



UPDATE ON ACTIVITIES OF THE TECHNICAL PANEL FOR THE GLOSSARY FROM MAY 2016 TO APRIL 2017

(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 2017:

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 Roshdy OMAR (Egypt)	Arabic	2017
Mr Andrei ORLINSKI (EPPO)	Russian	2020 (1 st term: 2010-2015)

[3] It is noted that two TPG members' terms are ending in 2017 and that calls have been made for new members. In addition, one member for English informed the TPG that 2017 would be his last TPG meeting.

[4] Currently the TPG has 24 terms on their work programme, 21 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 2016 to April 2017

[5] The Technical Panel for the Glossary met in Rome, Italy, on 12-15 December 2016. The report from the meeting is available on the IPP¹.

[6] In 2016, the TPG worked on **19 terms** on the *List of topics for IPPC standards*: **8** terms are presented to the SC-7 May 2017 as draft 2016 Amendments to the Glossary (these draft Amendments include terms approved for first consultation by the SC in 2015 and in 2016); **5** terms are presented to the SC May 2017 meeting for approval for first consultation; **3** terms are suggested to be deleted from the work programme of the TPG (see section 2.1 below), **2** terms were worked on in connection to ePhyto and the use of “contracting party”, “country” and similar terms were reviewed for consistency across standards. Additionally, the TPG worked on **1** term that is not on the *List of topics for IPPC standards* (“detention”).

¹ The TPG 2016-12 report: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/84013/>

[7] The issues discussed are summarized below and cross-references given to the relevant sections in the TPG report. All recommendations for SC decisions are at the end of the document, and links to relevant proposed decisions are given under each section.

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

1.1 Draft 2016 Amendments to the Glossary (1994-001)

- [8] The TPG reviewed comments from the first consultation 2016 on the draft 2016 *Amendments to the Glossary*, which also contained the draft Amendments approved for consultation by the SC in May 2015. The TPG responded to all comments and modified where appropriate the draft Amendments that will be presented to the SC-7 2017 (see section 4.1 of the TPG 2016-12 report). Comments on translations of terms and definitions were also reviewed and suggestions will be forwarded to Translation-services when the draft Amendments are submitted for translation before adoption.
- [9] The TPG suggested that any future draft Amendments should contain only the arguments for the proposals, but not the historic information, when they are sent for consultation (the historic information should be retained for the SC only).
- [10] The TPG noted that draft Amendments would no longer be appended to the TPG report, as this was not in line with the standard setting process and availability of documents.
- [11] As to the **draft 2016 Amendments to the Glossary**, two issues are included in this update as considered of particular importance for the SC to note (no action needed):
- [12] Endangered area. The TPG agreed to propose the withdrawal of “endangered area” (2014-009) from the draft 2016 *Amendments to the Glossary* (for SC-7 consideration) because the TPG acknowledged that the definition of “endangered area” should not be revised as the term is defined in Article II of IPPC and the original definition is not incorrect. The TPG also agreed that the misunderstandings (identified by contracting parties in the [General IPPC Survey 2012–2013](#) undertaken by the Implementation Review and Support System) that the revision to the definition could address were not sufficiently important to merit an “agreed interpretation” of the term. Instead, note 1 in the Explanatory document on ISPM 5 (the “Annotated Glossary”) would be adjusted to clarify that the term “endangered area” should not be misinterpreted to mean an environmentally protected area in the ecological conservation sense.
- [13] Visual examination. The TPG also considered whether “visual examination” should be withdrawn from the draft 2016 *Amendments to the Glossary* based on a discussion regarding “inspection” in relation to “visual examination”. This because the TPG felt that the definition of “inspection” may be considered outdated due to advances in modern technology that result in visual examination not being the only method used for inspection. The TPG considered that should “inspection” reflect current practices, it should include mention of for instance olfactory and acoustic examination. Consequently, the TPG discussed if “visual examination” might also be considered outdated, but agreed that the definition (as modified in their 2016 meeting) was still correct although it may be considered irrelevant should “inspection” refer to also other types of examination. Therefore, the TPG considered to propose the withdrawal of “visual examination” from the draft 2016 *Amendments to the Glossary*, as the SC may find that the term should be reconsidered in combination with “inspection” in the future, but agreed to put it forward for SC-7 consideration as the current revision still improves the definition. The TPG proposed to include “inspection” on the *List of topics for IPPC standards* (see section 2.3 of this update).
- [14] In this context, the TPG noted that ISPM 23 (*Guidelines for inspection*) would benefit from revision to include also testing (i.e. to help implementation by clarifying the relationship between the measures). The Secretariat encouraged the TPG members to liaise with their NPPOs, should they wish to submit the revision of ISPM 23 as a topic at a future call for topics.

