France)	French	2018
Mr John HEDLEY (New Zealand)	English	2018 (1 st term: 2008-2013)
Ms Beatriz MELCHO (Uruguay)	Spanish	2020 (1 st term: 2010-2015)
Ms Hong NING (China)	Chinese	2017
Mr Ebbe NORDBO (Assistant steward) (Denmark)	English	2019 (1 st term: 2009-2014)
Ms Shaza Roushdy OMAR (Egypt)	Arabic	2017
Mr Andrei ORLINSKI (EPPO)	Russian	2020 (1 st term: 2010-2015)

[3] Currently the TPG has 32 terms on their work programme, 27 of these terms are on the *List of topics for IPPC standards* and the remainder are terms that the TPG works on as a consequence of the TPG review of ISPMs for consistency.

Volume of work for the TPG from May 2015 to April 2016

[4] The Technical Panel for the Glossary met in Rome, Italy, on 7-10 December 2015. The report from the meeting is available on the IPP¹. In the past year, the TPG had three e-forum discussions:

- TPG_2015-06_e-decision_02 to discuss the proposal for consistency across standards to replace “trading partner” (2013-009). The TPG did not reach agreement and the issue was discussed and finalized in the TPG 2015 face to face meeting.
- TPG_2015-06_e-decision_03 to discuss and finalize the proposed draft specification for the revision of ISPM 12 (*Phytosanitary certificates*), which was following submitted in the 2015 Call for topics (to be considered by the SC under agenda item 7.3).
- TPG_2016-01_e-decision_04 to discuss the proposed ink amendments to replace “protected area” with “regulated area”. The TPG reached agreement on the ink amendments to be presented to the SC.

[5] In 2015, the TPG worked on **16 terms** on the *List of topics for IPPC standards*: **3** terms were presented to the CPM-11 (2016) for adoption as Amendments to the Glossary (with 1 term consequential); **5** terms are presented to the SC May 2016 meeting for approval for member consultation; **8** terms are suggested to be deleted from the work programme of the TPG (see section 2.1 below), and lastly, **1** term was worked on in connection with consistency across standards.

¹ The TPG 2015-12 report : <https://www.ippc.int/core-activities/standards-setting/expert-drafting-groups/technical-panels/technical-panel-glossary-phytosanitary-terms-ispm-5>

- [6] Additionally, the TPG worked on **6** terms that are not on the *List of topics for IPPC standards* (“integrity (of a consignment)”, “practically free”, “protected area”, “quarantine facility”, “seeds (as a commodity class)” and the “concept of traceability”).
- [7] It is recalled that **3** terms were approved for member consultation by the SC May 2015 for submission to the 2016 consultation period.
- [8] The issues discussed are summarized below and cross-references given to the relevant sections in the TPG report.

1. REVIEW OF DRAFT ISPMs IN RELATION TO TERMS AND TO CONSISTENCY

1.1 Draft Amendments to the Glossary (1994-001) and translation adjustments to ISPM 5

- [9] In agreement with the SC May 2015 decision, the draft *Amendments to the Glossary* (1994-001) approved for member consultation in May 2015 would be collated with additional terms to be approved by SC May 2016 and submitted to member consultation in 2016. Therefore, the TPG did not have any member comments on draft *Amendments to the Glossary* (1994-001) to review.
- [10] As mandated by SC May 2015, the TPG member for Spanish reviewed ISPM 5 in Spanish for consistency and translation issues. TPG was briefed on the progress and agreed that the Language review group for Spanish should review and validate the proposed adjustments (see section 6.2.1 of the TPG report).
- [11] The work related to the translation adjustments to the Spanish version of ISPM 5, although mandated to the TPG, is being presented in the Standard Setting Unit update (14_SC_2016_May under agenda item 3.3) as similar work was carried out also for ISPM 5 in Chinese directly by the Language review group for Chinese, and because the work was combined with the work on the implementation of other ink amendments.

