



Food and Agriculture
Organization of the
United Nations



International
Plant Protection
Convention

REPORT

Technical Panel for the Glossary

Rome, Italy

04 - 07 December 2017

IPPC Secretariat

FAO encourages the use, reproduction and dissemination of material in this information product. Except where otherwise indicated, material may be copied, downloaded and printed for private study, research and teaching purposes, or for use in non-commercial products or services, provided that appropriate acknowledgement of FAO as the source and copyright holder is given and that FAO's endorsement of users' views, products or services is not implied in any way.

All requests for translation and adaptation rights, and for resale and other commercial use rights should be made via www.fao.org/contact-us/licence-request or addressed to copyright@fao.org.

FAO information products are available on the FAO website (www.fao.org/publications) and can be purchased through publications-sales@fao.org.

The designations The designations employed and the presentation of material in this information product do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) concerning the legal or development status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries. The mention of specific companies or products of manufacturers, whether or not these have been patented, does not imply that these have been endorsed or recommended by FAO in preference to others of a similar nature that are not mentioned. The views expressed in this information product are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of FAO.

CONTENTS

| | | |
|--------|---|----|
| 1. | Opening of the meeting..... | 5 |
| 2. | Meeting arrangements..... | 5 |
| 2.1 | Selection of the Chairperson..... | 5 |
| 2.2. | Selection of the Rapporteur..... | 5 |
| 2.3 | Review and adoption of the agenda..... | 5 |
| 2.4 | Current specification: TP5 (TPG) (2016) (for information)..... | 5 |
| 3. | Administrative Matters | 5 |
| 4. | Reports | 5 |
| 4.1 | Previous meetings of the TPG (December 2016) | 5 |
| 4.2 | Extracts from other meeting reports of relevance to the TPG (SC, CPM) | 6 |
| 4.3 | Current work plan..... | 7 |
| 5. | Review relating to draft ISPMs sent for first consultation in 2017 (1 July-30 September) | 8 |
| 5.1 | Draft 2017 Amendments to ISPM 5: <i>Glossary of Phytosanitary terms</i> (1994-001) | 8 |
| 5.2 | Draft ISPM on <i>International movement of cut flowers and foliage</i> (2008-005)..... | 10 |
| 5.3 | Draft ISPM on <i>Requirements for the use of fumigation as a phytosanitary measure</i> (2014-004) . | 10 |
| 6. | Consideration of new or revised terms/definitions (subjects on the TPG work programme) | 14 |
| 6.1 | “commodity class” (2015-013) and other commodity class terms | 14 |
| 6.1.1. | “commodity class” (2015-013)..... | 14 |
| 6.1.2. | “fruits and vegetables (as a commodity class)” (2017-003) | 14 |
| 6.1.3. | “wood (as a commodity class)” (2017-009) | 15 |
| 6.1.4. | “cut flowers (as a commodity class)” (2012-007) | 15 |
| 6.1.5. | “grain (as a commodity class)” (2017-004)..... | 16 |
| 6.1.6. | “seeds (as a commodity class)” (2017-007) | 16 |
| 6.1.7. | “bulbs and tubers (as a commodity class)” (2017-001)..... | 16 |
| 6.1.8. | “plants in vitro (as a commodity class)” (2017-006)..... | 17 |
| 6.2 | “inspection” (2017-005) | 17 |
| 6.3. | “treatment” (2017-008) | 19 |
| 7. | Review of ISPMs for consistency of terms and style..... | 19 |
| 7.1 | General recommendations on use of terms in ISPMs..... | 19 |
| 7.2 | Consistency of adopted ISPM (standard by standard)..... | 21 |
| 7.3 | Consistency across standards: consistency review of “contamination” across ISPMs (2017-002) | 21 |

| | | |
|------|--|----|
| 8. | Annotated Glossary: 2017 intermediate version | 22 |
| 9. | Explanation of Glossary terms | 23 |
| 10. | TPG work plan | 24 |
| 11. | Membership of the TPG (See agenda item 2.3) | 24 |
| 12. | Any other business | 25 |
| 12.1 | How to avoid inconsistent / incorrect uses of Glossary terms in ISPMs | 25 |
| 13. | Date and venue of the next meeting | 25 |
| 14. | Close | 25 |
| | Appendix 1 - Agenda | 26 |
| | Appendix 2: Documents List..... | 29 |
| | Appendix 3: Participants List | 31 |
| | Appendix 4: General recommendations on use of terms in ISPMs..... | 34 |
| | Appendix 5: Proposed ink amendments to ensure a consistent use of “contamination” and its derivatives in adopted ISPMs..... | 39 |
| | Appendix 6 - TPG Work Plan 2018-2019..... | 47 |

1. Opening of the meeting

- [1] The meeting was hosted by the Italian Ministry for Agriculture (Ministero delle Politiche Agricole Alimentari e Forestali). Mr Federico SORGONI (Official of the Central Phytosanitary Office, Italian National Plant Protection Organization (NPPO)) warmly welcomed all the participants and highlighted the importance of having a common phytosanitary lexicon.
- [2] The Standards Officer welcomed the participants and wished them a fruitful meeting. He noted that the new member of the Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG) for the English language, Ms Asenath Abigail KOECH (Kenya), was unable to attend the meeting due to issues related to travel clearance from the Kenyan government. The Standards Officer underlined the importance of the TPG in contributing to sort out some current challenges that the Standards Committee (SC) is facing, and in particular, through TPG discussions on agenda item 6.1 (commodity class terms), in addressing some of the concerns related to the draft ISPM on the *International movement of grain* (2008-007) and the draft ISPM on the *International movement of cut flowers and foliage* (2008-005).

2. Meeting arrangements

2.1 Selection of the Chairperson

- [3] The TPG selected Mr John HEDLEY (New Zealand) as Chairperson.

2.2. Selection of the Rapporteur

- [4] The TPG selected Mr Ebbe NORDBO (Denmark) as Rapporteur.

2.3 Review and adoption of the agenda

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

2.4 Current specification: TP5 (TPG) (2016) (for information)

- [6] The IPPC Secretariat (hereafter “Secretariat”) presented the current specification for the TPG (TP 5)¹, summarizing the tasks and recalled that it was last modified by the SC in 2016.

3. Administrative Matters

- [7] The Secretariat clarified local arrangements and introduced the documents list ([Appendix 2](#)) and the participants list ([Appendix 3](#)), inviting TPG members to verify their contact details.

4. Reports

4.1 Previous meetings of the TPG (December 2016)

- [8] There were no comments on the report of the TPG 2016-12 meeting².
- [9] The Secretariat informed the TPG that the phytosanitary treatment search tool developed by the Secretariat to search for phytosanitary treatments adopted by the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) or used at the national level was now available³. A news item was posted on the IPP in October 2017 to inform contracting parties about the release of the tool⁴.

¹ TP 5 (2016): <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/1300/>

² The reports from TPG meetings are available here: <https://www.ippc.int/core-activities/standards-setting/expert-drafting-groups/technical-panels/technical-panel-glossary-phytosanitary-terms-isp-5>

³ Available at: <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/standards-setting/technical-panels/technical-panel-phytosanitary-treatments/phytosanitary-treatments-tool/>

⁴ <https://www.ippc.int/en/news/how-a-simple-ippc-search-tool-may-help-the-phytosanitary-treatments-worldwide/>

4.2 Extracts from other meeting reports of relevance to the TPG (SC, CPM)

- [10] The Secretariat presented extracts of meetings held since the last TPG meeting (CPM-12 (2017), SC May 2017, SC-7 May 2017 and SC November 2017), noting that the TPG had received other updates via e-mail⁵. The TPG discussed the following issues.
- [11] *Language review group process.*
- [12] In reference to the changes to the Language Review Group (LRG) process approved by CPM-12 (2017), the TPG queried how to retrieve the latest versions of standards since adjusted translations are no longer presented to the CPM for noting. The Secretariat confirmed that the modified versions of the standards will be posted on the Adopted Standards page of the IPP⁶ as they are available and all contracting parties will be notified.
- [13] The Secretariat informed that a project post in the Standard Setting Unit (SSU) to support report writing, publications, translations and the TPG work had been cancelled and that some staff will also be leaving the Standard Setting Unit (SSU) in the next months. The publication and translation of ISPMs and CPM recommendations, including those adjusted through the LRG process and ink amendments, will be handled centrally in the Secretariat and will no longer be the responsibility of the SSU. In response, the TPG stressed that publication of standards was a complicated task which required very specific expertise and experience, and expressed concerns about the consequences of those changes as regards the quality of the work.
- [14] *Future joint call for topics “Standards and Implementation” and proposals for terms to be worked on.*
- [15] The Secretariat recalled that the CPM had agreed that, in the future, joint calls for topics for standards and tools for implementation should be held. In this context, the TPG discussed whether proposals for addition, revision or deletion of Glossary terms could be submitted during this joint call. The TPG agreed that, since the SC and expert drafting groups can make proposals for terms to be worked on, contracting parties should also be allowed to do so.
- [16] In addition, the TPG discussed the possibility of working on terms that are not used in ISPMs, but used e.g. in IPPC manuals. While they recognized the usefulness of a common understanding of the terms used in IPPC manuals, they cautioned on the addition of a wide range of new terms in the Glossary because of the complexities of terminology work and the resources involved at all stages in developing and adopting terms and definitions.
- [17] The TPG eventually agreed that proposals for terms used in IPPC manuals to be defined in the Glossary could be made during the joint call, provided that the SC continues to exclusively decide on the addition of terms to the TPG work programme and the review of draft amendments to ISPM 5. They emphasized that submissions for new terms to be added to the Glossary should be accompanied by a clear explanation of the concept to be defined and a solid justification for including the term in the Glossary thus seeking harmonization of the definition. At the same time, authors of manuals and other phytosanitary resources are encouraged to use Glossary terms whenever appropriate.
- [18] *2018 work plan for the Standard Setting Unit (SSU) and 2018 TPG meeting.*
- [19] The Secretariat informed the TPG that, due to the lack of adequate staff resources and the cancellation of the project post mentioned above, some Secretariat activities will be reduced and a meeting of the TPG will not be planned for 2018, unless the appropriately skilled staff can be recruited early in 2018.
- [20] *ePhyto and ink amendments made to Appendix 1 (Electronic phytosanitary certificates, information on standard XML schemas and exchange mechanisms) to ISPM 12 (Phytosanitary certificates).*

⁵ 18_TPG_2017_Dec

⁶ <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/standards-setting/ispm5/>

- [21] The TPG applauded the June 2017 CPM Bureau decision to let the SC have an oversight role in the process of developing and maintaining the list of product descriptions to be included in the ePhyto system. They wondered whether many new terms would result from the work of the ePhyto Steering Group (ESG) and whether the TPG would be involved. The Secretariat clarified that indeed the list of product descriptions was expected to be comprehensive and include new terms, but that the process agreed to by the SC did not include the TPG. Because the process needs to be flexible and swift, the ESG would adjust terms associated with Appendix 1 to ISPM 12 immediately and present the changes for endorsement by the SC at their meetings.
- [22] The IPPC Secretariat informed the TPG that, in October 2017, the Bureau agreed to several ink amendments to Appendix 1 to ISPM 12 which were presented by the ESG and requested the Secretariat apply them immediately. One TPG member queried why the normal procedure for the ink amendments had not been followed. The Secretariat clarified that there was an urgent and exceptional need to amend Appendix 1 to ISPM 12 because countries are currently implementing the ePhyto pilot project, and that the CPM would be informed about those ink amendments.
- [23] *Draft ISPM on Requirements for the use of temperature treatments as phytosanitary measures (2014-005).*
- [24] One TPG member queried why the SC had decided in November 2017 to move the content of Appendix 1 (*Guidance for temperature treatment efficacy studies*) to this draft ISPM to appear instead in the Procedure Manual for Standard Setting, and not as an appendix to ISPM 28 (*Phytosanitary treatments for regulated pests*). The Procedure Manual would normally include administrative and procedural information related to standard setting, whereas this Appendix contained guidance on the design of research protocols. The Secretariat explained that it was decided to move the Appendix text to the Procedure Manual for Standard Setting (as a procedure of the Technical Panel for Phytosanitary Treatments (TPPT)), because there it would be easier to update, rather than in an ISPM, where revisions follow the standard setting procedure. The Secretariat clarified that the Appendix provided guidance on how to produce efficacy data accompanying the submissions of phytosanitary treatments, and felt that harmonization was not particularly needed, because the supporting research may be done differently. He noted that the work of the TPPT would be simplified if researchers and countries submitting phytosanitary treatments followed the guidance provided in this document.
- [25] *Revision of ISPM 6 (Surveillance) (2009-004).*
- [26] One TPG member pointed out that it was important for detection surveys to also determine the absence of pests, however the SC in November 2017 had inserted brackets around the reference to pest absence in the explanation of detection survey in this draft ISPM. The TPG steward clarified that this was done because the Glossary definition for “detection survey” only refers to pest presence, and not to pest absence.
- [27] The TPG:
- (1) *noted* the update provided by the Secretariat.
 - (2) *invited* the SC to consider the possibility of allowing submissions, during the call for topics “Standards and Implementation”, of terms to be worked on by the TPG at the exclusive decision of the SC, including terms that are not used in ISPMs (e.g. terms used in IPPC manuals), taking into account the above discussion.

4.3 Current work plan

- [28] The TPG updated their work plan during the meeting (see [section 10](#)).
- [29] The Secretariat recalled that the TPG had reviewed by e-decision (TPG_2017-08_e-decision_01) the entries associated with the IPPC in the draft compilation of terms used in the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, the Glossary of Phytosanitary Terms, and other Relevant Instruments, which was initiated by the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD). The Secretariat had sent the outcome

of the TPG review to the CBD Secretariat and will keep the TPG updated on any evolution related to this work.

5. Review relating to draft ISPMs sent for first consultation in 2017 (1 July-30 September)

[30] The TPG reviewed consultation comments on terms and definitions together with the draft ISPMs for consistency in the use of terms. Recommendations will be transmitted to stewards and the SC-7 (May 2018).⁷

5.1 Draft 2017 Amendments to ISPM 5: *Glossary of Phytosanitary terms* (1994-001)

[31] The Steward introduced the draft 2017 Amendments to ISPM 5 and the consultation comments⁸.

[32] “Growing period” (2016-004)

[33] *Deletion of “time”.*

[34] One consultation comment did not agree with the deletion of “time” and would have preferred to keep the wording “time period”. The TPG noted that this issue was related to a translation issue into Russian. If in Russian, it is considered essential to keep the reference to “time”, the TPG recommended it to be translated into Russian this way.

[35] *Reference to “development”.*

[36] Some consultation comments had suggested that the definition refers not only to the active growth of a plant species, but also to its development; for example, fruit ripening could be an important period for certain pests like fruit flies. The TPG agreed that the notion of “development” is already included in “growth”, as “growth” is not only a question of increasing in size. Therefore, the TPG did not add a reference to the development of the plant in the definition of “growing period”.

[37] *Reference to “in an area, place of production or production site”.*

[38] Some consultation comments did not support the proposed revision of the definition of “growing period” as they felt the addition of “in an area, place of production or production site” would confuse the definition (e.g. they considered there is a risk of understanding that if a plant is grown, during its months of active growth, in two places of production (a container plant or pot plant) the plant is considered to be grown in two growing periods).

[39] The TPG discussed the issue thoroughly, and recalled that the term “growing period” is essential for inspection and treatment purposes to ensure that those are carried out when relevant (i.e. when the plant actively grows).

[40] The TPG noted that “growing period” is meant to be more specific than “growing season” because “growing season” would refer to a plant species’ phenology in large areas like countries or regions, whereas “growing period” would refer to the actual period a plant species is grown in a specific location. They agreed that the addition of “in an area, place of production or production site” in the definition of “growing period” is necessary to convey the idea that the growing period depends on the location, and this is important for countries when setting their phytosanitary import requirements. Without the qualifier “in an area, place of production or production site”, the proposed definition would be rather tautological and meaningless.

[41] While the TPG acknowledged that plants can be moved during their growing period and can be grown in several places of production, they agreed that, in such cases, the common understanding of the definition proposed in the 2017 draft Amendments to ISPM 5 did not imply that several inspections

⁷ The tables of TPG recommendations are not attached to this report but will be posted on the TPG and SC-7 work areas.

⁸ 1994-001; 05_TPG_2017_Dec

would be required during the growing period, unless countries would deem it necessary and justified due to a change in the growing conditions related to the place of production. They recalled that Glossary definitions do not set requirements but merely stipulate the harmonized understanding of phytosanitary terms.

[42] The TPG considered, as an alternative, to delete the proposed addition of “an area, place of production or production site” and rewrite the definition as follows: “Period, depending on the local growing conditions, when a plant species actively grows”. However, they felt that the addition of “depending on the local growing conditions” did not improve clarity. The TPG recalled that “an area, place of production or production site” had been added in the proposed definition for “growing period”, due to the proposed deletion of “growing season” where this was included in the definition. They noted that the current Glossary definition for “growing period” refers to “growing season”, and that the current link to “an area, place of production or production site” so far had seemingly not given rise to confusion. In addition, the TPG noted that, if the intention had been to link the growing period to only one specific area, place of production or production site, the proposed wording would have read: “Period when a plant species actively grows in one area, place of production or production site”.