1.2 Other draft ISPMs from first consultation (1 July – 30 September 2016)

- [15] The TPG reviewed comments on terms and consistency for other draft ISPMs from the 2016 first consultation. Comments on translations of terms and definitions were also reviewed and suggestions made and suggestions will be forwarded to Translation-services when the draft ISPMs are submitted for translation before adoption.
- [16] The TPG noted that there were several consultation comments that identified terminology and consistency issues in the draft standards, and appreciated that IPPC Official contact points seemed to be more attentive of these issues than in the past.
- [17] The TPG reviewed 2 draft ISPMs (discussions are detailed in sections 4.2 and 4.3 of the TPG report).
- [18] Regarding the draft Revision of ISPM 6, the TPG did not have any substantial issues for SC consideration. However, for information, the TPG decided to review the term “survey” (2013-015), although actually on pending status, when reviewing the draft revision of ISPM 6 to ensure a consistent approach to the review. The TPG proposed a revised definition of “survey” in the 2017 *draft Amendments to the Glossary* that was fully in line with the concept outlined in the draft revision to ISPM 6.
- [19] Regarding the draft ISPM on Requirements for the use of temperature treatments as phytosanitary measures (2014-005), the TPG discussed whether to recommend that Appendix 1 be moved to ISPM 28, noting that this discussion was at the margins of the TPG mandate and that it was a matter for the SC to consider. One TPG member felt that there was an inconsistency between the scope of the standard (guidance on the application of temperature treatments) and the content of the appendix (guidance for temperature treatment efficacy studies), and considered if perhaps the appendix would fit better under ISPM 28. Other TPG members preferred including the appendix in the draft ISPM because of the following reasons:
- [20] - Efficacy of temperature treatments is a major concern with many countries lacking trust in the efficacy studies. The appendix will help countries to carry out studies for temperature treatments in a consistent manner, and this should enhance confidence in the treatments between countries. The link between the scope of the standard and the issue of trust is mentioned in the draft standard. One TPG member expressed concern that countries might feel that historically used treatments would need to be supported by research carried out according to the appendix to be able to be used internationally. This could potentially impede trade. However, the TPG stressed that the guidance in the appendix would be highly useful to help researchers design their experiments better to generate meaningful data and that the appendix was not prescriptive.
- [21] - There are practical examples of countries needing guidance on designing temperature treatment efficacy studies.
- [22] - The appendix has broader relevance than IPPC adopted PTs and it would therefore not be appropriate to include it under ISPM 28. However, should there be a wish to do so, a topic for the revision of ISPM 28 should be submitted in response to a call for topics.

2. INDIVIDUAL TERMS AND DEFINITIONS AND AMENDMENTS TO THE GLOSSARY

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

- [23] 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.
- [24] The table below covers only terms that are not part of the draft 2017 *Amendments to the Glossary* (1994-001). The draft 2017 *Amendments to the Glossary* (1994-001) are for consideration under agenda item 4.4 of the SC May 2017 agenda and concern the terms “confinement (of a regulated article)”, “growing period” and “growing season” (2016-004), “mark” (2013-007) and “survey” (2013-015).

