



Food and Agriculture  
Organization of the  
United Nations



International  
Plant Protection  
Convention

## **REPORT**

# **Technical Panel for the Glossary**

**Rome, Italy**

**03 - 06 December 2018**

**IPPC Secretariat**

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). 2019. *Report of the Meeting of the Technical Panel on the Glossary, 3-6 December 2018*. Produced by the Secretariat of the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC). Rome, Italy. 64 pages. Licence: CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO.

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.

© FAO, 2019



Some rights reserved. This work is made available under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 3.0 IGO licence (CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO; <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/igo/legalcode/legalcode>).

Under the terms of this licence, this work may be copied, redistributed and adapted for non-commercial purposes, provided that the work is appropriately cited. In any use of this work, there should be no suggestion that FAO endorses any specific organization, products or services. The use of the FAO logo is not permitted. If the work is adapted, then it must be licensed under the same or equivalent Creative Commons licence. If a translation of this work is created, it must include the following disclaimer along with the required citation: "This translation was not created by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). FAO is not responsible for the content or accuracy of this translation. The original [Language] edition shall be the authoritative edition.

Disputes arising under the licence that cannot be settled amicably will be resolved by mediation and arbitration as described in Article 8 of the licence except as otherwise provided herein. The applicable mediation rules will be the mediation rules of the World Intellectual Property Organization <http://www.wipo.int/amc/en/mediation/rules> and any arbitration will be conducted in accordance with the Arbitration Rules of the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL).

**Third-party materials.** Users wishing to reuse material from this work that is attributed to a third party, such as tables, figures or images, are responsible for determining whether permission is needed for that reuse and for obtaining permission from the copyright holder. The risk of claims resulting from infringement of any third-party-owned component in the work rests solely with the user.

**Sales, rights and licensing.** FAO information products are available on the FAO website ([www.fao.org/publications](http://www.fao.org/publications)) and can be purchased through [publications-sales@fao.org](mailto:publications-sales@fao.org). Requests for commercial use should be submitted via: [www.fao.org/contact-us/licence-request](http://www.fao.org/contact-us/licence-request). Queries regarding rights and licensing should be submitted to: [copyright@fao.org](mailto:copyright@fao.org).

## 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 2017).....	5
4.2	Extracts from other meeting reports of relevance to the TPG (SC, CPM).....	6
5.	Review relating to draft ISPMs sent for first consultation in 2018 (1 July - 30 September).....	7
5.1	Draft 2018 Amendments to ISPM 5: <i>Glossary of Phytosanitary terms</i> (1994-001).....	7
5.2	Draft revision of ISPM 8: <i>Determination of pest status in an area</i> (2009-005) .....	10
5.3	Draft ISPM on <i>Authorization of entities to perform phytosanitary actions</i> (2014-002) .	13
5.4	Draft ISPM on <i>Requirements for the use of modified atmosphere treatments as a phytosanitary measure</i> (2014-006) .....	14
6.	Consideration of new or revised terms/definitions (subjects on the TPG work programme).....	16
6.1	“Quarantine area” (2012-006).....	16
6.2.	“Commodity” (2018-002) .....	17
6.3.	“Emerging pest” (2018-003).....	18
6.4.	“Detection survey” (consequential to the revision of “survey” (2013-015)) .....	21
6.5	“Inspection” (2017-005).....	22
7.	Review of ISPMs for consistency of terms and style .....	24
7.1	General recommendations on use of terms in ISPMs .....	24
7.2	Consistency of adopted ISPMs (standard by standard).....	24
7.3	Consistency review of “commodity class” across ISPMs (2018-004).....	24
8.	Annotated Glossary: 2019 final version .....	25
9.	Explanation of Glossary terms.....	26