1.2 Other draft ISPMs from member consultation (1 July – 30 November 2015)

- [12] The TPG reviewed comments on terms and consistency for other draft ISPMs from the 2015 member consultation and reviewed the drafts for consistency. Comments on translations of terms and definitions were also reviewed and suggestions made, and forwarded to FAO Translation services.
- [13] The TPG reviewed **1** draft ISPM appendix; amendments to **2** ISPM annexes; **4** draft phytosanitary treatments, and; **6** draft diagnostic protocols (discussions are detailed in sections 4.1-4.13 of the TPG report).

2. INDIVIDUAL TERMS AND DEFINITIONS AND AMENDMENTS TO THE GLOSSARY

2.1 Consideration of terms in the *List of topics for IPPC standards*

- [14] The TPG discussed terms on the *List of topics for IPPC standards* based on proposals prepared by its members. The outcome of the discussions is summarized below and details are given in the TPG report.
- [15] The table below covers only terms that are not part of the draft 2016 *Amendments to the Glossary* (1994-001). The draft 2016 *Amendments to the Glossary* (1994-001) are for consideration under agenda item 5.1 of the SC May 2016 agenda and concern the terms “exclusion (of a pest)” (2010-008), “quarantine” (2015-002), “test” (2015-003), “visual examination” (2013-010) and “pre-clearance” (2013-016).
- [16] For details on the status of terms and discussions in the TPG meeting, refer to the TPG work plan 2015-2016 (Appendix 9 of the TPG report).

Term	Outcome of the discussions and proposals to the SC
-------------	---

“confinement facility” (2015-001) (5.1.1 in TPG report)	Proposed for deletion from the <i>List of topics for IPPC standards</i> . Consequential following the proposed revision of “quarantine” given in the draft 2016 <i>Amendments to the Glossary</i> .
“containment” (2011-004), “control (of a pest)” (2011-005), “eradication”(2011-003), “suppression” (2011-002) (5.1.2 in TPG report)	Proposed for deletion from the <i>List of topics for IPPC standards</i> as the TPG, following SC May 2015 guidance, did not agree on the issue of the broad or narrow understanding of “phytosanitary measure” and therefore agreed to not propose revisions of the definitions for these terms. The proposals submitted originally in the draft 2013 <i>Amendments to the Glossary</i> will be archived for consideration if the terms are revised in the future.
“country of origin” (2006-016) (5.1.3 in the TPG report)	Proposed for deletion from the <i>List of topics for IPPC standards</i> . This term had been pending on the TPG work programme for a number of years. The TPG re-evaluated the need to review the use of the term in ISPM 11 and ISPM 20, agreeing that the term did not seem to cause confusion but that any adjustments to the ISPMs could possibly change the intended meaning. The TPG therefore did not wish to suggest changes to the ISPMs.
“inspection” (2015-012) (5.1.6 in the TPG report)	Proposed for deletion from the <i>List of topics for IPPC standards</i> as the current definition of “inspection” and the proposed revisions of “test” and “visual examination” adequately reflect the uses in adopted ISPMs. The definitions are general; any particular requirements that would differ from those described in the definitions should be clarified in the ISPM text.
“bark (as a commodity)” (2013-005) (4.2 in the SC-7 2015 report)	The SC-7 in May 2015 withdrew the term because they did not feel it was needed to define “bark” as a commodity, and because they were afraid of possible repercussions on the future Glossary work; they did not think there should be two definitions for all terms that may also be commodities. The TPG did not reconsider the term in their December 2015 meeting.