[43] Therefore, the TPG suggested that the common understanding of the definition proposed in the 2017 draft Amendments to ISPM 5 would not lead to misunderstandings as suggested by the comments and agreed to retain the same proposal for revision of “growing period”.

[44] A few other comments had suggested some other changes to the proposed definition; the TPG did not incorporate those changes because they did not find the proposals improved the understanding of the definition.

[45] **“Survey” (2013-015)**

[46] The same consultation comment as for “growing period” (2016-004) was made regarding the deletion of “time”. Similarly, the TPG noted that this issue was related to a translation issue into Russian. If in Russian it is considered essential to keep the reference to “time”, the TPG recommended it to be translated into Russian this way.

[47] In relation to one consultation comment, the TPG recalled that by adding the qualifier “(of pests)”, “survey” could be used in a general sense (for instance for surveys in the IPPC domain done by the Implementation Review and Support System).

[48] One consultation comment objected to the addition of “determine the presence or absence of pests in an area” as a purpose, because this would overlap with the definition of “surveillance” and a survey is not a condition to prove the absence of the pest. The TPG fully acknowledged that a survey is not always necessary to determine the absence of a pest, but on the other hand a survey may be and is often in practice used to do so. The TPG also recalled that Glossary definitions do not carry any requirements for National Plant Protection Organizations (NPPOs). Therefore, they retained the reference to the determination of pest presence or absence.

[49] To answer to a comment related to the frequency of the amendments to ISPM 5 and their consequences on national legislations, the TPG recalled that all the proposed revisions to the Glossary are intended to improve the clarity and overcome unnecessary restrictions of the definitions, and in most cases and certainly with the current batch of terms do not change the underlying concepts.

[50] One consultation comment had suggested to refer not only to “area” in the definition, but also to “place of production or production site”. Although place of production and production site are smaller entities within an “area”, the TPG agreed that “place of production or production site” should nevertheless appear explicitly in the definition of “survey” to clarify that surveys can also be conducted at those smaller, specific levels, as they can indeed be used to establish pest free places of production or pest free production sites (as per ISPM 10 (*Requirements for the establishment of pest free places of production and pest free production sites*)). This would also be consistent with the draft revision of ISPM 6 (*Surveillance*). Therefore, the TPG modified the proposed definition of “survey (of pests)” to insert a reference to “place of production or production site” and further improve clarity.

[51] A few other changes suggested by other consultation comments were not incorporated because the TPG did not think they improved the clarity of the definition.

[52] **“Confinement (of a regulated article)” (2016-002)**

[53] There were no comments disagreeing with the proposed deletion of the term “confinement (of a regulated article)”. One consultation comment wished to have more explanation regarding the proposed deletion. The TPG reviewed the draft 2017 Amendments to ISPM 5 (1994-001) and found that they had nothing to add to the explanations provided.

[54] **“Growing season” (2016-004)**

[55] Some consultation comments did not support the proposed deletion of the term “growing season”, in connection to those comments also objecting to the proposed revision of the term “growing period”. The TPG considered this carefully but agreed to leave unchanged the proposal for revision of “growing period” (refer to above discussion) and retain their recommendation for the deletion of “growing season” for the reasons explained in the draft 2017 Amendments to ISPM 5 (1994-001).

[56] **“Mark” (2013-007)**

[57] One consultation comment pointed out that a proper definition for “mark” should be developed to take care of its use in all ISPMs. The TPG considered the comment and referred to the explanations of the draft 2017 Amendments to ISPM 5 (1994-001), where it is clarified that defining “mark” in a manner that would cover all current uses of the term in ISPMs would not be possible and is not needed. Therefore, they retained their recommendation to delete the term “mark” unchanged.

[58] In addition, the TPG considered a general comment, which wondered whether a definition of “phytosanitary” should be developed. The TPG recalled that Appendix 1 (List of old terms, no longer included in the Glossary) to the Explanatory document on ISPM 5⁹, explains that “phytosanitary” was originally defined as “pertaining to plant quarantine”, but deleted in 1999, and further refers to note 17 on Plant quarantine, which provides a short summary of years’ discussions on this issue.

[59] The TPG:

- (3) *noted* that its responses to comments and the modified draft 2017 *Amendments to the Glossary* (1994-001) would be transmitted to the SC-7.
- (4) *noted* that the Secretariat would transmit the proposals regarding language versions of terms and definitions to the translators.

5.2 Draft ISPM on *International movement of cut flowers and foliage* (2008-005)

[60] The agenda item was withdrawn from the TPG agenda as, in their November 2017 meeting, the SC agreed not to forward the draft ISPM to the SC-7 in May 2018 and agreed to postpone further discussion of the draft ISPM until after guidance had been provided by CPM-13 (2018).

5.3 Draft ISPM on *Requirements for the use of fumigation as a phytosanitary measure* (2014-004)

[61] A TPG member introduced the draft ISPM and the consultation comments on consistency in use of terms and definitions¹⁰.

[62] The TPG provided recommendations on terms and consistency which would be submitted to the steward of the ISPM. The TPG specifically considered consistency issues between this draft ISPM and the draft ISPM on *Requirements for the use of temperature treatments as phytosanitary measures* (2014-005)¹¹ which was recommended by the November 2017 SC to the CPM for adoption. However, they felt that, where possible, it was better to try to improve the clarity of the draft ISPM on *Requirements for the use of fumigation as a phytosanitary measure* (2014-004) and ensure a correct use of terms, and that a

⁹ Available at: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/42/>

¹⁰ 2014-004; 17_TPG_2017_Dec

¹¹ 23_TPG_2017_Dec

complete consistency with the draft ISPM on *Requirements for the use of temperature treatments as phytosanitary measures* (2014-005) was not vital in cases where the latter draft was felt inappropriate or inconsistent with many other ISPMs.

The TPG discussed the following main issues.

[63] ***Scope.***

[64] The TPG did not support some consultation comments suggesting to amend “for regulated pests or regulated articles” to “for regulated pests on regulated articles” because the text may then be understood rather restrictively. The TPG acknowledged that the draft ISPM on *Requirements for the use of temperature treatments as phytosanitary measure* (2014-005) uses the suggested formulation but stressed that this was incorrect. The TPG felt that the part “for regulated pests or articles” was actually redundant, as it would already be covered by the definition of “phytosanitary measures” and recommended the deletion of these words as a simplification, avoiding potential confusion and unnecessary controversies.

[65] ***Use of “fumigation” instead of “fumigation treatment”.***

[66] The TPG noted that “fumigation” is defined as a treatment in the Glossary and it is not necessary to repeat “treatment”. The TPG therefore recommended the use of “fumigation” instead of “treatment” or “fumigation treatment”. The TPG noted that the redundant term “fumigation treatment” is used in Phytosanitary Treatment (PT) 22 (*Sulfuryl fluoride fumigation treatment for insects in debarked wood*) and PT 23 (*Sulfuryl fluoride fumigation treatment for nematodes and insects in debarked wood*), but that such redundancy should be avoided.

[67] ***Outline of requirements.***

[68] The TPG supported consultation comments stating that the Outline of requirements should (as the title implies) rather be a summary of the main requirements of the standard, than take the form of an extended scope. The TPG noted that the Outline of requirements of this draft ISPM and the draft ISPM on *Requirements for the use of temperature treatments as phytosanitary measure* (2014-005) had been made an elaborate contents list, inconsistent with how Outlines of requirements were previously written. They noted that the Outline of requirements should summarize the main requirements as spelled out in the core text of the standard, and obviously not add any other requirement. The TPG suggested that the SC examines further how Outline of requirements are written in current draft standards, as compared to earlier practice.

[69] ***Background.***

[70] The TPG supported the deletion of the first paragraph of the Background section as suggested by one comment, because it looked like a definition of “fumigation” but did not reflect the current Glossary definition of “fumigation”. The TPG acknowledged that the intention of the paragraph was to clarify that fumigation is not a modified atmosphere treatment. However, the use of “toxic” did not add clarity as natural gasses can be toxic as well and it also raised the question to whom it is toxic. They considered that the exclusion of the use of modified atmosphere in the Scope section was sufficient. In addition, deleting this paragraph would solve other concerns raised in other consultation comments.

[71] The TPG proposed to also delete the second paragraph referring to the purpose of the IPPC, as it is redundant and the quote of the IPPC is not accurate. Should this paragraph be retained, the quote from the IPPC should be exact, so as to avoid any (mis)interpretation.

[72] ***Use of “fumigation entity”, “treatment provider” or “treatment facility”.***

[73] The TPG noted that, in the draft ISPM on *Requirements for the use of temperature treatments as phytosanitary measures* (2014-005), “entities” is always used in association with the notion of authorization (e.g. “authorized entities” or “authorizing the entity”). They further noted that “treatment provider” is only used in one paragraph of that draft ISPM but is used many times in ISPM 15

(*Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade*). The TPG noted that the treatment provider is a person or organization applying the treatment operating in a physical construction (i.e. the treatment facility).

[74] Because “entity” could refer to the facility, the provider, or both, the TPG supported using “treatment provider” and “treatment facility” as appropriate and avoiding “entity”. They felt such an approach would be clearer and straightforward, although they acknowledged such approach was not consistent with the draft ISPM on *Requirements for the use of temperature treatments as phytosanitary measures* (2014-005).

[75] The TPG supported using “treatment provider” as in ISPM 15, rather than “fumigation provider”.

[76] ***Use of “protocol” versus “schedule”.***

[77] In connection with some consultation comments, the TPG discussed the meaning of the word “protocol”, which is used twice in the draft ISPM on *Requirements for the use of fumigation as a phytosanitary measure* (2014-004) (and similarly used in the draft ISPM on *Requirements for the use of temperature treatments as phytosanitary measures* (2014-005)). They concluded that “protocol” is used in those instances with a meaning different from that of the Glossary term “treatment schedule”. However, the TPG agreed that the meaning of “protocol”, its relation to “treatment schedule” and who should produce such protocols is not clear from the draft ISPM. They noted that “protocol” appears with a determining article without having been previously introduced, as if it was clear what it meant, although this is not the case.

[78] The TPG agreed that, as per its Glossary definition, “treatment schedule” refers to the critical parameters to be met, and they felt that a “protocol” would include the treatment schedule but contain additional information to that, e.g. other relevant information that may be needed to apply the treatment correctly as well as approved processes and procedures to be followed, such as contingency procedures and guidance on corrective actions.

[79] The TPG noted that it would be possible to rewrite the paragraph so as to require the descriptions of the process of pre- and post-conditioning and of contingency procedures and guidance on corrective actions, but without mentioning “protocols” at all.

[80] If, in the other hand, the reference to “protocol” in this draft ISPM is considered important, the TPG suggested that an explanation is needed in the text as to the relation between a protocol and a treatment schedule (namely, that a protocol would include the treatment schedule plus other information as mentioned) and the role of the NPPO towards protocols. In any case, the TPG favoured a straightforward explanation of “protocol” in the text, and would avoid any attempts to define the term, which is rarely used and with different meanings in other ISPMs.

[81] The TPG recommended that the use of “schedule” and “protocol” be carefully reviewed throughout the draft ISPM depending on the context to try to avoid confusion. The Glossary term “treatment schedule” should be used when the intention is to refer to the concept covered by this term.

[82] In addition, the TPG noted that “schedule” and “protocol” would be translated the same way in some of the other FAO languages.

[83] ***Definition of “enclosure”.***

[84] One consultation comment had suggested that “enclosure” be defined. However, the TPG suggested that, if it was felt that more explanation was needed on what is meant by “enclosure” and how it relates to facility, an additional explanation in that section would be more appropriate than a definition of “enclosure”.

[85] ***Use of “will”.***

[86] The TPG noted that the draft standard in several instances unnecessarily uses “will” which in some languages could mistakenly become translated with the future sense, and this should be changed to either

present tense (if expressing a fact) or “may” (if offering a possibility, or in the sense of “is permitted to”), as appropriate (see *General recommendations on use of terms in ISPMs*¹²).

[87] Use of “monitoring”, “recording”, “reading”, “measuring”, “determining” or “verifying”.

[88] The TPG discussed in depth some consultation comments pointing out that “monitoring” was not used in this draft ISPM according to its Glossary definition.

[89] First of all, the TPG noted that, since the treatment provider was approved by the NPPO, the monitoring would actually be official and thus it was appropriate to use the term “monitoring” for activities that are undertaken by the treatment provider.

[90] The TPG also noted that there were six instances where “monitoring” had been used to mean “measuring” (i.e. measuring parameters such as temperature and concentration). Because the definition of “monitoring” refers to “a process to verify phytosanitary situations”, the TPG was concerned that measuring temperatures or concentrations during the application of fumigation would not be a “phytosanitary situation”, and hence the use of the term “monitoring” in those cases would be incorrect. The TPG recommended that, in these instances, the use of “monitor” / “monitoring” be amended to “measure” / “measuring” (or “continuously measure”).

[91] The TPG discussed whether to invite the SC to add the term “monitoring” to the TPG work programme with a view to allowing for “monitoring” to be used in its common dictionary sense (for instance by adding “phytosanitary” to the Glossary term). However, they acknowledged that any change to the definition or the term would require many ink amendments to adopted standards and decided against it.

[92] The TPG noted that the six terms “monitoring”, “recording”, “reading”, “measuring”, “determining” and “verifying” seemed to be used somewhat interchangeably in the draft, leaving it unclear whether there is always an intended difference in the meaning of those words. The TPG recommended the draft ISPM be reviewed to ensure a correct use of these terms, and in particular to avoid using different terms for the same concept.

[93] Use of “load factor”.

[94] The TPG did not recommend defining “load factor” as suggested by one consultation comment, but rather to explain it in the context of the paragraph where it is used. They agreed with using “load ratio” instead of “load factor” and suggested to add in the text itself the following explanation for “load ratio”: “ratio of occupied space to the entire space”. In addition, the TPG suggested to use “load configuration” instead of “commodity load pattern” for consistency with other ISPMs.

[95] Appendix 1 (Guidance for fumigation efficacy studies)

[96] The TPG noted that the SC had agreed to delete Appendix 1 from this draft ISPM and therefore they did not consider consultation comments made on Appendix 1.

[97] The TPG:

- (5) *noted* that recommendations on consultation comments and consistency would be transmitted to the steward and SC-7 for consideration.
- (6) *invited* the SC to examine further how Outline of requirements are written in current draft standards, taking into account the above discussion.
- (7) *noted* that PT 22 and PT 23 were using the redundant term “fumigation treatment” and *invited* the Secretariat to archive those issues to be dealt with at a future revision of PT 22 and PT 23.

¹² Available at: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/81329/>

6. Consideration of new or revised terms/definitions (subjects on the TPG work programme)

6.1 “commodity class” (2015-013) and other commodity class terms

[98] The term “commodity class” (2015-013) was added to the List of topics for IPPC standards by the Standards Committee (SC) in November 2015, because difficulties related to the understanding of its Glossary definition had been identified. The issue was discussed by the TPG during their December 2016 meeting¹³. The TPG had felt that the definition for “commodity class” was not useful and that it might be suitable to delete it from the Glossary. The TPG had agreed to analyze how the term had been used in standards. The TPG had also suggested that the actual terms defining different commodity classes be reviewed to determine if their definitions added value or rather created difficulties. In May 2017, the SC confirmed that the TPG should consider the term “commodity class” (2015-013) and its possible deletion. The SC removed the pending status of the term “cut flowers (as a commodity class)” (2012-007) and added the other Glossary terms related to commodity classes to the *List of topics for IPPC standards*.

6.1.1. “commodity class” (2015-013)

[99] The TPG lead introduced the paper¹⁴.

[100] The TPG confirmed their previous findings regarding the Glossary term “commodity class”¹³: Since grouping commodities into higher levels and defining this hierarchy in the Glossary has proven not helpful, this term is not useful and has created confusion, particularly during the development of commodity standards. When discussing the Glossary terms defining different commodity classes (see sections 6.1.2 to 6.1.8), they also acknowledged that those definitions often created confusion and did not provide clarity and support for the drafting of commodity standards. The TPG decided to recommend that the term “commodity class” be deleted from the Glossary, and noted that not having it defined in ISPM 5 would not prevent countries from considering similar commodities together in phytosanitary regulations, whenever technically justified.

[101] The TPG reviewed the use of “commodity class” in the IPPC and ISPMs and noted that “commodity class” is used as a qualifier in several Glossary terms and is used in several adopted ISPMs. They felt that ink amendments to adopted ISPMs removing “commodity class” could be easily applied without affecting the meaning of those standards, for instance by deleting “commodity class” or replacing it with “commodity”.

[102] In addition, the TPG briefly discussed the Glossary term “commodity” and the usefulness of its definition and felt they should consider it further.

[103] The TPG:

- (8) *proposed* the deletion of “commodity class” (2015-013) in the draft 2018 Amendments to the Glossary (1994-001) to be presented to SC May 2018.
- (9) *invited* the SC to agree that the TPG propose ink amendments to adopted ISPMs to avoid the use of “commodity class”.
- (10) *invited* the SC to add the term “commodity” to the *List of topics for IPPC standards*.