---

9.1 Draft explanatory document on ISPM 16 ( <i>Regulated non-quarantine pests: concept and application</i> ).....	28
10. TPG work plan.....	29
11. Any other business.....	29
12. Date and venue of the next meeting .....	29
13. Closing of the meeting.....	30
Appendix 1: Agenda.....	31
Appendix 2: Documents list .....	34
Appendix 3: Participants list .....	37
Appendix 4: Proposed ink amendments on inconsistent uses of <i>commodity</i> in ISPMs .....	40
Appendix 5: TPG considerations on a definition for “emerging pest” .....	41
Appendix 6: Proposed ink amendments – consistency review “ <i>commodity class</i> ” (2018-004).....	47
Appendix 7: TPG Work Plan 2019-2020 .....	50

## 1. Opening of the meeting

- [1] The representative of the host agency, Mr Federico SÒRGONI (Official of the Central Phytosanitary Office, Italian National Plant Protection Organization (NPPO)) warmly welcomed all participants and highlighted the importance of having a common phytosanitary terminology and a panel that ensures the consistent language across ISPMs.
- [2] The International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) Secretariat (hereafter referred to as the “Secretariat”) welcomed the participants of the annual meeting of the Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG), and wished them a fruitful meeting. The Secretariat highlighted the importance of this meeting and thanked the Italian Ministry for Agriculture (Ministero delle Politiche agricole, alimentari, forestali e del turismo) for hosting it.
- [3] The Secretariat welcomed the TPG member for the English language, Ms Asenath Abigail KOECH (Kenya), who was attending the TPG meeting for the first time, and noted the absence of Ms Stephanie BLOEM (USA). The Secretariat also welcomed Mr Rajesh RAMARATHNAM (Canada) who was attending the TPG meeting as an invited expert as he will become a member from the beginning of 2019.

## 2. Meeting arrangements

### 2.1 Selection of the Chairperson

- [4] The TPG selected Ms Beatriz MELCHO (Uruguay) as Chairperson.

### 2.2. Selection of the Rapporteur

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

### 2.3 Review and adoption of the agenda

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

### 2.4 Current specification: TP5 (TPG, 2016 - for information)

- [7] The Secretariat presented the current specification for the TPG (TP 5)<sup>1</sup>, summarizing the tasks and recalled that it was last modified by the SC in 2016.

## 3. Administrative Matters

- [8] 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. The Secretariat also informed the TPG that two CRPs<sup>2</sup> were submitted before the meeting. These were distributed as paper copies.

## 4. Reports

### 4.1 Previous meetings of the TPG (December 2017)

- [9] There were no comments on the report of the TPG 2017-12 meeting<sup>3</sup>.

---

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

<sup>2</sup> CRP\_01\_TPG\_2018\_Dec and CRP\_02\_TPG\_2018\_Dec

<sup>3</sup> 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-ispms>

## 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<sup>4</sup> (CPM-13 (2018), SC May 2018, SC-7 May 2018, TFT Oct 2018, SPG Oct 2018 and SC November 2018), noting that the TPG had received other updates via e-mail. The TPG discussed the following issues.

### *CPM-13*

[11] The Secretariat recalled that in 2017 22 standards went through the LRG process for all FAO languages except French, for which a coordinator is needed. The CPM had also noted the ink amendments to ISPM 5 and ISPM 12 and agreed to the reorganization of the fruit fly ISPMs.

### *SC May 2018*

[12] The Secretariat reminded the TPG that the ISPMs to be reviewed at the current meeting were discussed at the SC May meeting. The SC May also added several terms to the TPG work programme for discussion during this meeting, including the term “emerging pest”. This issue had been brought forward by the Technical Consultation among Regional Plant Protection Organizations (TC-RPPO), highlighting the importance of having a common understanding of what constitutes an emerging pest. The Secretariat further elaborated that the update also included excerpts of meeting reports of the Strategic Planning Group meeting in October 2018 and the 30<sup>th</sup> TC-RPPO meeting in October-November 2018, during which the topic of emerging pests was further discussed.

### *SC-7 May 2018*

[13] Discussing the draft ISPM on Requirements for the use of fumigation as a phytosanitary measure (2014-004), the SC-7 suggested that the definition of fumigation may need to be revised to clarify that it did not cover the use of modified atmosphere. However, the SC at their November 2018 meeting considered that this was not needed, but that it may be appropriate to consider a definition of “modified atmosphere treatment”.