- [25] For details on the status of terms and discussions in the TPG meeting, refer to the TPG work plan 2017-2018 (Appendix 6 of the TPG report).

Term	TPG report	Outcome of the discussions and proposals to the SC
“ecosystems” (2016-003) “habitat” (2016-005)	Section 5.6	Proposed for deletion from the <i>List of topics for IPPC standards</i> .
“modern biotechnology” (2016-006)		The TPG discussed whether these terms should be proposed for deletion from ISPM 5 but agreed that the terms were used in meanings specific to IPPC and were useful terms to retain in the Glossary.

2.2 Terms or issues that need further discussion by the SC

2.2.1 “Commodity” and “commodity class” in the context of ePhyto

- [26] As agreed by the SC May 2016, the TPG discussed the terms “commodity” and “commodity class” with a representative from the ePhyto Steering Group to try to ensure a harmonized approach to the standardized product descriptions needed for ePhyto.

Background

- [27] The Glossary defines both “commodity” and “commodity class” as well as a number of terms as a “commodity class”. However, it is not always clear which commodities belong to a specific commodity class, or if one commodity class term should actually rather be considered part of another commodity class. This has created some confusion specifically in relation to the development of standards for specific commodity classes. The current definition of “commodity class” as well as the categorization of specific commodities into commodity classes has also made it challenging for the IPPC community to agree on specific requirements when developing standards (e.g. for “wood”). This because there is a discrepancy between the groupings of commodities based on an *a priori* perceived similar pest risk and the actual specific requirements that may be set for the individual commodities within the commodity class.

Discussion

- [28] The TPG felt that the general discussion on grouping commodities and how to define their hierarchy was not essential for the purposes of developing ISPMs. The TPG stressed that the scope of an ISPM should define what the ISPM concerns, but also acknowledged that when there are existing Glossary terms that are defined differently from the scope of an ISPM, this creates confusion (e.g. the draft ISPM on *International movement of cut flowers and foliage* (2008-005) has a different scope from what is intended by “cut flowers and branches (as a commodity class)” in ISPM 5).
- [29] As to the broader context of harmonized phytosanitary terminology, the TPG appreciated the opportunity to discuss this with Mr Nico HORN, representative of the ePhyto Steering Group (ESG), to promote a degree of alignment between ISPM 5 and ePhyto and provide input in the standardization of product descriptions to be used in ePhyto.
- [30] Mr Nico HORN gave a presentation on standardized product descriptions needed for the ePhyto system and stressed that the harmonization of product descriptions was essential for ePhyto but would also be useful for the paper phytosanitary certificates.
- [31] He noted that while the use of international custom codes (HS codes) would seem a beneficial way to harmonize product categorization, they are too few and the individual codes cover too many different plant products to be useful for phytosanitary certification. Furthermore, he explained that adding new HS codes is a lengthy process so it would be unrealistic to request that all plant products be given individual HS codes. Therefore, and because making HS codes mandatory would add an obligation not required by ISPM 12, the use of HS codes would be optional in ePhyto as it is currently optional for paper phytosanitary certificates.