6.1.2. “fruits and vegetables (as a commodity class)” (2017-003)

[104] The TPG lead introduced the paper¹⁵.

¹³ See December 2016 TPG meeting report, section 5.2 at: <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/standards-setting/expert-drafting-groups/technical-panels/technical-panel-glossary-phytosanitary-terms-ispm-5/>

¹⁴ 07_TPG_2017_Dec

¹⁵ 08_TPG_2017_Dec

[105] The TPG recognized that the Glossary term “fruits and vegetables (as a commodity class)” does not have any specific meaning in the phytosanitary context. It is making explicit the intended use of fruits and vegetables (i.e. “for consumption and processing and not for planting”) and their state (i.e. “fresh”), but this is also clear from the common meaning of the term.

[106] The TPG agreed that the use of the words “fruits” and “vegetables” in their common sense is appropriate and well understood in all ISPM contexts where they are used. They agreed that the term “fruits and vegetables (as a commodity class)” is not needed in the Glossary and they noted that its deletion would not require any ink amendments to adopted ISPMs.

[107] The TPG:

- (11) *proposed* the deletion of “fruits and vegetables (as a commodity class)” (2017-003) in the draft 2018 *Amendments to the Glossary* (1994-001) to be presented to SC May 2018.

6.1.3. “wood (as a commodity class)” (2017-009)

[108] The TPG lead introduced the paper¹⁶.

[109] The TPG acknowledged that, although wood packaging material, processed wood material and bamboo products would normally be considered as wood in its broad sense, the Glossary definition of “wood” clearly excludes these materials and products. The TPG agreed that, because of these exclusions, the Glossary definition of “wood” is useful and the term should remain in the Glossary.

[110] The TPG noted that the scope of ISPM 39 (*International movement of wood*) is consistent with the Glossary definition of “wood” as it also excludes wood packaging material which is covered by ISPM 15 (*Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade*), processed wood material and bamboo.

[111] Because the term “commodity class” is proposed for deletion from the Glossary (see section 6.1.1 of this document), the TPG agreed that it would be confusing to continue to use “as a commodity class” as a qualifier to the term “wood”. The TPG proposed to use the qualifier “as a commodity” instead of “as commodity class”, consistent also with the proposed revision of “grain” and “seeds” (see sections [6.1.5](#) and [6.1.6](#)).

[112] The TPG:

- (12) *proposed* the revision of “wood (as a commodity class)” (2017-009) in the draft 2018 *Amendments to the Glossary* (1994-001) to be presented to SC May 2018.

6.1.4. “cut flowers (as a commodity class)” (2012-007)

[113] The TPG lead introduced the paper¹⁷.

[114] The TPG noted that the current Glossary term “cut flowers and branches (as a commodity class)” is not consistent with the scope of the draft ISPM on International movement of cut flowers and foliage (2008-005), which currently excludes woody foliage. They confirmed the position of the SC and TPG that the coverage of a standard should be defined by the Scope section of the standard and does not need to match the scope of a Glossary definition.

[115] The TPG recognized that the Glossary term “cut flowers and branches (as a commodity class)” does not have any specific meaning in the phytosanitary context. It is making explicit the intended use of cut flowers and branches (i.e. “for decorative use and not for planting”) and their state (i.e. “fresh”), but this is also clear from the common meaning of the term.

[116] The TPG agreed that the use of the words “cut flowers” or “cut flowers and branches” in their common sense is appropriate and well understood in all ISPM contexts where they are used. They agreed that the

¹⁶ 09_TPG_2017_Dec

¹⁷ 06_TPG_2017_Dec

term “cut flowers and branches (as a commodity class)” is not needed in the Glossary and they noted that its deletion would not require any ink amendments to adopted ISPMs.

[117] The TPG:

- (13) *proposed* the deletion of “cut flowers (as a commodity class)” (2012-007) in the draft 2018 *Amendments to the Glossary* (1994-001) to be presented to SC May 2018.

6.1.5. “grain (as a commodity class)” (2017-004)

[118] The TPG lead introduced the paper¹⁸. The TPG discussion and decision related to the term “grain (as a commodity class)” are reported under section [6.1.6](#) “seeds (as a commodity class)” (2017-007) because these two terms are closely related.

6.1.6. “seeds (as a commodity class)” (2017-007)

[119] The TPG lead introduced the paper¹⁹.

[120] The TPG acknowledged that, while the Glossary definitions of “seeds” and “grain” both refer to “seeds (in the botanical sense)”, they distinguish “seeds” in the Glossary sense from “grain” in the Glossary sense by stating that their intended use is different, “seeds” being for planting and “grain” being for processing or consumption, but not for planting. The TPG agreed that the terms “seeds” and “grain” and their definitions should remain in the Glossary, because they are essential to explain the difference between these commodities in a phytosanitary context.

[121] The TPG reviewed the use of “seeds” and “grain” in ISPMs and CPM recommendations. “Seeds” is used in several ISPMs and CPM recommendations, either according to its Glossary definition or in its botanical sense. The scope of ISPM 38 (*International movement of seeds*) is consistent with the Glossary definition for “seeds” and this definition did not create any challenge during the development of this standard. Regarding “grain”, the TPG noted it is used consistently in several ISPMs, according to its Glossary definition: for consumption or processing, but not for planting. The use of “grain” in the draft ISPM on the *International movement of grain* (2008-007) is consistent with its Glossary definition, even if the current scope of the draft standard is restricted to only three particular types of grain commodities (cereals, oilseeds and pulses).

[122] Because the term “commodity class” is proposed for deletion from the Glossary (see section [6.1.1](#)), the TPG agreed that it would be confusing to still use “as a commodity class” as a qualifier to the terms “seeds” and “grain”. However, they recognized that having a qualifier for the Glossary term “seeds” is needed to distinguish the Glossary term from seeds in its botanical sense (i.e. a propagating organ formed in the sexual reproductive cycle of plants) or even from seeds in its agricultural broad sense (including not only true seeds, but also vegetative plant parts which may be sown e.g. seed potatoes). The TPG proposed to use the qualifier “as a commodity” instead of “as commodity class” to allow for the use of “seeds” in its botanical or agricultural broad sense where necessary. For consistency, the qualifier “as a commodity” should also be used for the Glossary term “grain”.

[123] The TPG:

- (14) *proposed* the revision of “grain (as a commodity class)” (2017-004) and “seeds (as a commodity class)” (2017-007) in the draft 2018 *Amendments to the Glossary* (1994-001) to be presented to SC May 2018.

6.1.7. “bulbs and tubers (as a commodity class)” (2017-001)

[124] The TPG lead introduced the paper²⁰.

¹⁸ 10_TPG_2017_Dec

¹⁹ 11_TPG_2017_Dec

²⁰ 19_TPG_2017_Dec

[125] The TPG noted that the Glossary term “bulbs and tubers (as a commodity class)” is used inconsistently in adopted ISPMs and not always according to its Glossary definition. Some ISPMs use “bulbs and tubers” while others use the words separately; some ISPMs use “bulbs” or “tubers” in association with other commodities, such as in “bulbs, tubers and rhizomes” or “bulbs and rhizomes”, whereas the Glossary definition for “bulbs and tubers (as a commodity class)” includes rhizomes. Furthermore the term “bulbs and tubers (as a commodity class)” being defined as “for planting” has not been used consistently in ISPMs with that exclusive meaning, as some bulbs and tubers (in the botanical sense) can be used for consumption and not for planting. The TPG thus agreed that the definition of “bulbs and tubers (as a commodity class)” has proven too artificial to be useful and does not improve understanding and implementation of ISPMs. Rather, where bulbs or tubers are mentioned in standards, their intended use should be specified in the context, if so needed.

[126] The TPG agreed that the use of the words “bulbs” and “tubers” in their broad, common sense is appropriate and well understood in all current ISPM contexts. They agreed that the term “bulbs and tubers (as a commodity class)” is not needed in the Glossary and they noted that its deletion would not require any ink amendments to adopted ISPMs.

[127] The TPG:

- (15) proposed the deletion of “bulbs and tubers (as a commodity class)” (2017-001) in the draft 2018 Amendments to the Glossary (1994-001) to be presented to SC May 2018.

6.1.8. “plants in vitro (as a commodity class)” (2017-006)

[128] The TPG lead introduced the paper²¹.

[129] The TPG acknowledged that the Glossary term “plants in vitro (as a commodity class)” does not have any specific meaning in the phytosanitary context. “Plants in vitro” is only used in ISPM 32 (*Categorization of commodities according to their pest risk*) and ISPM 33 (*Pest free potato (Solanum spp.) micropropagative material and minitubers for international trade*). The TPG agreed that the common understanding of “plants in vitro” is appropriate in those contexts. They agreed that the term “plants in vitro (as a commodity class)” is not needed in the Glossary and that its deletion would not require any ink amendments to adopted ISPMs.

[130] The TPG:

- (16) *proposed* the deletion of “plants in vitro (as a commodity class)” (2017-006) in the draft 2018 Amendments to the Glossary (1994-001) to be presented to SC May 2018.

6.2 “inspection” (2017-005)

[131] The TPG lead introduced the papers²². She recalled that, when the proposed revisions for “test” (2015-003) and “visual examination” (2013-010) included in the draft 2015 and 2016 Amendments to ISPM 5 were reviewed, the TPG had recognized that the definition of “inspection” may be considered partly outdated due to advances in modern technology whereby visual examination may not be the only method used for inspection. The TPG had considered that should “inspection” reflect current practices, it might include mention of, for instance, olfactory and acoustic examination. In May 2017, the SC added the term “inspection” to the *List of topics for IPPC standards* for a possible revision to adequately reflect current inspection practices that may also include examination methods other than visual.

[132] The TPG discussed several possible modifications to the definition of “inspection” to take into account the use of olfactory (e.g. canines, electronic nose technologies), acoustic or other types of tools (e.g. computer vision systems), including future technologies, that may assist inspectors in performing inspections.

²¹ 15_TPG_2017_Dec

²² 20_TPG_2017_Dec; 21_TPG_2017_Dec

[133] One proposal considered by the TPG involved the removal of the word “visual” in the definition of “inspection”. The TPG acknowledged that such a change would require revision of also the definition of “test”, since currently the criterion differentiating the term “test” from the term “inspection” is that inspection is visual and test is not. Some TPG members proposed other possible criteria to distinguish “test” from “inspection”, as follows:

- the location where the examination is carried out, as inspections would usually be carried out at points of entry or in the fields and tests would be usually carried out in laboratories. However, other TPG members pointed out that testing involving for instance the use of serological tools can also be done in the fields.
- the sequence of the examination, as inspection would consist in a preliminary examination carried out before testing. However, other TPG members pointed out that in some cases tests can be performed without any prior inspection and in other cases tests may not be needed after an inspection.
- the types of procedures or techniques involved, as sampling would be done at the time of inspection (and not at the time of testing) and test would involve chemical or bio-chemical procedures or techniques.

[134] After a lengthy discussion, the TPG did not find that using one of the above-proposed criteria would make the definitions of “inspection” and “test” clearer or more correct. The TPG agreed that “inspection” and “test” are two different methods, often distinguished between in regulation, used to determine if pests are present or to determine compliance with phytosanitary regulations, and that the main criterion used to distinguish “inspection” from “test” should still be that inspection is visual and test is not. They noted that a revision of the term “test” is recommended to CPM-13 (2018) for adoption as part of the 2015 and 2016 Amendments to ISPM 5, and they agreed that “test” need not be further revised for the moment.

[135] Therefore, the TPG considered other possible modifications to the definition of “inspection” adding a reference to other tools that may be used to assist with the inspection process, while still defining “inspection” as an “official visual examination”. The TPG agreed that such other tools only assisted the inspector who in any case would need to perform a visual examination to confirm the findings. Hence, they proposed to introduce these other tools in the definition of “inspection” by the use of the words “which may be assisted by”, i.e., not all inspections are assisted by such tools.

[136] The TPG considered qualifying those tools that may assist in the inspection process as “other non-visual tools”. However, they felt this could be confusing since inspection is defined as a visual official examination. In addition, it would not account for computer vision systems to assist in the inspection process as computer vision systems would be considered as visual tools. Therefore, the TPG felt that the main, new types of tools (e.g. olfactory, acoustic) should be specified, and thus decided to recommend the addition of the wording “which may be assisted by olfactory, acoustic or other examination tools”. The use of “other examination tools” would make the definition broad enough to cover also other, future types of tools (such as computer vision systems). The TPG noted that their proposed revised definition of “inspection” adequately reflected the use of the term in adopted ISPMs.

[137] Some TPG members wondered if “official” should be deleted from the definition, because there might be situations, e.g. with containers, where inspection would not be “officially” carried out. However, the TPG agreed that any inspection carried out for phytosanitary purposes would have to be confirmed by the NPPO and thus the use of “official” was appropriate.

[138] The TPG:

- (17) *proposed* the revision of “inspection” (2017-005) in the draft 2018 Amendments to the Glossary (1994-001) to be presented to SC May 2018.

6.3. “treatment” (2017-008)

- [139] The TPG lead introduced the paper²³. She recalled that, in May 2017, the SC added the term “treatment” to the *List of Topics for IPPC Standards* for a possible revision to make the term usable in a non-official sense. Because treatment in the Glossary sense is always official and finding an alternative term to be used in national legislations for the non-official cases (e.g. farmers treating their crops) has proven difficult, it may be useful to consider revising the definition.
- [140] First of all, the TPG agreed that, “treatment” being both a common term and a phytosanitary term defined in the Glossary, retaining the Glossary term was useful in order to refer to treatments as phytosanitary procedures, as opposed to non-official treatments applied by farmers to their crops.
- [141] The TPG discussed adding qualifiers to the Glossary term “treatment”, such as in “treatment (in the phytosanitary sense)”, “treatment (for quarantine pests)” or “treatment (for regulated pests)”, so that treatment could, in other contexts, still be used in its common non-official sense. However, the TPG acknowledged that these changes would not solve the issue because farmers sometimes also apply treatment in the phytosanitary sense and also deal with regulated pests. The TPG also considered changing the Glossary term to “phytosanitary treatment” to solve the issue but decided against this solution because it would require many ink amendments to adopted ISPMs. The TPG finally agreed on adding the qualifier “(as a phytosanitary measure)” to the term “treatment” because when used according to its Glossary definition, a treatment is a phytosanitary measure. That modification would enable “treatment” to refer to an official procedure (as per its Glossary meaning) when used in the context of a phytosanitary measure or to refer to its non-official sense when used in other contexts.
- [142] The TPG noted that, in addition to using the term “treatment”, ISPM 28 uses “phytosanitary treatments” (abbreviated as “PT”). They acknowledged that “phytosanitary treatment” was redundant wording but did not cause confusion and agreed that no ink amendment was needed in this respect.
- [143] The TPG also agreed to add “regulated” before “pests” in the Glossary definition of “treatment (as a phytosanitary measure)” because, according to its Glossary definition, a “phytosanitary measure” only applies to regulated pests. In some situations, official treatments need to be applied on imports for pests which are not yet regulated; however, the TPG noted that this would not conflict with the proposed revised definition of “treatment (as a phytosanitary measure)” because the application of treatments in those situations would refer to emergency actions.
- [144] The TPG recommended further editorials to the definition of “treatment (as a phytosanitary measure)” to make it more readable, as all the actions of killing, inactivating, removing, rendering infertile and devitalizing are related to regulated pests.
- [145] The TPG:
- (18) *proposed* the revision of “treatment” (2017-008) in the draft 2018 Amendments to the Glossary (1994-001) to be presented to SC May 2018.

7. Review of ISPMs for consistency of terms and style

7.1 General recommendations on use of terms in ISPMs

- [146] The Secretariat introduced the paper²⁴ recalling that the *General recommendations on use of terms in ISPMs* are published in the IPPC Style guide. She recalled that a draft version of the *General recommendations on use of terms in ISPMs* was circulated to TPG members for comments in January 2017. However, it was decided that some of the changes proposed at that time required more discussion by the TPG during a face-to-face meeting and thus those changes were not incorporated in the revised version as published in April 2017. Those notes were discussed by the TPG, together with proposals for

²³ 22_TPG_2017_Dec

²⁴ 13_TPG_2017_Dec

new notes in the *General recommendations on use of terms in ISPMs*²⁵, as prepared and introduced by some TPG members.