[14] **Call for topics.** The Secretariat informed the TPG that two Glossary terms had been submitted via the 2018 Call for Topics: Standards and Implementation, and considered by the Task Force on Topics (TFT) during their October 2018 meeting. The TFT did not recommend the term “harmful organism” (topic 2018-005) for the TPG work programme, and the SC Nov 2018 agreed. The revision of the term “incidence” (2018-010) was recommended by the TFT, discussed at the SC Nov 2018 and included in the TPG work programme.

[15] The TPG steward provided additional background on the SC discussions during their November 2018 meeting and recalled that the TPG in the past had been considering the terms “incidence” and “prevalence” extensively. Only “incidence” is defined in the Glossary and instead of revising its definition, the SC proposed to delete “incidence” from the Glossary and to use the terms “incidence” and “prevalence” in their common dictionary sense. The steward noted that this may not solve the problem, and suggested that ink amendments would be needed as a consequence.

### *SC Nov 2018*

[16] The SC approved the 2017 draft amendments to ISPM 5 for adoption by CPM-14, with only one minor change to include a comma in the definition of “survey” to improve clarity.

---

<sup>4</sup> 05\_TPG\_2018\_Dec

[17] **Frequency of ink amendments.** The SC agreed with the proposal of the Secretariat that from 2020 on, ink amendments will only be presented to the CPM for noting biennially or when the Secretariat has resources to incorporate them into the ISPMs.

[18] **Call for experts:** The SC selected a new expert for the English language for the TPG, Mr Rajesh RAMARATHNAM, during an e-decision<sup>5</sup>, and agreed that he should participate in the 2018 TPG meeting as an invited expert before his term starts in 2019.

[19] The TPG:

(1) *noted* the update provided by the Secretariat.

## **5. Review relating to draft ISPMs sent for first consultation in 2018 (1 July - 30 September)**

[20] 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 2019).

### **5.1 Draft 2018 Amendments to ISPM 5: *Glossary of Phytosanitary terms (1994-001)***

[21] The steward introduced the draft 2018 Amendments to ISPM 5 and the consultation comments<sup>6</sup>. It was noted that new comments from the Regional Workshop in Africa were forwarded to the TPG steward the week before the TPG meeting<sup>7</sup>, most of them already covered in comments previously submitted by individual countries.

[22] The TPG discussed the following issues in detail:

***Deletion of the “commodity class” terms: “commodity class” (2015-013), “bulbs and tubers (as a commodity class)” (2017-001), “cut flowers and branches (as a commodity class)” (2012-007), “fruits and vegetables (as a commodity class)” (2017-003) and “plants in vitro (as a commodity class)” (2017-006)***

[23] Several contracting parties commented that the intended use of a commodity needed to be properly addressed in ISPMs, considering the proposed deletion of several *commodity class* terms. This would especially apply to “*bulbs and tubers*” as well as “*cut flowers and branches*”, as these could be understood to include plants for planting when no longer explicitly excluded with a Glossary definition. A TPG member expressed concern that with the deletion of the definition, the requirements that cut flowers need to be “fresh” and are not used for planting are lost. He also noted that cut branches have to be considered in pest risk analyses (PRAs) as they can be used as decoration or as plants for planting.

[24] The TPG considered that cut flowers and cut branches are different commodities and supported the deletion of the term, which is not used in ISPMs. The TPG also noted that the draft standard on *International movement of cut flowers and foliage* (2008-005) has currently pending status, awaiting a decision by CPM on how to proceed with commodity and pathway standards. The TPG suggested that the characteristics of the commodities covered by the draft standard and their intended use should be clarified in the scope rather than in a Glossary definition.

[25] One TPG member noted that in the future, ISPMs need to be more explicit about the intended use of commodities and suggested to include a note in the IPPC style guide on this.