- [32] He explained that the main challenges faced in setting up the product descriptions concern how to categorize products (i.e. commodities in the ISPM 5 sense) in a standardized manner and without overlaps. To have a functioning electronic system, entries need to be systematized and standardized, and not allow countries to input entries incorrectly which could result in erroneous handling at import. For instance, the same product may appear in different categories according to its intended use. This is the case for “potatoes”, which may be described as tubers (seed potatoes for planting) or as vegetables (ware potatoes for consumption), with different levels of risk and consequent phytosanitary import requirements. Likewise, some seeds (in the botanical sense) may be for consumption and others for planting, again with significant differences in the pest risk.
- [33] Added challenges to this were (i) the discrepancies between the proposed product descriptions and the ISPM 5 definitions. The Glossary defines specific products (commodity classes, actually) by making their intended use explicit. For instance, “bulbs and tubers” or “seeds” are only intended for planting, and not for processing or consumption, whereas in the ePhyto context these products per se may also be for processing or consumption. (ii) The relation between the ePhyto system and ISPM 32 (*Categorization of commodities according to their pest risk*) because this standard requires that certain commodities are exempted from phytosanitary certification due to their level of processing or their intended use. Should the ePhyto system allow for certificates to be issued also for no-risk commodities (as still required by some countries) or only for risk products?
- [34] First, the TPG agreed that it was not appropriate to link the product descriptions to the Glossary terms “commodity” or “commodity class”, therefore using the word “product” was appropriate. The TPG also agreed that ISPM 5 terms should be used in the ePhyto context only when useful and should not be mandatory. The TPG agreed with the importance of having sufficient parameters for categorization to ensure that phytosanitary certification would be unambiguous. The TPG felt that it was necessary to have three layers for plants and plant products: intended use, plant parts and condition.
- [35] Second, the TPG suggested that the intended use be the first input level as this was deemed the most essential parameter to take into account. By having intended use at the first level, categorization of the products would be more straightforward. The system should hereafter prompt a list of products (i.e. at the second level) that would automatically fall under the respective first level entry (e.g. first level: consumption; second level: potatoes). This would allow the system to filter the products without countries having to consider whether to name a potato “a tuber”, “seed potato”, “ware potato”, etc., as the system would automatically make this distinction.
- [36] In this context, the TPG considered that there were three intended-use categories: planting, consumption and other uses (e.g. crafts, decorative products, cut flowers), and processing (see ISPM 32, section 1.2).
- [37] Third, the TPG supported describing the products according to the “plant part” and the “condition” as the second and third levels, respectively.
- [38] Fourth, acknowledging that some countries would still require phytosanitary certificates for products categorized in ISPM 32 as low risk, the TPG suggested that the system be set up so that it would query input where a phytosanitary certificate would not normally be requested (e.g. by prompting “Do you realize that, according to ISPM 32, no phytosanitary certificate should be required for this product?”).
- [39] Fifth, the TPG recommended that the ePhyto system should:
- facilitate choosing the right description (e.g. by auto filling and not allowing the selection of “seeds” after having chosen the intended use “consumption”, or by querying the selection)
 - provide descriptions of the categories of products (e.g. via a pop up or a float over)
 - provide scroll down description lists as comprehensive as needed, but as short as possible to reduce the number of possible errors by users (the longer the list, the more subtle the differences between descriptions and higher probability of selecting the wrong description).

- [40] **Oversight body.** The Secretariat invited the TPG to consider which body should have governance of determining and revising the list of products (now called “IPPC commodity classes”²) in the future. The TPG considered that while the harmonized product descriptions would facilitate both paper and electronic phytosanitary certificates, the immediate objective is to enable the development of ePhyto for which strict and thorough harmonization on the one hand, and a flexible development process on the other hand, are essential. Therefore, the list of products should not be included as or considered part of ISPM 12 (i.e. requiring a lengthy standard setting and adoption procedure). Nevertheless, there would be value in having a formal oversight body to endorse the changes and additions to the list of products considering the standardization needed (and consequently international harmonization). The TPG recommended the SC become responsible for the oversight of the product descriptions, as this work was still linked to ISPM 12 and phytosanitary certification.
- [41] Mr Nico HORN agreed that the process of maintaining the list of product descriptions would need an oversight body and supported that SC would be the suitable one. He noted that the ESG should propose a procedure for developing and maintaining the list.
- [42] The TPG suggested that, for transparency purposes, the list of products could be presented to the CPM for noting. A TPG member added that it might be useful to have a “hands on” demonstration of how to input data into the system during a CPM side session and take that opportunity to invite for further comments to the description list.
- [43] **Addition of “commodity class” terms to the *List of topics for IPPC standards*.** Following the discussions, the TPG felt that the definition for “commodity class” was not useful and considered that it might be suitable to delete it from the Glossary. The TPG agreed to analyse how the term had been used in standards, however, before proposing its deletion. As to the actual terms defining different commodity classes, the TPG suggested that these be reviewed carefully to determine if their definitions add value or rather create challenges, and thus agreed that these terms should all be added to their work programme.