- [147] The TPG modified the *General recommendations on use of terms in ISPMs* by adding or revising the following notes.
- [148] ***Accredit, authorize and certify (revision)***. While noting that the restrictions indicated in the note regarding the use of those terms are still applicable, the TPG slightly revised the wording of the note for clarity. The TPG wondered if it would be useful to add “approve” to the note as this term is used in various adopted and draft ISPMs, but they felt that, in those contexts, “approve” is used in its normal dictionary meaning, is well understood and does not need further explanation.
- [149] ***Appropriate level of protection, acceptable level of risk (revision)***. The TPG revised the wording of this note and agreed to put “appropriate level of protection” first and “acceptable level of risk second”, because “appropriate level of protection” is the term defined in the WTO Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS Agreement).
- [150] ***(Non-)compliance, (non-)conformity (revision)***. The TPG slightly revised this note for clarity, replacing “implementation of measures” by “application of measures”, because standards are implemented but measures are applied.
- [151] ***Contamination, contaminating pest (revision)***. See discussion in [section 7.3](#). The TPG agreed to add “contaminant” in the title of the note and provide some guidance on the use of “contaminant” as opposed to “contamination” and “contaminating pest” because “contaminant” is actually used in several ISPMs.
- [152] ***Country, contracting party, NPPO (revision)***. The TPG revised the wording of this note as the explanation provided for “country” did not seem appropriate.
- [153] ***Hazard (proposed new note)***. The TPG agreed to add a note to explain that the use of “hazard” should be avoided and that, where “hazard” is used to refer to deleterious effects on humans, the term “danger” could be used instead.
- [154] ***(Non-)indigenous, (non-)native, exotic, endemic and alien (proposed new note)***. The TPG agreed to add a short and concise note, focusing on the terms that should be preferably used and discouraging the use of other terms. The TPG considered adding more detailed guidance on the terms that should be avoided to underline their normal meaning. However, some TPG members pointed out that it was not necessary and that it would be difficult to provide clear guidance on these terms, for which there is considerable disagreement as to their meaning. In addition, the TPG felt that providing more guidance on these terms would emphasize them and could send a wrong signal since their use in ISPMs is discouraged. The TPG also noted that “non-naturally present” is not used in ISPMs, and agreed that there was no need to mention this term.
- [155] ***Phytosanitary measures, phytosanitary actions (revision)***. The TPG slightly revised this note for clarity, aligning the wording with the Glossary terms “phytosanitary measure” and “phytosanitary action” and their definition.
- [156] ***Spread, dispersal, dissemination (proposed new note)***. The TPG agreed to add guidance on these terms as they are sometimes used interchangeably but have different meanings, and this creates confusion. The TPG discussed whether to mention “propagules of plants” in the note: some members felt this example was too specific, but others felt it was useful to clarify and important for plants for planting. Thus, the TPG agreed to mention “including propagules of plants as pests”.
- [157] The TPG:
- (19) *invited* the SC to note the modified *General recommendations on use of terms in ISPMs* ([Appendix 4](#)).

²⁵ 14_TPG_2017_Dec

7.2 Consistency of adopted ISPM (standard by standard)

[158] The Secretariat updated the TPG on the standards which have been republished after the incorporation of approved ink amendments since the last TPG meeting²⁶ and noted that this list will be updated again in 2018.

7.3 Consistency across standards: consistency review of “contamination” across ISPMs (2017-002)

[159] The TPG lead introduced the paper²⁷. She recalled that, in May 2017, the SC added “contamination” (consistency review of its use in ISPMs) (2017-002) to the *List of topics for IPPC Standards* because there may be some cases in adopted standards (e.g. ISPM 18 (*Guidelines for the use of irradiation as a phytosanitary measure*)) where “contamination” is used with a different meaning than its Glossary meaning.

[160] The TPG reviewed the use of “contamination” and its derivatives in ISPMs and identified straightforward instances where the term “contamination” is clearly used correctly (i.e. according to its Glossary definition), therefore not requiring any ink amendments.

[161] The TPG reviewed carefully other instances in adopted ISPMs where the term “contamination” or one of its derivatives are used with a different meaning than its Glossary definition. The TPG specifically discussed instances in ISPM 21 (section 3.3.1), ISPM 36 (Appendix 1), ISPM 40 (section 3.1) and ISPM 41 (section 2.3) referring to the contamination of places of production or water by pests. They noted that, in those instances, “contamination” or its derivative “contaminated” was not strictly used according to the Glossary definition of “contamination” because places of production and water were not listed in the definition as places that could be contaminated. However, some TPG members felt it was important to retain “contamination” or “contaminated” in those texts because the cases referred to contamination by pests. The TPG discussed whether the definition of “contamination” was too restrictive and should be revised again. However, they decided not to recommend a new revision, a revision of “contamination” being already recommended to CPM-13 (2018) for adoption. The TPG agreed to propose ink amendments to ISPM 11 (section 1.1), ISPM 18 (annex 2), ISPM 21 (section 3.3.1), ISPM 33 (section 3.1) and ISPM 36 (Appendix 1) to avoid inconsistent use of “contamination” or one of its derivatives (see [Appendix 5, table 1](#)). However, the TPG agreed not to propose any ink amendments to “contaminated water” in ISPM 40 (section 3.1) and ISPM 41 (section 2.3), as they considered the current wording to be sufficiently clear.

[162] The TPG also reviewed and discussed the use of “contaminant” in adopted ISPMs. They agreed that, when an ISPM needs to refer to objects similar to “contamination”, but beyond its Glossary definition (as not related to pests or regulated articles), the use of the term “contaminant” may be appropriate (despite the general clause of ISPM 5, that a definition pertains to a term and any derivative thereof). Thus, they proposed to amend accordingly the note on “contamination, contaminating pest” in the *General recommendations on use of terms in ISPMs* (refer to [section 7.1](#) and [Appendix 4](#) of this report).

[163] The TPG considered instances in ISPM 2 and ISPM 3 where the term “contamination” or its derivatives is used in relation to biological control agents or beneficial organisms.

- *Regarding ISPM 2.* They proposed an ink amendment to section 1.2.2 of ISPM 2 to use “contaminants” instead of “contamination” (see [Appendix 5, table 2](#)) because “contamination” was not used according its Glossary definition and “contaminants” is a word commonly used in this context and well understood; this would also be in line with their above recommendation on the use of the word “contaminant”. They agreed that the use of “contaminants” in section 4.2 of ISPM 2 was appropriate for the same reason, and therefore did not propose any ink amendment in this case.

²⁶ List of proposed or approved ink amendments is available on the IPP: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/82115/>

²⁷ 12_TPG_2017_Dec

- *Regarding ISPM 3.* The TPG noted that the use of “contamination” in sections 3.1 and 5.1 of ISPM 3 in relation to biological control agents or beneficial organisms was incorrect (as not related to pests), and so was the use of “infestation” in section 3.1 of ISPM 3 for the same reason. However, they did not find suitable rewording and thus proposed those instances be archived by the Secretariat to be addressed at a future revision of ISPM 3.

[164] Finally, the TPG considered instances in adopted ISPMs where “contaminant” was used but the intended meaning was actually “contamination” or “contaminating pest”, and therefore proposed ink amendments to use those Glossary terms instead of “contaminant” (see [Appendix 5, table 3](#)). They particularly discussed the use of “contaminant” in Appendix 1 of ISPM 40 regarding liners and whips. They could not understand the intended meaning of the current wording since the growing media for liners and whips should be free from contaminants; they proposed this instance be archived by the Secretariat to be addressed at a future revision of ISPM 40.

[165] The TPG:

- (20) *Invited* the SC to review and approve the ink amendments proposed in tables 1, 2 and 3 of [Appendix 5](#) to ensure a consistent use of “contamination” and its derivatives in adopted ISPMs.
- (21) *Requested* the Secretariat to archive the instances where “contamination” is used in sections 3.1 and 5.1 of ISPM 3 in relation to biological control agents or beneficial organisms, to be addressed at a future revision of ISPM 3.
- (22) *Requested* the Secretariat to archive the instance where “contaminant” is used in Appendix 1 of ISPM 40, to be addressed at a future revision of ISPM 40.

8. Annotated Glossary: 2017 intermediate version

[166] The annotated glossary, version 4, was finalized at TPG December 2015 and published in March 2016. The TPG lead recalled that she had prepared the 2017 intermediate version, which was submitted to the TPG for comments in June 2017, and noted that one TPG member had submitted comments.

[167] The TPG discussed those comments and agreed on the following changes to be made in the Annotated Glossary:

- A note at the beginning of the Annotated Glossary should be added to stress that its latest published version should be used.
- *Background section.* The TPG considered whether it was still found appropriate for the Annotated Glossary to recommend that terms, which are only relevant to a particular ISPM, be defined in that ISPM only and not in the Glossary. The TPG agreed that the wording should be deleted as irrelevant, for the following reasons. In the default situation, when the CPM finds it appropriate to define a certain term, that term and definition will appear in the Glossary, irrespective of in how many ISPMs it is or will be used. Glossary terms and their definitions are available for use wherever appropriate in any future ISPM and for harmonizing terminology internationally. However, the SC and ultimately the CPM may decide that a certain definition should only apply to the text of a particular ISPM, because this definition is only relevant to that ISPM. In such case, the term will be defined within the text of that ISPM and will not appear in the Glossary. Recent examples are the four definitions of various types of host status of fruit to fruit flies in ISPM 37 (*Determination of host status of fruit to fruit flies (Tephritidae)*).
- Note 5b on cross-references between terms in the Annotated Glossary and all references to this note should be deleted because it is easier to simply cross-refer to other terms in the notes.
- In the note on “efficacy (of a treatment)”, only the references to “required response” and note 9 should be kept because the rest is not accurate anymore.
- In the note on “import permit”, the reference to “consignments” should be changed to “commodities” as per the Glossary definition of “import permit”.
- The note on “interception (of a pest)” should be slightly amended for clarity.

- In the notes on “inundative release”, “natural enemy”, “sterile insect” and “sterile insect technique”, only the reference to note 4 should be kept as the rest of the explanation is not useful.

[168] The TPG lead would prepare a 2018 intermediate version based on the TPG comments, the outcomes of the 2017 TPG meeting, the November 2017 SC, the April 2018 CPM and the May 2018 SC, and share it with the TPG after the May 2018 SC. The Secretariat recalled that the next version for publication should normally be finalized in 2019. However, if the 2018 TPG meeting was to be cancelled (see [section 4.2](#)), the publication of the next version of the Annotated Glossary might have to be postponed to 2020.

[169] The TPG:

- (23) *agreed* that the intermediate version of the Annotated Glossary would be modified after the meeting by Beatriz MELCHO²⁸.

9. Explanation of Glossary terms

[170] The following term was discussed.

[171] ***Regulated non-quarantine pest.***

[172] One TPG member indicated that he had wondered whether the Glossary definition for this term should be revised to refer more restrictively to “propagation material” rather than to “plants for planting”, because “plants for planting” include “plants intended to remain planted” for which he had thought there was not an intention to regulate non-quarantine pests. However, he clarified that having re-read ISPM 16 (*Regulated non-quarantine pests: concept and application*), ISPM 21 (*Pest risk analysis for regulated non-quarantine pests*) and the draft explanatory document on ISPM 16 which was drafted several years ago, but not finalized, he understood that the intent was actually also to cover risks associated with plants intended to remain planted.

[173] Another TPG member recalled that the concept of regulated non-quarantine pests was originally introduced to address the issues faced by some countries, where some importers would import plants free of quarantine pests but infested with pests already widely distributed in the country because these would be cheaper.

[174] Several TPG members highlighted that the concept of regulated non-quarantine pests is still not clear for many NPPOs and they wondered why the explanatory document on ISPM 16 was not finalized as they felt it would help clarify the concept. The Secretariat explained that the latest version of the draft explanatory document on ISPM 16 found in the archived folders was dated 2010 and that any endorsement of that version by the SC could not be retrieved. She added that she was unsure why it was not finalized, but assumed the reason was a lack of resources in the Secretariat to process explanatory documents, which is still the case.

[175] The TPG agreed that it would be useful to have the explanatory document on ISPM 16 finalized and felt it might not require much additional work. They recognized that this might not be strictly considered as part of the TPG tasks described in the Specification TP 5; however, because it relates to clarifying the concept covered by a Glossary term, they proposed to take on this work provided the SC agrees. They noted that, once the explanatory document is finalized, a link to it could be added in the Annotated Glossary to clarify the concept covered by the term “regulated non-quarantine pest”.

[176] The TPG:

- (24) *invited* the SC to agree that the TPG review and finalize the draft explanatory document on ISPM 16 (*Regulated non-quarantine pests: concept and application*).

²⁸for circulation within the TPG after SC May 2018

10. TPG work plan

[177] The TPG updated its work plan for 2018 ([Appendix 6](#)). This work plan will be presented to SC May 2018. 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.

[178] Even though the TPG meeting was planned to be cancelled in 2018 (see [section 4.2](#)), the Secretariat suggested that tentative dates for the 2018 TPG meeting still be identified, in case the needed staff resources could be recruited early in 2018. The week of 3-7 December 2018 was proposed as tentative dates for the 2018 TPG meeting.

[179] The Secretariat highlighted the main consequences of the cancellation of the 2018 meeting, if confirmed, in terms of TPG work plan:

- 2018 draft Amendments to ISPM 5 would be processed for submission to the 2018 May SC for approval for first consultation in 2018, but consultation comments would only be reviewed by the TPG in 2019.
- Consultation comments on consistency in use of terms and definitions in other draft ISPMs submitted to the first consultation in 2018 would not be reviewed by the TPG.
- The TPG discussions of terms and definitions on the work programme, to be submitted to the SC, would have to be deferred to 2019.
- The publication of the new version of the Annotated Glossary might have to be deferred to 2020.

[180] The 2017 draft Amendments, if submitted to the 2018 second consultation, will not be affected by the cancellation of the TPG meeting; they will be finalized by the Steward before the November 2018 SC meeting (possibly with TPG e-mail consultation if deemed necessary by the Steward).

[181] TPG members expressed serious concerns regarding the cancellation of the 2018 TPG meeting, which would jeopardize the continuity of their work as most of their tasks cannot be carried out virtually. They highlighted that the importance of having a harmonized terminology is recognized by contracting parties and that a break in the continuity of TPG meetings could have consequences on the availability of some of the TPG members for the following years. They also recognized that experienced skilled Secretariat staff was needed to support the TPG given the complexities of their work and they agreed to try to help seeking solutions to the staffing issue. Given that the SC at its November 2017 meeting had expressed strong concerns to the proposed cancellation of the 2018 TPG meeting, TPG members decided to first draft a note stating their concerns in support of the SC's sentiments in that regard, for submission to CPM Bureau members before the December 2017 Bureau meeting, and to explore the possibility of having those concerns highlighted at CPM-13 (2018) through several contracting parties. The TPG agreed that the SC should also be made aware of those concerns of TPG members.

[182] The TPG:

- (25) *invited* the SC to note the TPG work plan 2018 ([Appendix 6](#)) and the TPG concerns about the possible cancellation of the 2018 meeting.

11. Membership of the TPG (See agenda item 2.3)

[183] The Secretariat noted that the terms of Mr John HEDLEY (New Zealand), Ms Laurence BOUHOT-DELDUC (France) and Ms Stephanie BLOEM (USA) would be ending in 2018. Mr John HEDLEY (New Zealand) had already informed the TPG that 2017 would be his last TPG meeting and a new TPG member for English had already been selected by the SC in 2017. Ms Laurence BOUHOT-DELDUC (France) and Ms Stephanie BLOEM (USA) were invited to confirm their employer's support and their willingness to be considered for an additional term by end February 2018, so that if necessary a call for experts could be launched. The Secretariat stressed the importance of the continuity of TPG membership.

[184] The TPG:

(26) *invited* the Secretariat to issue a call for experts as appropriate.

12. Any other business

12.1 How to avoid inconsistent / incorrect uses of Glossary terms in ISPMs

[185] A TPG member highlighted the two incorrect uses of the term “area” in ISPM 41 (*International movement of used vehicles, machinery and equipment*) which was adopted by the CPM-12 (2017). Some contracting parties had identified these incorrect uses prior to the CPM meeting but decided not to mention them during the CPM to avoid confusion with the more important issues that were raised by an objection submitted before CPM-12 on this draft standard. He wondered whether it would be appropriate to propose ink amendments to replace “area” by “surface” where “area” is not used in ISPM 41 according its Glossary definition. Another TPG member highlighted that there are other cases in adopted ISPMs where “area” is not used according its Glossary definition, but she felt that the meaning of “area” was obvious in all those contexts and did not think ink amendments were necessary. The TPG agreed not to propose ink amendments, but rather to add a note on “area” in the Annotated Glossary to clarify this.

[186] More generally, a TPG member raised the global issue of ensuring consistency in the use of terms in ISPMs and wondered how the existing guidance (such as the General recommendations on use of terms in ISPMs, the Annotated Glossary and the Guidelines for a consistent ISPM terminology) was made available to SC and expert drafting group members, stewards and Secretariat staff. The Secretariat confirmed that new SC members and expert drafting group members were made aware of the existing guidance but acknowledged that training of new members could possibly be improved to focus more on the importance of terminology, pending the availability of adequate resources. Some material (terminology game) had been adapted for expert working group meetings and would benefit from being used more broadly. The TPG agreed that it would be useful to enhance the training of SC and expert drafting groups members as well as of Secretariat staff regarding terminology aspects, possibly through the development of e-learning tools. They suggested such trainings be also delivered during the IPPC regional workshops. In addition, the TPG highlighted the importance of the editor to ensure a correct use of terms in draft standards and they felt it would be useful for her to also attend a TPG meeting, if possible.

[187] The TPG:

(27) *invited* the Secretariat to consider where possible the development of training material on terminology, taking into account the above suggestions.

13. Date and venue of the next meeting

[188] The week of 3-7 December 2018 was proposed as tentative dates for the 2018 TPG meeting. In the beginning of 2018, the Secretariat will confirm to TPG members whether the 2018 face-to-face TPG meeting is cancelled or not.