2.2 Terms or issues that need further discussion by the SC

- [17] **“commodity class”** (2015-013). The TPG discussed the addition of this term to their work programme and noted the SC May 2015 discussions on “commodity” and “commodity class”. Some TPG members felt that the relation between harmonization of terms in ISPM 5 and ePhyto respectively needed thorough consideration and clarification. It was noted that the ePhyto commodity codes are built into a three-layer hierarchy. Also possible relations between ePhyto codes and customs codes may need to be considered. The term “commodity class” will be discussed in the next TPG meeting and the TPG felt that it would be very valuable to receive input on this from the ePhyto Steering group. For this reason, the TPG agreed to invite a representative from the ePhyto Steering Group to a dedicated part of their next meeting.
- [18] **Concept of “traceability”**. As mandated by SC May 2015, the TPG discussed the concept of “traceability” and acknowledged that there are numerous understandings and types of traceability in the phytosanitary context, for instance related to phytosanitary certificates or to phytosanitary actions, and therefore trying to gain one common understanding of the concept of traceability may be very challenging. The TPG noted that although the use and meaning of the concept varies between different ISPMs, those uses are all clear in the context and do not cause confusion.
- [19] The TPG felt that ISPM 12 provides adequate guidance in relation to traceability on a general level. One member felt that, in respect to the draft ISPM on the *International movement of grain* (2008-007), traceability is not particularly important for grain in a phytosanitary context because of the lower level of pest risk.
- [20] For future draft ISPMs, the TPG urged drafting groups to ensure that whenever traceability or similar terms are being used, the concept and requirements should be clearly described. The TPG felt that an excellent example of this was the use in ISPM 34 (*Design and operation of post-entry quarantine stations for plants*), section 2.3.2 “...a system to enable full traceability of the consignments, through

the post-entry quarantine (PEQ) station (the traceability system should use a unique identifier from plant consignment arrival through handling, treatment and testing, until release or destruction of the infested consignment)”.

- [21] Additionally, the TPG highlighted that should the SC wish to proceed with defining the term, numerous ink amendments would likely be needed to ISPMs to ensure that the meaning of the standards would be retained.
- [22] The TPG recommended that should the SC wish to discuss in-depth the concept of traceability, the table outlining the current use in ISPMs of “traceability” and related terms presented in this meeting could be used as basis for the discussions.
- [23] **Process load.** The TPG considered if this term should be deleted from ISPM 5, but it was not clear if there is an IPPC-related meaning of the term that would warrant its continued inclusion in the Glossary (it is used only once in ISPM 18 (*Guidelines for the use of irradiation as a phytosanitary measure*) and in ISPM 5 definitions of “dose mapping” and “minimum absorbed dose”). If so, perhaps the term could be used also for other treatment types than irradiation. The TPG suggested that the SC should consider if this requires additional discussion and if needed, request the TPPT to consider this question.

2.3 Proposed additions to the *List of topics for IPPC standards*

- [24] During discussions, the following terms were proposed for addition to the *List of topics for IPPC standards*:

Term	TPG report	Proposal
“confinement”	5.1.1	Addition (to consider revision, or possibly deletion from the Glossary, due to the proposed revision of “quarantine” as this term is a subset of “confinement” and because the revision of “quarantine” would make the two definitions inconsistent).
“ecosystems”	8	Addition (to consider deletion from ISPM 5 as some TPG members felt the term did not have a particular IPPC meaning).
“growing season” and “growing period”	8	Addition (to clarify the difference between these two terms especially because of the links of “area, place of production or production site” to “growing season” and not to “growing period”, which seemed odd because a “growing period” was supposed to be more specific than a “growing season”).
“habitat”	8	Addition (to consider deletion from ISPM 5 as some TPG members felt the term did not have a particular IPPC meaning).
“modern biotechnology”	8	Addition (to consider deletion from ISPM 5 as some TPG members felt the term did not have a particular IPPC meaning).

3. CONSISTENCY IN THE USE OF TERMS

- [25] The *General recommendations on consistency* were modified by adding a note on the use of bodies of CPM (rather than “IPPC”) when referred to as taking action. The TPG also accepted a number of editorial changes suggested by the IPPC Secretariat to help increase clarity (see section 6.1 and Appendix 7 of the TPG report). The guidance on the *General recommendations on consistency* is provided in the IPPC Procedure manual for standard setting², and the full list of terms are available in the IPPC Style guide³ (updated in February 2016).