2.2.2 Concept of terminology

- [44] The TPG developed a paper on guidelines for a consistent terminology in ISPMs with an aim at facilitating the drafting work of the SC and expert drafting groups (EWGs) and at improving transparency. The paper contains a number of principles around terminology that, if followed, will help ensure consistent terminology in ISPMs from drafting to adoption stage. The paper is presented to the SC for consideration and discussion under agenda item 6.2 and will, should the SC agree, become part of the TPG section in the IPPC Procedure Manual for Standard Setting.

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

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

Term	TPG report	Proposal
“contamination”	Section 4.1	Proposed addition to the <i>List of topics for IPPC standards</i> for a review of the use of the term across standards. When discussing “contaminating pest, contamination” (2012-001), a comment from first consultation suggested that the use of “contamination” in ISPMs be reviewed. The TPG agreed that there may be some cases in adopted (e.g. ISPM 18 (<i>Guidelines for the use of irradiation as a phytosanitary measure</i>)) or draft ISPMs where the term is used with a different meaning from its definition in the Glossary, and concurred that a review across ISPMs should be undertaken.
“inspection”	Section 4.1	Proposed addition to the <i>List of topics for IPPC standards</i> for possible revision. In relation to the discussion on “visual

² See <http://ephyto.ippc.int/commodity>

		examination”, the TPG considered that the definition of “inspection” might be outdated and that should “inspection” reflect current practices, it should include mention of for instance olfactory and acoustic examination.
“bulbs and tubers (as a commodity class)” “fruits and vegetables (as a commodity class)” “grain (as a commodity class)” “plants <i>in vitro</i> (as a commodity class)” “seeds (as a commodity class)” “wood (as a commodity class)”	Section 5.2	Proposed addition to the <i>List of topics for IPPC standards</i> for possible deletion or revision. The TPG discussed all commodity class-related terms and suggested they be reviewed and possibly deleted from the Glossary (see further details on these discussions in section 2.2.1 of this paper).
“treatment”	Section 8	Proposed addition to the <i>List of topics for IPPC standards</i> for possible revision. The TPG suggested that it may be useful to revise the definition to allow for farmers treating their crops to call this a “treatment” (although not official), because it has proven difficult to find an alternative term to be used in national legislation for the non-official case. The TPG felt that “treatment” is both a common term and also that it was useful to have it defined in the Glossary. The TPG agreed it would be useful to analyse the term and definition further.

3. CONSISTENCY IN THE USE OF TERMS

3.1 General recommendations on use of terms in ISPMs

[46] The TPG modified the *General recommendations on use of terms in ISPMs* by adding notes on “prescribed, required and target” and “invasive, invasiveness, invasion”, and modifying the note on “efficacy” (see section 6.1 of the TPG report). In addition, the TPG made editorial changes to most of the notes.

[47] The TPG agreed to prepare notes for discussion at their 2017 meeting on:

- “acceptable level of risk”, “appropriate level of protection” (revision)
- “accredit”, “authorize” and “certify” (revision)
- “contamination” (revision)
- “country”, “contracting party”, “NPPO” (revision)
- “dispersal, spread, dissemination”
- “exotic, non-indigenous, non-naturally present” and “hazard”.

[48] The guidance on the *General recommendations on consistency* is provided in the IPPC Procedure Manual for Standard Setting³, and the full list of terms is available in the IPPC Style guide⁴ (updated in April 2017).