14. Close

[189] The Secretariat thanked the TPG members for their contributions to the work of the TPG.

[190] As this was his last TPG meeting, the Chairperson thanked the TPG members for the good companionship and interesting discussions over the past years. The TPG wished him the best for the future and thanked him warmly for his tremendous contributions since the creation of this panel and its precursor, including at the occasion of the 1997 revision of the Convention.

[191] The Chairperson also thanked the Secretariat for their support, wished all the TPG members safe travels and closed the meeting.

Appendix 1 - Agenda

| AGENDA ITEM | DOCUMENT NO. | PRESENTER |
|---|--|------------------------|
| 1. Opening of the meeting | - | |
| 1.1 Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat | - | Secretariat |
| 1.2 Welcome by the Director of the Central Phytosanitary Office, Italian NPPO | | FARAGLIA Bruno Caio |
| 2. Meeting arrangements | | |
| 2.1 Selection of the Chairperson | - | - |
| 2.2 Selection of the Rapporteur | | Chairperson |
| 2.3 Adoption of the agenda | 01_TPG_2017_Dec | Chairperson |
| 2.4 Current specification: TP5 (TPG) (2016) [Posted June 2016 in three languages] | Web link | Secretariat |
| 3. Administrative Matters | - | |
| 3.1 Documents list | 02_TPG_2017_Dec | Secretariat |
| 3.2 Participants list | 03_TPG_2017_Dec | Secretariat |
| 3.3 Local information | 04_TPG_2017_Dec | Secretariat |
| 4. Reports | - | |
| 4.1 Previous meetings of the TPG (December 2016) | Web link | Steward |
| 4.2 Extracts from other meeting reports of relevance to the TPG (SC, CPM) | 18_TPG_2017_Dec | Secretariat |
| 4.3 Current work plan The work plan was decided by the TPG 2016. The work plan will be reviewed during the meeting (agenda item 10) | Web link (work area; log on needed) | Secretariat |
| 5. Review relating to draft ISPMs sent for first consultation in 2017 (1 July-30 September) 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 2018). | | |
| 5.1 Draft 2017 Amendments to ISPM 5: <i>Glossary of Phytosanitary terms</i> (1994-001) 1. Consultation 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 05_TPG_2017_Dec 1994-001_Amendments_Es; 1994-001_Amendments_Fr | Chairperson |
| 5.2 Draft ISPM on <i>International movement of cut flowers and foliage</i> (2008-005) – Withdrawn from TPG agenda as the November 2017 SC agreed not to forward the draft ISPM to the SC-7 in May 2018 (related documents are left here for TPG information only) - Consultation comments on terms and consistency, including translation issues | 2008-005 16_TPG_2017_Dec | Chairperson |
| 5.3 Draft ISPM on <i>Requirements for the use of fumigation as a phytosanitary measure</i> (2014-004) - Consultation comments on terms and consistency, including translation issues - For information: draft ISPM on <i>Requirements for the use of temperature treatments as phytosanitary measures</i> (2014-005) | 2014-004 17_TPG_2017_Dec 23_TPG_2017_Dec | Nordbo |

| AGENDA ITEM | DOCUMENT NO. | PRESENTER |
|--|--|------------------------------------|
| 6. Subjects on the TPG work programme 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 2018. | | |
| 6.1 “commodity class” (2015-013) and other commodity class terms | | |
| ❖ “commodity class” (2015-013), ❖ “fruits and vegetables (as a commodity class)” (2017-003), ❖ “wood (as a commodity class)” (2017-009) | 07_TPG_2017_Dec 08_TPG_2017_Dec 09_TPG_2017_Dec | Orlinski |
| ❖ “cut flowers and branches (as a commodity class)” (2012-007) ❖ “grain (as a commodity class)” (2017-004) ❖ “seeds (as a commodity class)” (2017-007) | 06_TPG_2017_Dec 10_TPG_2017_Dec 11_TPG_2017_Dec | Bouhot-Delduc |
| ❖ “bulbs and tubers (as a commodity class)” (2017-001), ❖ “plants <i>in vitro</i> (as a commodity class)” (2017-006) | 19_TPG_2017_Dec 15_TPG_2017_Dec | Omar |
| 6.2 Subject on the TPG work programme: “inspection” (2017-005) | 20_TPG_2017_Dec | Bloem |
| Subject on the TPG work programme: “inspection” attachment 1 | 21_TPG_2017_Dec | |
| 6.3 Subject on the TPG work programme: “treatment” (2017-008) | 22_TPG_2017_Dec | Bloem |
| 7. Review of ISPMs for consistency of terms and style | | |
| 7.1 General recommendations on consistency (as modified following the TPG 2016 and noted by the SC. To be reviewed and completed as needed) ❖ Notes 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”. | 13_TPG_2017_Dec 14_TPG_2017_Dec | Secretariat Nordbo / Hedley |
| 7.2 Consistency of adopted ISPM (standard by standard) - List of standards that have gone through the consistency review | List of ink amendments proposed or approved for ISPMs (work area; log on needed) | Secretariat |
| 7.3 Consistency review of “contamination” (2017-002) across ISPMs | 12_TPG_2017_Dec | Melcho |
| 8. Annotated glossary: 2017 intermediate version [The annotated glossary, version 4, was finalized at TPG 2015 and published in March 2016. The next version should be finalized in 2019. The TPG considers yearly which amendments need to be made and produces an intermediate version. The 2017 intermediate version was prepared by Ms Beatriz Melcho and submitted to the TPG for comments (in June 2017). No comment has been received on this version. The 2017 intermediate version is posted in the TPG work area.] | Web link to the 2016 Annotated Glossary Web link to the 2017 intermediate version (work area; log on needed) | Melcho |
| 9. Explanation of Glossary terms Standing agenda item for TPG meetings. Members identify before the meeting some glossary terms/definitions requiring further explanations. These terms/definitions will be discussed during the TPG meeting and the need for additional explanations (e.g. in the annotated glossary) discussed. | | Secretariat |
| 9.1 Definition for “regulated non-quarantine pest” | | Nordbo |
| 10. TPG work plan | - | |

| AGENDA ITEM | DOCUMENT NO. | PRESENTER |
|--|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| 10.1 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 2018 for noting. | To be prepared during the meeting | Secretariat |
| 11. Membership of the TPG 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 | |
| 12. Any other business | | |
| 12.1 How to avoid inconsistent / incorrect uses of Glossary terms (e.g. "area" in ISPM 41, possibly others) | | Nordbo |
| 13. Date and venue of the next meeting | - | Secretariat |
| 14. Close of the meeting | - | |

Appendix 2: Documents List

| DOCUMENT NO. | AGENDA ITEM | DOCUMENT TITLE | DATE POSTED / DISTRIBUTED |
|------------------------|-------------|--|--|
| Draft ISPMs | | | |
| 1994-001 | 5.1 | Draft 2017 amendments to ISPM | 2017-11-06 |
| 2008-005 | 5.2 | Draft ISPM on <i>International movement of cut flowers and foliage</i> | 2017-11-06 |
| 2014-004 | 5.3 | Draft ISPM on <i>Requirements for the use of fumigation as a phytosanitary measure</i> | 2017-11-06 |
| Other Documents | | | |
| 01_TPG_2017_Dec | 2.3 | Draft Annotated Agenda | 2017-11-06 2017-11-09 2017-11-17 2017-11-21 2017-11-29 |
| 02_TPG_2017_Dec | 3.1 | Documents List | 2017-11-06 2017-11-09 2017-11-17 2017-11-21 2017-11-29 |
| 03_TPG_2017_Dec | 3.2 | Participants List | 2017-11-06 2017-11-17 2017-11-21 |
| 04_TPG_2017_Dec | 3.3 | Local Information | 2017-11-06 |
| 05_TPG_2017_Dec | 5.1 | Compiled comments on 2017 draft amendments to ISPM 5 | 2017-11-06 |
| 06_TPG_2017_Dec | 6.1 | Cut flowers and branches (as a commodity class) | 2017-11-06 |
| 07_TPG_2017_Dec | 6.1 | Commodity class | 2017-11-06 |
| 08_TPG_2017_Dec | 6.1 | Fruits and vegetables (as a commodity class) | 2017-11-06 |
| 09_TPG_2017_Dec | 6.1 | Wood (as a Commodity Class) | 2017-11-06 |
| 10_TPG_2017_Dec | 6.1 | Grain (as a Commodity Class) | 2017-11-06 |
| 11_TPG_2017_Dec | 6.1 | Seeds (as a Commodity Class) | 2017-11-06 |
| 12_TPG_2017_Dec | 7.3 | Consistency review of "contamination" across ISPMs | 2017-11-06 |
| 13_TPG_2017_Dec | 7.1 | General recommendations on use of terms in ISPMs | 2017-11-06 |
| 14_TPG_2017_Dec | 7.1 | Notes for terms in "General recommendations on use of terms in ISPMs" | 2017-11-06 |
| 15_TPG_2017_Dec | 6.1 | Plants <i>in vitro</i> (as a commodity class) | 2017-11-09 |

| DOCUMENT NO. | AGENDA ITEM | DOCUMENT TITLE | DATE POSTED / DISTRIBUTED |
|-----------------|-------------|---|---------------------------|
| 16_TPG_2017_Dec | 5.2 | Compiled comments for TPG recommendation: Draft ISPM on the International Movement of cut flowers and foliage | 2017-11-09 |
| 17_TPG_2017_Dec | 5.3 | Compiled comments for TPG recommendation: Draft ISPM for the use of fumigation treatments as a phytosanitary measure | 2017-11-09 |
| 18_TPG_2017_Dec | 4.2 | Update from the various meetings of relevance to the TPG | 2017-11-21 |
| 19_TPG_2017_Dec | 6.1 | Bulbs and tubers (as a commodity class) | 2017-11-09 |
| 20_TPG_2017_Dec | 6.2 | Subject on the TPG work programme: "inspection" | 2017-11-17 |
| 21_TPG_2017_Dec | 6.2 | Subject on the TPG work programme: "inspection" attachment 1 | 2017-11-17 |
| 22_TPG_2017_Dec | 6.3 | Subject on the TPG work programme: "treatment" | 2017-11-17 |
| 23_TPG_2017_Dec | 5.3 | For information: draft ISPM on <i>Requirements for the use of temperature treatments as phytosanitary measures</i> (2014-005) | 2017-11-29 |

| IPP LINKS: | Agenda item |
|--|-------------|
| Current specification: TP5 (TPG) (2016) | 2.4 |
| Previous meetings of the TPG (December 2016) | 4.1 |
| Current work plan (work area; log on needed) | 4.3 |
| 2016 Annotated Glossary | 8 |
| 2017 intermediate version of Annotated Glossary (work area; log on needed) | 8 |

Appendix 3: Participants List

(with TPG membership details)

| Participants details | | | TPG member's term | |
|--|--------------------------------|--|-------------------|---|
| Name, mailing, address, telephone | Participant role | Email address | begins | ends |
| Ms Laurence BOUHOT-DELDUC Ministry of Agriculture, Agro-food and Forestry General directorate for food Sub-directorate for plant quality, health and protection 251 rue de Vaugirard 75732 Paris Cedex 15 FRANCE Tel: (+33) 149558437 Fax: (+33) 149555949 | TPG member Steward / French | laurence.bouhot-delduc@agriculture.gouv.fr | May 2013 | 2018 |
| Ms Stephanie BLOEM Executive Director North American Plant Protection Organization (NAPPO) 1730 Varsity Drive, Suite 145, Raleigh, North Carolina 27606, USA Tel: (+1) 919 617 4040 Mobile: (+1) 919-480-4761 | TPG member English | Stephanie.Bloem@NAPPO.org ; | Nov 2013 | 2018 |
| Mr John HEDLEY International Standard Organisations International Policy and Trade Ministry for Primary Industries Pastoral House, 25 The Terrace P.O. Box 2526 Wellington, NEW ZEALAND Tel: (+64) 4 894 0428 Mobile : (+64) 298940428 Fax: (+64) 4 894 0742 | TPG member English | John.Hedley@mpi.govt.nz | 2013 | 2018 (1 st term: 2008-2013) |
| Ms Beatriz MELCHO Ministry of Livestock, Agriculture and Fisheries, General Direction of Agricultural Services, Plant Protection Division Avda. Millan 4703 CP 12900 Montevideo, URUGUAY Tel: (+598) 2 309 8410 ext 267 | TPG member Spanish | bmelcho@mgap.gub.uy ; bemelcho@hotmail.com ; | Nov 2010 | 2020 (1 st term: 2010-2015) |

| Participants details | | | TPG member's term | |
|---|-----------------------|--|-------------------|---|
| Name, mailing, address, telephone | Participant role | Email address | begins | ends |
| Ms Hong NING Plant Quarantine Station of Sichuan Agricultural Department No. 4 Wuhouci Street, Chengdu, Sichuan, 610041 PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA Tel: (+86) 28 85505251 Fax: (+86) 28 85505251 | TPG member Chinese | ninghong2006@aliyun.com ; | May 2017 | 2022 |
| Mr Ebbe NORDBO Åbanken 34, 4320 Lejre DENMARK Tel: (+45) 46358095 Mobile: (+45) 28740095 | TPG member English | ebbenordbo@outlook.com ; | Nov 2014 | 2019 (1 st term: 2009-2014) |
| Ms Shaza Roushdy OMAR Phytosanitary Specialist Central Administration for Plant Quarantine Ministry of Agriculture 1 Nadi al Said Street Dokki, Giza, EGYPT Mobile: (+20) 1014000813 Fax: (+20) 237608574 | TPG member Arabic | shaza.roshdy@gmail.com ; | Oct 2012 | 2022 |
| Mr Andrei ORLINSKI European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization 21 bd. Richard Lenoir 75011 Paris, FRANCE Tel: (+33) 1 45 20 77 94 ; (+33) 1 84790743 Fax: (+33) 1 70 76 65 47 | TPG member Russian | Orlinski@epppo.int ; | Nov 2010 | 2020 (1 st term: 2010-2015) |
| Ms Céline GERMAIN Standard Setting IPPC Secretariat Rome, ITALY Tel: +(39) 06 57054 468 | IPPC Secretariat | Celine.Germain@fao.org ; | | |
| Ms Eva MOLLER Standard Setting IPPC Secretariat Rome, ITALY Tel: (+39) 0657052 855 | IPPC Secretariat | Eva.Moller@fao.org ; | | |

| Participants details | | | TPG member's term | |
|--|------------------|--|-------------------|------|
| Name, mailing, address, telephone | Participant role | Email address | begins | ends |
| Mr Brent LARSON Standard Setting IPPC Secretariat Rome, ITALY Tel: +(39) 06 57054 915 | IPPC Secretariat | Brent.Larson@fao.org ; | | |
| Ms Adriana MOREIRA Standard Setting IPPC Secretariat Rome, ITALY Tel: (+39) 0657055 809 | IPPC Secretariat | Adriana.Moreira@fao.org ; | | |

TPG member not attending the 2017 December meeting:

| Participants details | | | TPG member's term | |
|---|-----------------------|--|-------------------|------|
| Name, mailing, address, telephone | Participant role | Email address | begins | ends |
| Ms Asenath Abigael KOECH Pest Risk Analysis expert/Plant health inspector Kenya Plant Health Inspectorate Service (KEPHIS) KEPHIS Headquarters OLOOLUA RIDGE , KAREN P.O. BOX 49592-00100, NAIROBI, KENYA Mobile: +254 -722973535 Office: +254 – 709891110 Fax: +254 -020 3536175 | TPG member English | akoech@kephis.org ; abigakoech@gmail.com ; | May 2017 | 2022 |

Appendix 4: General recommendations on use of terms in ISPMs

(as agreed by TPG 2017-12)

Drafting groups should follow these recommendations²⁹ to ensure consistency across ISPMs:

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

Recommendations on use of specific terms

Accredit, authorize and certify

These terms are used by many bodies and organizations 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 restrictions.

“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.

Appropriate level of protection, acceptable level of risk

These terms are not defined in the Glossary. They are recognised as terms of the WTO Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS Agreement) and “appropriate level of protection” is the term defined in this Agreement. These terms should only be used in ISPMs when referring to the SPS context, and with the precise wording of the SPS Agreement. Otherwise, in the phytosanitary context, it is preferable to state that exporting countries have to meet the “phytosanitary import requirements” of importing countries, not their “appropriate level of protection”.

(Non-)compliance, (non-)conformity

According to IPPC Article 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 cases referring to correct or incorrect application of measures (e.g. regarding requirements prescribed for an entire place of production) it might be more appropriate to use terms such as “(non-) conformity”.

Contamination, contaminating pest and contaminant

“Contamination” and “contaminating pest” are Glossary terms and they should be used whenever the object in question fits with their respective definition. In case an ISPM needs to refer to objects similar, but beyond any of those definitions (as not related to pests or regulated articles), another term such as “contaminant” may be used (despite the general clause of ISPM 5, that a definition pertains to a term and any derivate thereof).