² IPPC Procedure manual for standard setting: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/1086/>

³ IPPC Style guide: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/132/>

[26] The TPG proposed a number of ink amendments, presented to the SC in 06_SC_2016_May and attachments (agenda item 9.2) with detailed explanations for the proposals:

- Ink amendments to improve consistency across standards to replace “trading partner” (2013-009) with more appropriate wording are presented in Attachment 1 (see section 6.3.1 of the TPG report), and to replace “protected area” with the Glossary term “regulated area”, where appropriate, are presented in Attachment 3 (see section 8 of the TPG report).
- Ink amendments to ISPM 3 to replace “quarantine facility” with the Glossary term “quarantine station” are presented in Attachment 2 (see section 5.1.1 of the TPG report).
- Ink amendments to ISPM 5 to the term “practically free” presented in Attachment 4 (see section 5.1.4 of the TPG report).

4. ISSUES RELATED TO THE ORGANIZATION AND CONTENT OF TPG WORK

4.1 Annotated Glossary

[27] Intermediate versions of the explanatory document on ISPM 5, the “Annotated Glossary” are reviewed by the TPG yearly; these versions take account of any relevant decisions taken by the TPG, SC and CPM. The TPG in their 2015 meeting reviewed the Annotated Glossary to finalize it for publication, prepared every three years (see section 7 of the TPG report). Following endorsement by the SC through e-decision for the publication, the Annotated Glossary was published on 14 March 2016 on the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP)⁴.

[28] During the review of the Annotated Glossary, the TPG agreed (see section 7 of the TPG report):

- that “revised” should be included only at the mention of the first source of revision and that this should be applied also to ISPM 5.
- that ink amendments should not be listed in the sources of terms in ISPM 5, and that in the Annotated Glossary they should be listed in the note column only.
- not to retain the asterisks indicating terms on the TPG work programme in the Annotated Glossary. In the TPG 2014 meeting, the TPG had felt it was useful to have the asterisks not only in ISPM 5 but also in the Annotated Glossary to indicate the terms on the TPG work programme. However, the TPG reconsidered this, agreeing not to include them because there would be divergence between ISPM 5 (revised almost annually) and the Annotated Glossary (published only every three years).

4.2 TPG work plan

[29] The TPG updated its work plan for 2015-16 (section 9 of the TPG Report). It is recalled that the work plan lists both terms that are on the *List of topics for IPPC standards* and those that the TPG is working on due to consequential changes (i.e. without topic numbers) proposed to existing terms or definitions in order to ensure consistency, or because of other reasons as mandated by the SC. The work plan therefore provides a clear overview of all terms the TPG works on, including the status and history of the terms (see Appendix 9 of the TPG report).

4.3 Proposed change to the TPG Specification

[30] When reviewing the member comments on the draft annexes (diagnostic protocols) to ISPM 27 (see sections 4.7 and 9 of the report), the TPG concluded that the issues raised in member comments in relation to terminology were often too technical for the TPG to recommend solutions on them. Also, the TPG deemed that many comments identified as consistency issues were actually editorial issues, which should be corrected by the IPPC Secretariat editor. In addition, it was noted that not all draft DPs had been included on the TPG 2015-12 agenda as they had been processed for adoption directly, having been submitted to member consultation in February 2015. Due to the difficulty in providing adequate

⁴ Explanatory document on ISPM 5, the “Annotated Glossary”: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/42/>

guidance on the terminology and consistency issues in DPs, and considering that only some DPs would be submitted for review by the TPG, the TPG suggested that the TPG review of draft DPs should be discontinued in a formal manner. Instead, the TPG proposed that the TPDP may contact the TPG direction for any query related to terminology or consistency in the use of terms. Such a change in the content of TPG work would foresee a modification to the TPG Specification.

4.3 Implementation facilitation of the Glossary

[31] The IPPC Secretary in his opening remarks suggested that the TPG would work towards expanding the influence and increasing the use of the Glossary. The TPG liked the idea and one TPG member agreed to collaborate with the IPPC Secretariat to prepare advocacy material as a first step to attain these goals (see section 1.1 and 11.4 of the TPG report).