³ IPPC Procedure Manual for Standard Setting: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/1086/>

⁴ IPPC Style guide: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/132/>

3.2 Ink amendments

- [49] The TPG proposed one ink amendment for the Glossary term “detention”, presented to the SC in Attachment 1 of this paper, to correct an inconsistency of the term “detention” with other Glossary definitions as it has the cross reference “see quarantine”. Glossary terms are bolded in the definitions of other Glossary terms to ensure cross-reference, whereas “see...” is not used. Therefore, the TPG agreed that an ink amendment should be proposed to delete the wording “(see quarantine)” from the definition of “detention” (see 5.3 in TPG report).
- [50] The SC is also reminded that a list of all proposed or approved ink amendments is posted on the IPP⁵. Following request from the TPG, the IPPC Secretariat will provide hyperlinks to all the publicly posted papers that contained the ink amendments in the list that will be posted after CPM-12 (2017).

3.2 Consistency across standards for “contracting party”, “country” and similar terms

- [51] The TPG analysed the use of these terms in standards to understand if they were used inconsistently, possibly leading to misunderstandings (see section 6.3.1 of the TPG report). The TPG felt that the terms were generally used with their correct meanings and that none of the cases of slightly incorrect uses in ISPMs would necessitate ink amendments. The TPG acknowledged that “countries” were often used in ISPMs to mean “contracting parties”, but that this was not considered a problem or in conflict with the IPPC. The TPG also recalled that the *General recommendations on use of terms in ISPMs* specified when to use the various terms.

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

4.1 Annotated Glossary

- [52] 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 2016 meeting reviewed the Annotated Glossary based on the version published in March 2016 on the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP)⁶.

4.2 TPG work plan

- [53] The TPG updated its work plan for 2017-2018 (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 Implementation facilitation of the Glossary

- [54] The TPG reviewed a brochure on phytosanitary terminology that had been prepared by the IPPC Secretariat together with various stakeholders (see section 11.3 of the TPG report). The brochure was since posted in English on the IPP⁷. The IPPC Secretariat has accepted a kind offer from the North American Plant Protection Organization to translate the brochure into Spanish.

4.4 CBD Cartagena protocol terms vs ISPM 5

- [55] The Standards Officer, responsible for liaising with the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), informed the TPG that the CBD wished TPG’s assistance to review a draft document comparing terms used in the Cartagena Protocol with terms in the ISPM 5 explaining the linkages and differences. The

⁵ List of all proposed or approved ink amendments: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/82115/>

⁶ Explanatory document on ISPM 5, the “Annotated Glossary”: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/42/>

⁷ Brochure on international phytosanitary terminology is available here: https://www.ippc.int/static/media/uploads/web_ippc_ispm5_e_170216.pdf

TPG was willing to give assistance, provided the SC would find it appropriate to include on the TPG work programme. The TPG also suggested that the CBD Secretariat consider preparing a similar document vis-a-vis the OIE and CODEX Glossaries.

Attachment 1: Proposed ink amendment to ISPM 5 (“detention”)

- [56] The Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG) reviewed the definition of “detention” in their 2016 meeting when discussing “confinement (of a regulated article)” (2016-002).
- [57] The TPG noted that the definition of “detention” was inconsistent with other Glossary definitions and the general style as it had the cross reference “see quarantine”. Glossary terms are using bolded words when using other Glossary terms in their definition to ensure easy cross reference, whereas cross reference to any other term (by “see...”) is not used. The intention and legal effect of “see...” is obscure, and therefore inappropriate, and more confusing than helpful in harmonized terminology.
- [58] The below ink amendment to delete the cross reference “see quarantine” is therefore proposed to ensure consistency among Glossary terms.

Table 1. Proposed ink amendment to ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*) for consistency

detention	Keeping a consignment in official custody or confinement, as a phytosanitary measure (see quarantine)-[FAO, 1990; revised FAO, 1995; CEPM, 1999; ICPM, 2005]
------------------	--