Country, contracting party, national plant protection organization (NPPO)

Countries are variously specified in ISPMs as “contracting parties”, “national plant protection organizations (NPPOs)” or just “countries”. These terms can be used to support the intended meaning of a sentence. Where reference is being made specifically to the text of the IPPC and its obligations, the term “contracting party” is appropriate. If the responsibility for action is among those specified in Article IV of the IPPC, the term “NPPO” is more accurate. Otherwise, “country” can be used instead of “contracting party” for the requirements specified in ISPMs, as it is more straightforward, easier to understand and shorter.

²⁹ Previous process approved by the TPG 2010-10 (Annex 13), noted by the SC 2011-05; revised by TPG 2013-02, approved by SC 2013-11 (Appendix 16); recommendations revised by TPG 2014-02, noted by SC 2014-05; revised by TPG 2015-12, noted by SC 2016-05; revised by TPG 2016-12 to be noted by SC 2017-05; revised by TPG 2017-12 to be noted by SC 2018-05.

Dispersal, dissemination and spread

These terms are sometimes used in ways that make them appear to have the same or similar meanings. In ISPMs, it is recommended these terms be used with the following restrictions.

- “spread” should be used as defined in the Glossary, i. e. meaning the enlargement of the geographical range of a pest species by human activity or naturally,
- “dispersal” should be used for the movement of individual pest specimens (including propagules of plants as pests) be it by a vector, wind or soil or by its own means (e.g. flying),
- “dissemination” should be used only in reference to information flow.

Efficacy, effectiveness

“Efficacy” is a special concept linked to 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. The definition of “efficacy” includes the notion of being “measurable”. Therefore, “efficacy” should preferably be used alone, without “level of”. In some cases, the term “effectiveness” and its derived form “effective” may be used; for instance an “effective measure”, “effectiveness of measures”. The generally accepted understanding is that efficacy refers to measurable results under controlled conditions, whereas effectiveness is the degree to which something is successful in producing the desired results.

Hazard

The use of the term “hazard” should be avoided in ISPMs. It is considered confusing and difficult to translate into other languages. Furthermore, the terms “pest” and “pest risk” are sufficient. Where hazard is used to refer to deleterious effects on humans, the term “danger” could be used instead.

(Non-)indigenous, (non-)native, exotic, endemic and alien.

None of these terms are defined in the Glossary. Used in their normal dictionary sense, the terms “indigenous” and “non-indigenous” are the preferred terms to be used in ISPMs, whilst the use of other terms is discouraged. In particular, the CBD term “alien” should in any case be avoided in ISPMs, to not create confusion or conflict with that convention.

Inspection

This is the Glossary term. The definition of “inspection” includes “visual examination”, so the term “inspection” should not be used in conjunction with the word “visual” (as in “visual inspection”).

Intended use

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

Invasive, invasiveness, invasion

“Invasive” is a defined term of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) when it refers to certain organisms. It is recommended that this term is not used in ISPMs because more precise terms have been defined for the IPPC (i.e. “pest” and “quarantine pest”, building upon the well-defined processes of “entry”, “establishment” and “spread”). While IPPC and CBD terminology may seem similar, the differences are rather important (see Appendix 1 to ISPM 5) and confusion could arise from using CBD terminology in ISPMs. The derivatives “invasiveness” and “invasion”, although not defined by CBD, should also be avoided in ISPMs, as the meaning of these words is unclear, and appropriate and well-defined IPPC terms exist for use in ISPMs.

IPPC

It is recommended that the abbreviation “IPPC” only be used when referring specifically to the Convention itself. When referring to decisions or actions of the Commission or the Secretariat these bodies should be specified.

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 therefore recommended not to use the word “official” where it is redundant.

Pest list

There are different types of pest lists, and the terms “pest list”, “list of pests” or “pest listing” used on their own may be ambiguous, especially where they may be interpreted 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 always be qualified.

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

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

Pest free

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

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 pest risk analysis (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.

Phytosanitary certificate, certificate

Where “certificate” or “certification” refers to “phytosanitary certificate” or “phytosanitary certification”, the latter terms should be used, to distinguish from other instances where certificate and certification may relate to other situations (e.g. Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) certificates, certification scheme). In ISPM 12 (*Phytosanitary certificates*), 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”, below.

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. “Phytosanitary measure” is “legislation, regulation or official procedure” (in accordance also with the use of this term in the SPS Agreement), while “phytosanitary action” is “official operation”. For a fuller explanation, see Note 10 of the Annotated Glossary.

Phytosanitary status

The use of “phytosanitary status” should be avoided as it creates conflicts of meaning between existing ISPMs. The defined Glossary terms “pest status (in an area)” or “pest risk” may be used in some contexts. In other cases, the concept should be explained in plain words.

Point of entry

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

Prescribed, required, target

The terms “prescribed”, “required” and “target” have been used in ISPMs to indicate the desired measurement of a temperature, dose or similar. However, “target” indicates that which is aimed for, but which may not be reached. Thus, the word “target” should not be used in ISPMs in this context.

“Required” indicates a measurement that is set in the phytosanitary import requirements of a country, and is therefore a suitable adjective to use. “Prescribed” is synonymous with “required”, but “required” is the preferred term in this context.

Presence, occurrence

The terms “presence” and “occurrence” have been used in ISPMs in relation to pest status. However, it is recommended that the term “presence” be used rather than the term “occurrence”³⁰.

Prevalence

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

Restriction

While this previously defined Glossary term has been used in ISPMs, it was used to mean “phytosanitary import requirements”. The term “phytosanitary import requirements” is defined in the Glossary and, as such, is the preferred term³¹.

Security, phytosanitary security

Only “phytosanitary security” is defined in the Glossary. The full term should be used when appropriate.

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 be used and “shipment” should be avoided.

Trading partner

“Trading partner” (or “trade partner”) has been used in ISPMs in different contexts. This term may cause confusion. In ISPMs, it has often been used to make reference to the “NPPO of an importing country”, and does not cover the broader understanding of the term which may include stakeholders. Where it is intended to mean “importing country”, this expression should be used. Otherwise 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 either option or both options can apply at the same time. 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 quoted as written.

“/” and “(s)”

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

³⁰ CPM-10 (2015) adopted the deletion of the definition of “occurrence” and confirmed that the term “presence” does not need a specific IPPC definition.

³¹ CPM-10 (2015) adopted the deletion of the Glossary term “restriction” and thus the term can now be used with its general English meaning.

- 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 5: Proposed ink amendments to ensure a consistent use of “contamination” and its derivatives in adopted ISPMs

Background

- [1] In May 2017, the Standards Committee (SC) added “contamination” (consistency review of its use in ISPMs) (2017-002) to the *List of topics for IPPC Standards* because there may be some cases in adopted standards (e.g. ISPM 18 (*Guidelines for the use of irradiation as a phytosanitary measure*)) where “contamination” is used with a different meaning than its Glossary meaning.
- [2] In their December 2017 meeting, the Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG) reviewed the use of “contamination” and its derivatives in ISPMs and proposed the below ink amendments to ensure a consistent use of this Glossary term and its derivatives without changing the intended meaning of the ISPM texts.
- [3] **Table 1: proposed ink amendments to avoid using “contamination” or its derivatives where the intended meaning does not correspond to the Glossary definition of “contamination”**

| ISPM | ISPM SECTION | CURRENT TEXT | PROPOSED INK AMENDMENT | EXPLANATION |
|--|-----------------------|--|---|--|
| ISPM 11 (<i>Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests</i>) | 1.1 Initiation points | S2 The types of LMOs that an NPPO may be asked to assess for phytosanitary risk include: - plants for use (a) as agricultural crops, for food and feed, ornamental plants or managed forests; (b) in bioremediation (as an organism that cleans up contamination) [...] | S2 The types of LMOs that an NPPO may be asked to assess for phytosanitary risk include: - plants for use (a) as agricultural crops, for food and feed, ornamental plants or managed forests; (b) in bioremediation (as an organism that cleans up contamination <u>pollution</u>) [...] | “Contamination” is not used according to its Glossary definition. Bioremediation is a waste management technique that involves the use of organisms to neutralize pollutants from a contaminated site. According to EPA (USA), bioremediation is a "treatment that uses naturally occurring organisms to break down hazardous substances into less toxic or non-toxic substances". Therefore, the suggested ink amendment is to replace the term “contamination” by the word “pollution”. |

| ISPM | ISPM SECTION | CURRENT TEXT | PROPOSED INK AMENDMENT | EXPLANATION |
|---|---|--|---|--|
| ISPM 18 (<i>Guidelines for the use of irradiation as a phytosanitary measure</i>) | ANNEX 2 Criteria 3. Product handling, storage and segregation | Commodities are handled in an environment that does not increase the risk of contamination from physical, chemical or biological hazards | Commodities are handled in an environment that does not increase the risk of contamination from physical, chemical or biological hazards | “Contamination” is not used according to its Glossary definition. The suggested ink amendment is to avoid using “contamination”. |
| ISPM 21 (<i>Pest risk analysis for regulated non-quarantine pests</i>) | 3.3.1 Pest effects | In some cases, economic consequences may only become apparent after a long period of time (e.g. a degenerative disease in a perennial crop, a pest with a long-lived resting stage). Furthermore, the infestation in the plants may result in contamination of places of production with a consequential impact on future crops. [...] | In some cases, economic consequences may only become apparent after a long period of time (e.g. a degenerative disease in a perennial crop, a pest with a long-lived resting stage). Furthermore, the infestation in the plants may result in the pest remaining in the contamination of places of production with a consequential impact on future crops. [...] | “Contamination” is not considered to be used strictly according to its Glossary definition, in which “places of production” are not listed. Rewording is suggested to avoid using “contamination”. |
| ISPM 33 (<i>Pest free potato (Solanum spp.) micropropagative material and minitubers for international trade</i>) | 3.1 Establishment of pest free potato micropropagative material | [...] In addition to the laboratory testing procedure for regulated pests described below, potato micropropagative material should be inspected and found free from other pests or their symptoms and general microbial contamination. | [...] In addition to the laboratory testing procedure for regulated pests described below, potato micropropagative material should be inspected and found free from other pests or their symptoms and from microbes in general microbial contamination. | “Contamination” is not used according to its Glossary definition. Rewording is suggested to avoid using “contamination”. |
| ISPM 36 (<i>Integrated measures for</i> | APPENDIX 1 Table 1 | 6 Pests spread by water - Use of uncontaminated water sources, free of pests | 6 Pests spread by water - Use of uncontaminated water sources, free of pests | “Uncontaminated” is not considered to be used strictly according to the Glossary |

| ISPM | ISPM SECTION | CURRENT TEXT | PROPOSED INK AMENDMENT | EXPLANATION |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|---------------------------|---|
| <i>plants for planting)</i> | | | | definition of “contamination”, in which “water sources” are not listed. Furthermore, the word is redundant. Rewording is suggested to avoid using “uncontaminated”. |

[4] **Table 2: proposed ink amendments to ISPM 2 (Framework for pest risk analysis) where the term “contamination” is used in relation to biological control agents or beneficial organisms, but the use of “contaminants” is more appropriate**

| ISPM | ISPM SECTION | CURRENT TEXT | PROPOSED INK AMENDMENT | EXPLANATION |
|---|--|---|--|--|
| ISPM 2 (<i>Framework for pest risk analysis</i>) | 1.2.2 Biological control agents and other beneficial organisms | Biological control agents and other beneficial organisms are intended to be beneficial to plants. Thus, when performing a PRA, the main concern is to look for potential injury to non-target organisms. Other concerns may include: - contamination of cultures of beneficial organisms with other species, the culture thereby acting as a pathway for pests | Biological control agents and other beneficial organisms are intended to be beneficial to plants. Thus, when performing a PRA, the main concern is to look for potential injury to non-target organisms. Other concerns may include: - contamination <u>presence</u> of other species <u>as contaminants of</u> cultures of beneficial organisms with other species , the culture thereby acting as a pathway for pests. | “Contamination” is not used according its Glossary definition. The wording proposed instead uses “contaminants” because it is a word commonly used in this context and well understood. This is also in line with the note on “contaminant” in the <i>General recommendation in the use of terms in ISPMs</i> (as proposed by the TPG in their December 2017 meeting). |

[5] **Table 3: proposed ink amendments to adopted ISPMs where “contaminant” is used but the Glossary terms “contamination” or “contaminating pest” should be used instead.**

| ISPM | ISPM SECTION | CURRENT TEXT | PROPOSED INK AMENDMENT | EXPLANATION |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| ISPM 2 (<i>Framework for pest risk analysis</i>) | 1.2.1 Plants as pests | Plants as pests may also be introduced unintentionally into a country, for example as contaminants of seeds for sowing, grain for consumption or fodder, wool, soil, machinery, equipment, vehicles, containers or ballast water. | Plants as pests may also be introduced unintentionally into a country, for example as contaminants of <u>contaminating pests with</u> seeds for sowing, grain for consumption or fodder, wool, soil, machinery, equipment, vehicles, containers or ballast water. | The meaning corresponds to that of the Glossary term “contaminating pest”. |
| ISPM 11 (<i>Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests</i>) | ANNEX 4 Introduction | This annex provides specific guidance on conducting PRA to determine if a plant is a pest of It focuses primarily on plants proposed for import, whether as plants for planting or for other intended uses. It does not cover the unintentional introduction of plants as contaminants in commodities or conveyances. | This annex provides specific guidance on conducting PRA to determine if a plant is a pest of... It focuses primarily on plants proposed for import, whether as plants for planting or for other intended uses. It does not cover the unintentional introduction of plants as contaminants <u>contaminating pests</u> in commodities or conveyances. | The meaning corresponds to that of the Glossary term “contaminating pest”. |
| ISPM 11 | ANNEX 4 <i>Probability of spread (refer to section 2.2.3)</i> | The likelihood and extent of spread depends on natural and human-mediated factors. [...] | The likelihood and extent of spread depends on natural and human-mediated factors. [...] | The meaning corresponds to that of the Glossary term “contaminating pest”. |

| ISPM | ISPM SECTION | CURRENT TEXT | PROPOSED INK AMENDMENT | EXPLANATION |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| | | Human-mediated factors, whether intentional or unintentional, may include: - intended use, consumer demand, economic value and ease of transport - the movement of propagules as a contaminant of soil or other materials (e.g. clothing, conveyances, machinery, tools, equipment) | Human-mediated factors, whether intentional or unintentional, may include: - intended use, consumer demand, economic value and ease of transport - the movement of propagules of contaminating pests as a contaminant of with soil or other materials (e.g. clothing, conveyances, machinery, tools, equipment) | |
| ISPM 14 (<i>The use of integrated measures in a systems approach for pest risk management</i>) | 3. Relationship with PRA and Available Risk Management Options | Harvest - sanitation (e.g. removal of contaminants, “trash”) | Harvest - sanitation (e.g. removal of contamination contaminants , “trash”) | The meaning corresponds to that of the Glossary term “contamination”. |
| ISPM 20 (<i>Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system</i>) | 5.1.6.2 Emergency action | Emergency action may be required in a new or unexpected phytosanitary situation, such as the detection of quarantine pests or potential quarantine pests: - as contaminants of conveyances, storage places or other places involved with imported commodities. | Emergency action may be required in a new or unexpected phytosanitary situation, such as the detection of quarantine pests or potential quarantine pests: - as contaminants contaminating pests of conveyances, storage places or other places involved with imported commodities. | The meaning corresponds to that of the Glossary term “contaminating pest”. |

| ISPM | ISPM SECTION | CURRENT TEXT | PROPOSED INK AMENDMENT | EXPLANATION |
|---|---|--|---|---|
| ISPM 23 (<i>Guidelines for inspection</i>) | 2.3.2 Compliance of phytosanitary requirements | Inspection can be used to verify the compliance with some phytosanitary requirements. Examples include: freedom from contaminants (e.g. leaves, soil) | Inspection can be used to verify the compliance with some phytosanitary requirements. Examples include: - freedom from contaminants <u>contamination</u> (e.g. leaves, soil) | The meaning corresponds to that of the Glossary term “contamination”. |
| ISPM 33 (<i>Pest free potato (Solanum spp.) micropropagative material and minitubers for international trade</i>) | Annex 2 Operating procedures | - a monitoring programme to check the level of air-borne contaminants in the subculture room, cabinets and growth room | - a monitoring programme to check the level of air-borne contaminants <u>contamination</u> in the subculture room, cabinets and growth room | The meaning corresponds to that of the Glossary term “contamination”. |
| ISPM 41 (<i>International movement of used vehicles, machinery and equipment</i>) | Appendix 2 Category: Agricultural, forestry and horticultural used VME, such as: | Contamination notes: Contaminants: soil, pests. | Contamination notes: Contaminants <u>Contamination by:</u> soil, pests | The meaning corresponds to that of the Glossary term “contamination”. |
| ISPM 41 | Appendix 2 Category: Earth moving used VME, such as: - bulldozers - graders - surface mining equipment. | Contamination notes: Soil is the main contaminant; pests, plant debris and seeds can also be contaminants | Contamination notes: Soil is the main contaminant; <u>Contamination mainly by soil;</u> but also by pests, plant debris and seeds can also be contaminants | The meaning corresponds to that of the Glossary term “contamination”. |

| ISPM | ISPM SECTION | CURRENT TEXT | PROPOSED INK AMENDMENT | EXPLANATION |
|---------|--|---|---|---|
| | Reconditioned or field-tested used VME are included. Pest risk is variable, but high levels of contamination may occur in this category | | | |
| ISPM 41 | Appendix 2 Category: Used military VME, such as: | Contamination notes: Contaminants: soil, pests [...] | Contamination notes: Contaminants Contamination by: soil, pests [...] | The meaning corresponds to that of the Glossary term “contamination”. |
| ISPM 41 | Appendix 2 Category: Waste management used VME, such as: | Contamination notes: Organic waste debris is the main contaminant, including: soil, pests [...] | Contamination notes: Contamination mainly by Organic waste debris is the main contaminant , including: soil, pests [...] | The meaning corresponds to that of the Glossary term “contamination”. |
| ISPM 41 | Appendix 2 Category: Deep mining used VME. | The most likely contaminants are soil and to a lesser extent pests. Pest risk is generally low unless used VME are contaminated with surface soil [...] | The Contamination is most likely contaminants are by soil and to a lesser extent by pests. Pest risk is generally low unless used VME are contaminated with surface soil [...] | The meaning corresponds to that of the Glossary term “contamination”. |
| ISPM 41 | Appendix 2 Category: Used vehicles, such as: - cars, vans, trucks, buses | Contamination notes: Contaminants: soil, pests [...] | Contamination notes: Contaminants Contamination by: soil, pests [...] | The meaning corresponds to that of the Glossary term “contamination”. |

Appendix 6 - TPG Work Plan 2018-2019

(Prepared by the Secretariat, last updated 2018-01-22)

[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 scheduled tentatively for the week of 3-7 December 2018 (pending confirmation by the IPPC Secretariat early 2018). Tentative deadline for submitting meeting documents is 1 October 2018.

TABLE 1 - REGULAR TASKS

| Regular tasks | | Detailed task | Responsible | Deadline | Comments |
|---|--|---|----------------------------------|-------------|---|
| 1. Meeting reports: preparation and update to SC | December 2017 | Draft report to Steward, Chairperson and rapporteur | Secretariat | 2018-01-17 | |
| | | Steward, Chairperson and rapporteur send back draft report | Steward, Chair & rapporteur | 2018-01-25 | |
| | | Secretariat finalizes report and sends to TPG | Secretariat | 2018-01-29 | |
| | | TPG review report and send comments | All | 2018-02-05 | |
| | | Final report | Secretariat | 2018-02-12 | (To allow review in Secretariat) |
| | Update for SC May 2018 | Prepare update (incl. decisions) from December 2017 meeting for SC May 2018 | Secretariat with stewards | 2018-03-16 | Secretariat to draft; steward to respond by 23/3 tent. |
| 2. Draft ISPMs in 1st consultation (except Amendments, see 3) | Going to SC-7 / 2 nd consultation | Terms and consistency comments extracted. <i>Note: pending confirmation of the 2018 TPG meeting. If the TPG meeting is cancelled, the TPG will not review terms and consistency comments on draft ISPMs sent to first consultation in 2018.</i> | Secretariat | 2018-10-04 | 1 st consultation closes 30/09 |
| | | 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 stewards | 2018-12-21 | Comments from TPG on these will not be solicited, documents will be finalized by Secretariat and Steward (15/02 deadline for stewards to send Sec. responses to comments and revised draft) |

| Regular tasks | | Detailed task | Responsible | Deadline | Comments |
|--|------------------------|--|---|-----------------|--|
| | | Check accuracy of translation of definitions in draft ISPMs and propose translations for Chinese, Arabic and Russian | French, Spanish Russian, Chinese, Arabic | 2019-01-28 | These will be submitted to translation-services when drafts go for translation before CPM |
| 3. Terms and definitions (incl. Amendments to the Glossary) | 2017 Amendments | Volunteers sends draft meeting papers to Secretariat | ALL, as allocated in Table 3 | 2016-10-03 | TPG 2016 |
| | | Draft 2017 Amendments compiled based on discussions at TPG 2016-12 | Secretariat and steward | 2016-12-22 | Back to Secretariat by 2017-01-04 |
| | | TPG members' help to translate new terms proposed for the draft amendments in languages for the List of topics (LOT) | Secretariat N/A | TPG meeting | No terms for TPG 2016-12 as all terms already in the Glossary |
| | | Draft 2017 Amendments finalized | ALL | 2017-01-20 | |
| | | Amendments processed for SC | Secretariat | 2017-02-17 | Posting deadline for SC May 2017 is 1 March |
| | | Draft amendments to 1 st Consultation | | 2017-07 to 09 | |
| | | Draft amendments and 1 st Cons. comments reviewed | | TPG 2017-12 | |
| | | Finalize amendments and responses | Secretariat and steward | 2017-12-21 | Back to Secretariat by 2018-01-10 |
| | | Amendments and responses for TPG comments | ALL | 2018-01-26 | Draft Amendments and responses to compiled comments to be posted by 1 March for SC-7 / 2 nd Cons. |
| | | Check accuracy of translation of definitions in draft ISPMs and propose translations for Chinese, Arabic and Russian | French, Spanish Russian, Chinese, Arabic | 2018-01-26 | These will be submitted to translation-services when drafts go for translation before CPM |
| | | Draft amendments in 2 nd Consultation | | 2018-07 to 09 | |
| | | Consultation by email on 2 nd Cons. comments | ALL | TBD, in 2018-10 | If Steward feels consultation is needed. The draft Amendments and responses to 2 nd Cons. comments are submitted to SC November |
| | | 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 2019-01 | The translations will be ready for review around the beginning of January and must be posted by 1 March for CPM. |

| Regular tasks | Detailed task | Responsible | Deadline | Comments |
|-----------------|--|---|-----------------|--|
| 2018 Amendments | Volunteers sends draft meeting papers to Secretariat | ALL, as allocated in Table 3 | 2017-10-02 | TPG 2017 |
| | Draft 2018 Amendments compiled based on discussions at TPG 2017-12 | Secretariat and steward | 2017-12-21 | Back to Secretariat by 2018-01-10 |
| | TPG members' help to translate new terms proposed for the draft amendments in languages for the List of topics (LOT) | Secretariat | TPG meeting | N/A |
| | Draft 2018 Amendments finalized | ALL | 2018-01-26 | |
| | Amendments processed for SC | Secretariat | 2018-02-17 | Posting deadline for SC May 2018 is 1 March |
| | Draft amendments to 1st Consultation | | 2018-07 to 09 | |
| | Draft amendments and 1st Cons. comments reviewed <i>Note: pending confirmation of the 2018 TPG meeting. If the 2018 TPG meeting is cancelled, this will be postponed to the 2019 TPG meeting.</i> | | TPG 2018-12 | |
| | Finalize amendments and responses | Secretariat and steward | 2018-12-21 | Back to Secretariat by 2019-01-09 |
| | Amendments and responses for TPG comments | ALL | 2019-01-28 | Draft Amendments and responses to compiled comments to be posted by 1 March for SC-7 / 2 nd Cons. |
| | Check accuracy of translation of definitions in draft ISPMs and propose translations for Chinese, Arabic and Russian | French, Spanish Russian, Chinese, Arabic | 2019-01-28 | These will be submitted to translation-services when drafts go for translation before CPM |
| | Draft amendments in 2 nd Consultation | | 2019-07 to 09 | |
| | Consultation by email on 2 nd Cons. comments | ALL | TBD, in 2019-10 | If Steward feels consultation is needed. The draft Amendments and responses to 2 nd Cons. comments are submitted to SC November |
| | 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 2020-01 | The translations will be ready for review around the beginning of January and must be posted by 1 March for CPM. |

| Regular tasks | Detailed task | Responsible | Deadline | Comments |
|-----------------|---|---|-----------------|--|
| 2019 Amendments | Volunteers sends draft meeting papers to Secretariat <i>Note: pending confirmation of the 2018 TPG meeting. If the 2018 TPG meeting is cancelled, no 2019 Amendments will be prepared (2020 Amendments to be prepared by the TPG during their 2019 meeting).</i> | ALL, as allocated in Table 3 | 2018-10-01 | TPG 2018 |
| | Draft 2019 Amendments compiled based on discussions at TPG 2018-12 | Secretariat and steward | 2018-12-21 | Back to Secretariat by 2018-01-10 |
| | TPG members' help to translate new terms proposed for the draft amendments in languages for the List of topics (LOT) | Secretariat | TPG meeting | |
| | Draft 2019 Amendments finalized | ALL | 2019-01-26 | |
| | Amendments processed for SC | Secretariat | 2019-02-17 | Posting deadline for SC May 2019 is 1 March |
| | Draft amendments to 1st Consultation | | 2019-07 to 09 | |
| | Draft amendments and 1st Cons. comments reviewed | | TPG 2019-12 | |
| | Finalize amendments and responses | Secretariat and steward | 2019-12-21 | Back to Secretariat by 2020-01-09 |
| | Amendments and responses for TPG comments | ALL | 2020-01-28 | Draft Amendments and responses to compiled comments to be posted by 1 March for SC-7 / 2 nd Cons. |
| | Check accuracy of translation of definitions in draft ISPMs and propose translations for Chinese, Arabic and Russian | French, Spanish Russian, Chinese, Arabic | 2020-01-28 | These will be submitted to translation-services when drafts go for translation before CPM |
| | Draft amendments in 2 nd Consultation | | 2020-07 to 09 | |
| | Consultation by email on 2 nd Cons. comments | ALL | TBD, in 2020-10 | If Steward feels consultation is needed. The draft Amendments and responses to 2 nd Cons. |

| Regular tasks | Detailed task | | Responsible | Deadline | Comments |
|--|---|---|-----------------------|------------------|--|
| | | | | | comments are submitted to SC November |
| | | 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 2021-01 | The translations will be ready for review around the beginning of January and must be posted by 1 March for CPM. |
| 4. Annotated Glossary – (to be published every 3 years) | 2017 (intermediate) | To prepare intermediate update based on TPG comments, outcomes of TPG 2016, CPM 2017, SC May 2017 | Beatriz Melcho | 2017-06-15 | |
| | | To review intermediate update | All | 2017-06-30 | |
| | 2018 (intermediate) | To prepare intermediate update based on TPG comments, outcomes of TPG 2017, including updates from SC Nov. 2017, CPM 2018, SC May 2018 | Beatriz Melcho | After SC 2018-05 | All to review / provide comments by end June 2018 |
| | 2019 (for publishing) | To prepare update based on TPG comments, outcomes of TPG 2018, including updates from SC Nov. 2018. | Beatriz Melcho | TBD | All to review / provide comments during TPG 2018 meeting |
| | | To review update <i>Pending confirmation of the 2018 TPG meeting. If the 2018 TPG meeting is cancelled, the review of the Annotated Glossary (for publishing) will be postponed to the 2019 TPG meeting.</i> | All | TPG meeting | To be approved by SC via e-decision asap in 2019. |
| 5. Explanation of Glossary terms | 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 | 2018-10-02 | |
| 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) | Ongoing consistency review | All during TPG meeting | | TPG meeting |
| | Present all ink amendments / proposals for revision made so far | Secretariat | Ongoing | TPG meeting |
| | Consistency review of “contamination”: review of proposed ink amendments for presentation to the May 2018 meeting | ALL | 2018-02-05 | |
| | Prepare ink amendments to adopted ISPMs to avoid the use of “commodity class” | Andrei Orlinski | 2018-10-01 | |
| 8. Other tasks | General recommendations on consistency: yearly updates as needed | Secretariat with stewards | 2019-01-07 | Back to the Secretariat by 2017-01-16 |
| | General recommendations on consistency | ALL | 2018-01-28 | Appended to TPG report |
| | Review the draft explanatory document on ISPM 16 (Regulated non-quarantine pests: concept and application): <i>pending the SC agrees in May 2018 to add this task to the TPG work programme</i> | TBD | 2018-10-01 | For discussion at the TPG 2018-12 meeting if confirmed |

TABLE 3 - TERMS AND SUBJECTS ON THE TPG WORK PROGRAMME

| | |
|-----------------------|--|
| Blue shading: | Active subjects on the List of topics |
| Red shading: | Consequential changes to terms |
| Green shading: | Pending subjects on the List of topics |
| Green text: | Terms to be submitted to SC / first consultation |
| Orange text: | Terms to be submitted to SC-7 / second consultation or to CPM |

| | Term | Status | Lead | Comments & next steps |
|----|--|-----------------|-------------------|--|
| 1. | bulbs and tubers (as a commodity class) (2017-001) | To SC 2018-05 | Shaza Roshdy Omar | - TPG 2016-12 invited SC to add all commodity class terms to the LOT to consider whether any should be deleted or revised. This recommendation was prompted by the discussions on “commodity class” in the context of ePhyto. - SC 2017-05 added “bulbs and tubers (as a commodity class)” to the LOT - TPG 2017-12 proposed deletion in the 2018 Amendments |
| 2. | commodity class (2015-013) | To SC 2018-05 | Andrei Orlinski | - SC 2015-11 added the term to LOT following discussions on the 2014 Amendments, specifically for the terms grain and seeds, and asked the TPG to review this term in light of the recent discussions on the concept of a commodity standard (see section 5 of TPG 2015 report) and commodity classes within the context of ePhyto and consider deletion. - TPG 2016-12 discussed the term in the context of ePhyto and recommended further studies to determine if “commodity class” and specific commodity class terms should be deleted from ISPM 5. - SC 2017-05 noted that the TPG will consider further the term “commodity class” in combination with the review of the different commodity classes included in the Glossary. - TPG 2017-12 proposed deletion in the 2018 Amendments |
| 3. | confinement (2016-002) | To SC-7 2018-05 | Ebbe Nordbo | - TPG 2015-12 recommended inclusion on LOT for revision. - SC 2016-05 added to LOT. - TPG 2016-12 recommended for deletion in the draft 2017 Amendments. - SC 2017-05 agreed with TPG proposal for deletion and approved it for the first consultation - TPG 2017-12 considered first consultation comments and left their recommendation (term to be deleted) unchanged. |

| Term | Status | Lead | Comments & next steps |
|---|------------------|------------------------|---|
| 4. contaminating pest, contamination (2012-001) | To CPM-13 (2018) | Laurence Bouhot-Delduc | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SC 2012-04 added <i>contaminating pest</i>; 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). - deletion proposed in Amendments 2013. - SC 2013-05 agreed with proposal. - TPG 2014-02 reviewed member comments. - 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. - SC 2014-05 agreed to withdraw from Amendments (2013) for the TPG to reconsider with <i>contamination</i>. - TPG 2014-12 discussed and proposed revisions to both terms in 2015 Amendments; to SC 2015-05 for approval for member consultation. - SC 2015-05 approved for MC 2016 (MC delayed one year as too few terms). - TPG 2016-12 considered consultation comments and adjusted the proposed revisions. - SC-7 2017-05 reviewed consultation comments, TPG proposals and approved the term for the second consultation (with no change) - SC 2017-11 reviewed second consultation comments and recommended the proposed revisions to the CPM for adoption (with no change) |
| 5. cut flowers and branches (as a commodity class) (2012-007) | To SC 2018-05 | Laurence Bouhot-Delduc | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SC 2012-04 added to the List of topics. 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 <i>cut flowers and branches</i>. - TPG 2013 proposal submitted to SC May 2013 in Amendments (2013). - SC 2013-05 postponed the consideration of the revised definition of <i>cut flowers and branches</i> (2008-005), and requested the Secretariat to transmit the proposed revised definition (and associated explanations) to the EWG on International movement of cut flowers and branches (2008-005) for further consideration. One issue is whether the ISPM should be restricted to fresh material. - SC 2015-05 discussed the draft ISPM on cut flowers and agreed that the term be kept pending until the draft ISPM has advanced further. - TPG 2015-12 was given an update on the draft ISPM which had its scope modified to "cut flowers and foliage" in SC 2015-11 meeting. - TPG 2016-12 invited SC to add all commodity class terms to the LOT to consider whether any should be deleted or revised. This recommendation was prompted by the discussions on "commodity class" in the context of ePhyto. - SC 2017-05 removed the pending status of "cut flowers and branches (as a commodity class)" - TPG 2017-12 proposed deletion in the 2018 Amendments |
| 6. detention | To CPM-13 (2018) | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - TPG 2016-12 proposed an ink amendment for consistency (when discussing "confinement") to delete "(see quarantine)" as this is not consistent with other Glossary terms. Cross references are made by indicating Glossary terms in bold. |

| Term | Status | Lead | Comments & next steps |
|--|------------------|------------------------|---|
| | | | - SC 2017-05 agreed with the proposed ink amendment (with no change) and noted that it will be processed for CPM noting and incorporated in ISPM 5 as resources permit this |
| 7. exclusion (2010-008) | To CPM-13 (2018) | John Hedley | <p>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).</p> <p>- TPF 2009, but not considered by TPG 2009. TPF 2010 resubmitted a definition to TPG. TPG 2010 modified definition.</p> <p>- SC 2011-05 decided to send for MC.</p> <p>- TPG 2011 advised, based on comments received, that the draft definition should be reconsidered together with <i>suppression</i>, <i>eradication</i>, <i>containment</i>, <i>control</i>.</p> <p>- For revision in Amendments (2013) as addition.</p> <p>- SC May 2013 agreed.</p> <p>- TPG 2014 reviewed member comments.</p> <p>- SC May 2014 withdrew from Amendments (2013). After SC discussion on phytosanitary measure, the TPG will be able to review the definition proposal.</p> <p>- SC 2015-05 could not agree on one understanding of phytosanitary measure but made the term “unpending”.</p> <p>- TPG 2015-12 recommended addition in the draft 2016 Amendments.</p> <p>- SC 2016-05 agreed to the inclusion and approved for MC.</p> <p>- TPG 2016-12 reviewed consultation comments and adjusted the proposed definition.</p> <p>- SC-7 2017-05 reviewed consultation comments, TPG proposals and approved the term for the second consultation (with no change)</p> <p>- SC 2017-11 reviewed second consultation comments and recommended the proposed addition to the CPM for adoption (with no change)</p> |
| 8. fruits and vegetables (as a commodity class) (2017-003) | To SC 2018-05 | Andrei Orlinski | <p>- TPG 2016-12 invited SC to add all commodity class terms to the LOT to consider whether any should be deleted or revised. This recommendation was prompted by the discussions on “commodity class” in the context of ePhyto.</p> <p>- SC 2017-05 added “fruits and vegetables (as a commodity class)” to the LOT</p> <p>- TPG 2017-12 proposed deletion in the 2018 Amendments</p> |
| 9. grain (as a commodity class) (2017-004) | To SC 2018-05 | Laurence Bouhot-Delduc | <p>- TPG 2016-12 invited SC to add all commodity class terms to the LOT to consider whether any should be deleted or revised. This recommendation was prompted by the discussions on “commodity class” in the context of ePhyto.</p> <p>- SC 2017-05 added “grain (as a commodity class)” to the LOT</p> <p>- TPG 2017-12 proposed a revision of the term in the 2018 Amendments</p> |
| 10. growing period / growing season (2016-004) | To SC-7 2018-05 | Laurence Bouhot-Delduc | <p>- TPG 2015-12 proposed to add to the LOT (proposal to be submitted to the SC May 2016).</p> <p>- SC 2016-05 added to LOT.</p> <p>- TPG 2016-12 discussed the terms and recommended the revision of “growing period” and the deletion of “growing season” in the draft 2017 Amendments.</p> |

| Term | Status | Lead | Comments & next steps |
|--|---|----------------------------|--|
| | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SC 2017-05 agreed with TPG proposals (no change) and approved the revision of “growing period” and the deletion of “growing season” for the first consultation - TPG 2017-12 considered first consultation comments and left their proposals unchanged. |
| 11. identity (2011-001) | Pending Focused revision of ISPM 12 | Ebbe Nordbo | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SC 2011-05 added 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 2013-05 agreed (see TPG 2012-10 report and SC 2013-05 report). - 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 but agreed that terms and ISPM 12 will be processed combined only (for SC May 2015). - SC 2015-05 reviewed but asked TPG to prepare draft specification for the review of ISPM 12 in combination with this term, as not consistency changes or ink amendments. - TPG 2015-06 prepared specification via <i>TPG_2015-06_e-decision_03: Draft specification for the revision of ISPM 12</i> and submitted to 2015-08 Call for topics. - SC 2015-11 recommended addition of topic to LOT to be approved by CPM-11 (2016). If approved, focused revision of ISPM 12 will be prepared. (Consider if apply “phytosanitary status” revisions as well). - Secretariat suggesting to wait with further work pending revision of ISPM 12 (SC not made pending). - CPM-11 (2016) approved the addition of the <i>Revision of ISPM 12 on Phytosanitary certificates</i> (2015-011), with priority 2. The draft specification will be submitted to consultation in July 2017. - SC 2017-11 agreed to review the comments and consider the draft specification by SC e-decision |
| 12. Inspection (2017-005) | To SC 2018-05 | Stephanie Bloem | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - TPG 2016 invited the SC to consider if inspection should be revised to adequately reflect current inspection practices that may also include examination methods other than visual and if so add this term to the LOT. - SC 2017-05 added “inspection” to the LOT - TPG 2017-12 proposed a revision of the term in the 2018 Amendments |
| 13. integrity (of a consignment) consequential | Pending Focused revision of ISPM 12 (consequential) | Ebbe Nordbo (see identity) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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 but agreed that terms and ISPM 12 will be processed combined only (for SC May 2015). - SC 2015-05 reviewed but asked TPG to prepare draft specification for the review of ISPM 12 in combination with this term, as not consistency changes or ink amendments. |

| Term | Status | Lead | Comments & next steps |
|--|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|---|
| | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - TPG 2015-06 prepared specification via <i>TPG_2015-06_e-decision_03: Draft specification for the revision of ISPM 12</i> and submitted to 2015-08 Call for topics. - SC 2015-11 recommended addition of topic to the LOT to be approved by CPM-11 (2016). If approved, focused revision of ISPM 12 will be prepared. - CPM-11 (2016) approved the addition of the <i>Revision of ISPM 12 on Phytosanitary certificates</i> (2015-011), with priority 2. The draft specification will be submitted to consultation in July 2017. - SC 2017-11 agreed to review the comments and consider the draft specification by SC e-decision |
| 14. kiln-drying (2013-006) | To CPM-13 (2018) | Andrei Orlinski Secretariat | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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). - SC 2015-05 agreed with proposal and approved for MC 2016 (delayed one year as too few terms). - TPG 2016-12 noted there were no consultation comments on the deletion of this term. - SC 2017-05 noted there were no consultation comment on the deletion of this term and its deletion will not be presented to the 2nd consultation - SC 2017-11 reviewed second consultation comments and recommended the proposed deletion to the CPM |
| 15. mark (2013-007) | To SC-7 2018-05 | Ebbe Nordbo | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - TPG 2013 addition to the List of topics. To remove “phytosanitary status” in the definition. Proposal already exists. To be extracted from relevant document. - 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. - SC-7 2015 agreed with the proposal and approved for SCCP. - SC withdrew term from Amendments (2014) and asked TPG to consider deletion. - TPG 2016-12 recommended the deletion of “mark” from the Glossary. - SC 2017-05 agreed with the TPG proposal and approved the deletion of “mark” for the first consultation - TPG 2017-12 considered first consultation comments and left their recommendation for deletion unchanged. |
| 16. phytosanitary security (of a consignment) (2013-008) | Pending Focused revision of ISPM 12 | Ebbe Nordbo | <p>See identity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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 but agreed that terms and ISPM 12 will be processed combined only (for SC May 2015). |

| Term | Status | Lead | Comments & next steps |
|--|------------------|------------------------|---|
| | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SC 2015-05 reviewed but asked TPG to prepare draft specification for the review of ISPM 12 in combination with this term, as not consistency changes or ink amendments. - TPG 2015-06 prepared specification via <i>TPG_2015-06_e-decision_03: Draft specification for the revision of ISPM 12</i> and submitted to 2015-08 Call for topics. - SC 2015-11 recommended addition of topic to LOT to be approved by CPM-11 (2016). If approved, a focused revision of ISPM 12 will be prepared. - CPM-11 (2016) approved the addition of the <i>Revision of ISPM 12 on Phytosanitary certificates</i> (2015-011), with priority 2. The draft specification will be submitted to consultation in July 2017. - SC 2017-11 agreed to review the comments and consider the draft specification by SC e-decision |
| 17. plants <i>in vitro</i> (as a commodity class) (2017-006) | To SC 2018-05 | Shaza Roshdy Omar | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - TPG 2016-12 invited SC to add all commodity class terms to the LOT to consider whether any should be deleted or revised. This recommendation was prompted by the discussions on "commodity class" in the context of ePhyto. - SC 2017-05 added "plants <i>in vitro</i> (as a commodity class)" to the LOT - TPG 2017-12 proposed deletion in the 2018 Amendments |
| 18. pre-clearance (2013-016) | To CPM-13 (2018) | Stephanie Bloem | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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. - SC 2015-05 made the term "unpending". The Secretariat also transmitted the following SC 2015-05 recommendation to FAO Translation: "in future IPPC related documents, "pre-clearance" should not be translated into Spanish as "pre-certificación" and ask them to consult with the Spanish speaking TPG member to identify an appropriate translation for the term." - TPG 2015-12 recommended deletion from Glossary in the draft 2016 amendments as term cannot be revised (concept unclear) and as it is currently not correct. TPG 2015-12 agreed that if the term is deleted from the Glossary, a note should be added to the General recommendations for consistency. See report for suggestion. - SC agreed with proposed deletion and approved for 1st Cons. - TPG 2016-12 reviewed consultation comments and reconfirmed that it was not possible to propose a revised definition and retained the proposal for deletion from the Glossary. - SC-7 2017-05 reviewed consultation comments, TPG considerations and approved the proposal for deletion for the second consultation - SC 2017-11 reviewed second consultation comments and recommended the proposed deletion to the CPM |
| 19. quarantine (2015-002) | To CPM-13 (2018) | Laurence Bouhot-Delduc | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SC 2015-05 added to the List of topics based on TPG 2014-12 proposal. - TPG 2015-12 recommended revision in the draft 2016 Amendments. - SC agreed with proposed revision (after extensive discussion) and approved for 1st Cons. - TPG 2016-12 reviewed consultation comments and adjusted the proposed revision of the definition. - SC-7 2017-05 reviewed consultation comments, TPG proposal and approved the proposed revision for the second consultation (with no change) |

| Term | Status | Lead | Comments & next steps |
|---|----------------------------|------------------------|--|
| | | | - SC 2017-11 reviewed second consultation comments and recommended the proposed revision to the CPM for adoption (with no change). |
| 20. quarantine area (2012-006) | Pending revision of ISPM 8 | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - TPF 2011. - SC 2012-04 added. - To be considered based on a draft revised definition proposed by the TPF. - 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). |
| 21. seeds (as a commodity class) (2017-007) | To SC 2018-05 | Laurence Bouhot-Delduc | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - TPG 2016-12 invited SC to add all commodity class terms to the LOT to consider whether any should be deleted or revised. This recommendation was prompted by the discussions on “commodity class” in the context of ePhyto. - SC 2017-05 added “seeds (as a commodity class)” to the LOT - TPG 2017-12 proposed a revision of the term in the 2018 Amendments |
| 22. survey (2013-015) | To SC-7 2018-05 | Laurence Bouhot-Delduc | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - See SC May 2013. - TPG 2014 discussed. Proposed to SC 2014-05 to classify as “pending” until progress made with revision of ISPM 6. - SC 2014-05 reviewed TPG recommendation and made term pending till draft revised ISPM 6 is available. - TPG 2015-12 was informed that the EWG was held in 2015 and the draft ISPM will be reviewed by SC May 2016. - SC 2016-05 approved draft revision to ISPM 6 for 1st Cons. but term still pending. - TPG 2016-05 reviewed the definition in connection with the review of terms and consistency in the draft ISPM, to ensure a holistic view on the terminology. The TPG proposed in the draft 2017 Amendments a revision to the term which was in accordance with the draft ISPM, the use of the term in other ISPMs and the three types of surveys defined in the Glossary. - SC 2017-05 agreed with the TPG proposal for revision (with no change) and approved the revision of “survey” for the first consultation - TPG 2017-12 considered first consultation comments and revised their proposal for revision. |
| 23. test (2015-003) | To CPM-13 (2018) | Beatriz Melcho | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SC 2015-05 added to the List of topics based on proposal by TPG 2014-12. - SC-7 2015 withdrew “visual examination”, recommended the SC add the term “inspection” to the LOT for the TPG to consider “visual examination”, “test” and “inspection” together. The SC-7 also suggested that the TPG consider what could be the consequential changes to ISPMs following their review. - TPG 2015-12 recommended revision in the draft 2016 Amendments. - TPG 2016-12 reviewed consultation comments and adjusted the proposed revision of the definition. - SC-7 2017-05 reviewed consultation comments, TPG proposal and approved the proposed revision for the second consultation (with no change) |

| Term | Status | Lead | Comments & next steps |
|--|------------------|-----------------------------------|---|
| | | | - SC 2017-11 reviewed second consultation comments and recommended the proposed revision to the CPM for adoption (with a change). |
| 24. Treatment (2017-008) | To SC 2018-05 | Stephanie Bloem | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - TPG 2016-12 invited SC to add the term to the LOT for possible revision to make the term usable in a non-official sense. - SC 2017-05 added "treatment" to the LOT as proposed by TPG - TPG 2017-12 proposed a revision of the term in the 2018 Amendments |
| 25. visual examination (2013-010) | To CPM-13 (2018) | Beatriz Melcho (Prev. Shaza Omar) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - TPG 2012-10. - SC May 2013 added to the List of topics. - TPG 2014 discussed, incorporated to Amendments (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 2014-05 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. - 2015-05 SC-7 withdrew term from the draft 2014 Amendments; back to TPG with recommendation that the term be reviewed together with "test" and "inspection". - TPG 2015-12 recommended revision in the draft 2016 Amendments. - SC 2016-05 approved for first consultation. - TPG 2016-12 reviewed consultation comments and adjusted the proposed revision of the definition. The TPG had considerable discussion on whether to propose the term be withdrawn from the Amendments and reconsidered together with "inspection". TPG agreed that the revision is still correct and that the SC may consider the issue. - SC 2017-05 added "inspection" to the LOT as proposed by TPG - SC-7 2017-05 reviewed consultation comments, TPG proposal and approved the proposed revision for the second consultation (with a small change to the definition) - SC 2017-11 reviewed second consultation comments and recommended the proposed revision to the CPM for adoption (with no change). |
| 26. wood (as a commodity class) (2017-009) | To SC 2018-05 | Andrei Orlinski | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - TPG 2016-12 invited SC to add all commodity class terms to the LOT to consider whether any should be deleted or revised. This recommendation was prompted by the discussions on "commodity class" in the context of ePhyto. - SC 2017-05 added "wood (as a commodity class)" to the LOT - TPG 2017-12 proposed a revision of the term in the 2018 Amendments |
| Related to consistency | | | |

| Term | Status | Lead | Comments & next steps |
|---|---------------|---|--|
| 27. 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. |
| 28. "contamination" (2017-002) | To SC 2018-05 | Beatriz Melcho | TPG 2016-12 agreed, based on a consultation comment from first consultation 2016, that it would be valuable to review the use of "contamination" across standards. SC 2017-05 agreed and added "contamination" (consistency review of its use in ISPMs) to the LOT - TPG 2017-12 proposed ink amendments to adopted ISPMs for approval by the SC |

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 |
|----------------|-------------------------------------|----------------|---|
| 2017-12 4 to 7 | | | TPG Meeting |
| 2018-01-15 | 3. Terms and defs | Language leads | Check of translations of draft 2017 Amendments going for adoption |
| 2018-01-26 | 2. ISPMs from 1 st cons. | Language leads | Check accuracy of translations of in Fr and Es and propose translations in Ar, Ru and Zih (via email to Secretariat) |
| 2018-01-26 | 3. Terms and defs | ALL | Review draft 2017 Amendments following TPG 2017-12 meeting and provide comments in track changes |
| 2018-01-26 | 3. Terms and defs | ALL | Review draft 2018 Amendments following TPG 2017-12 meeting and provide comments in track changes |
| 2018-02-05 | 1. Meeting reports | ALL | Review report of TPG 2017-12 meeting (including draft ink amendments on "contamination" and revised version of the General recommendations on consistency in the use of terms in ISPMs) and provide comments in track changes |
| 2018-06-30 | 4. Ann. Gloss. | ALL | Comment on 2018 intermediate version of Annotated Glossary |
| 2018-10-01 | 3. Terms and defs | Ebbe Nordbo | Paper on "commodity" – <i>pending the May 2018 SC adds the term to the List of topics</i> |

| Deadline | Activity in tables | Resp. | Task |
|------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|--|
| 2018-10-01 | 7. Review of ISPMs for consistency | Andrei Orlinski | Prepare ink amendments to adopted ISPMs to avoid the use of “commodity class” |
| 2018-10-01 | 8. Other tasks | TDB | Review the draft explanatory document on ISPM 16 (Regulated non-quarantine pests: concept and application) - <i>pending the SC agrees in May 2018 to add this task to the TPG work programme</i> |
| 2018-10-01 | 5. Explanation of glossary terms | ALL | Identify terms that need explanation (and which are not explained elsewhere) and provide a paper for TPG 2018 meeting. |
| 2019-01-28 | 2. ISPMs from 1 st cons. | Language leads | Check accuracy of translations of in Fr and Es and propose translations in Ar, Ru and Zih (via email to Secretariat) |
| 2019-01-28 | 3. Terms and defs | ALL | Review draft 2018 Amendments following TPG 2018-12 meeting and provide comments in track changes |
| 2019-01-28 | 3. Terms and defs | ALL | Review draft 2019 Amendments following TPG 2018-12 meeting and provide comments in track changes |
| 2019-01-29 | 1. Meeting reports | ALL | Review report of TPG 2018-12 meeting and provide comments in track changes |
| 2019-01-29 | 8. Other tasks | ALL | Review general recommendations on consistency for inclusion in the 2019 version of the IPPC Style guide |