---

<sup>5</sup> 2018\_eSC\_Nov\_06

<sup>6</sup> 1994-001; 06\_TPG\_2018\_Dec

<sup>7</sup> 22\_TPG\_2018\_Dec

**Revision of “commodity class” terms: “seeds (as a commodity class)” (2017-007), “grain (as a commodity class)” (2017-004) and “wood (as a commodity class)” (2017-009)**

- [26] Several contracting parties provided comments on the definitions of some commodity class terms proposed for revision in the draft. The TPG noted that the proposed revisions were a matter of consistency and a consequence of deleting the term and definition of *commodity class* and encompassed the deletion of the word “class” in the qualifier of the terms.
- [27] **Grain vs. grains:** The TPG discussed that grain as a commodity is used in singular and seeds is used in plural. It was highlighted that some countries use numbers of “kernels” to specify sampling size of grain commodities. Thus, the TPG considered that “grain” in singular is more accurate in this context.
- [28] **Intended use of grain and seeds:** One comment suggested to include “whose intended use is ...” in the definition for “seeds (as a commodity)” and “grain (as a commodity)” to be more explicit. One TPG member noted that the definition of “plants for planting” includes “intended for”. However, the TPG agreed that in that definition the “intended for” needs to be spelled out for clarity and grammatical correctness, as it refers to “remain planted, to be planted or replanted”. In case of grain and seeds, the definition clearly outlines that seeds are intended for planting and grain is intended for consumption.
- [29] The TPG recalled that during the 2016 revision of the terms, “intended for” was simplified to “for”. The TPG considered that to include “whose intended use is” was too much and noted that “intended for” and “for” have an identical meaning in this context.
- [30] Another member considered whether it may be easier to translate if the concept is spelled out clearer. The steward reminded that translations may use additional words to convey the intended meaning, and need not be translated word-by-word. The TPG considers both versions correct and agreed that the currently proposed definition is sufficient.
- [31] **Propagation, sowing and planting:** Some consultation comments suggested to include “propagation” and “sowing” in the definitions of “cut flowers and branches” and “seeds”, respectively. The TPG noted that both terms are covered by the definition of “planting” and agreed that their inclusion would not be needed. Some members noted that in some languages different terms are used for sowing seeds and planting plants. However, the TPG clarified that the term “planting seeds” is not incorrect, and noted that the definition may be translated using more words if needed to convey the intended meaning.
- [32] **Sprouted seeds for consumption:** One comment questioned whether seeds that have sprouted and are subsequently consumed would be considered as grain rather than seeds and suggested an explanation be added to the Annotated Glossary. The TPG acknowledged the logic and implications of the intervention, however, they agreed that ISPM 38 (*International movement of seeds*) provides guidance on addressing the pest risk of imported seeds, including those not intended for planting or release into the PRA area. The TPG considered this particular case beyond the scope of the Annotated Glossary but suggested that it could be considered during a possible future revision of ISPM 38.
- [33] **Wood vs. bamboo, cane and rattan:** One contracting party comment proposed to explicitly specify that “rattan”, along with bamboo, is excluded from the definition of wood (as a commodity), as it is also excluded from the scope of ISPM 39 (*International movement of wood*). The TPG considered whether the modification of the definition would be legitimate at this occasion, as the purpose of the revision was only relating to the deletion of *commodity class*

and not the whole text. The TPG agreed with the country comment, and added the exception of rattan to the definition, for consideration by the SC-7.

- [34] In another comment, a contracting party suggested including reference to cane products. However, the TPG considered that these were covered by “bamboo”.

#### *Revision of the term “treatment” (2017-008)*

- [35] **Devitalization.** Some consultation comments requested to remove “devitalization” from the definition for “treatment (as a phytosanitary measure)”, because the Glossary definition of “devitalization” only refers to plants and plant products, whereas in the proposed revised definition of “treatment”, it refers to the devitalization of pests.
- [36] The TPG noted that the proposed revision of “treatment” aims at clarifying that a treatment (as a phytosanitary measure) is always applied as an official measure against regulated pests, and to distinguish it from non-official treatments. However, a treatment, when not being applied as a phytosanitary measure, is not covered by the definition and may be applied to any pest, plant or plant product. In the definition of “treatment”, devitalization as a phytosanitary measure would target plants as pests (e.g. quarantine weeds). Therefore, in some cases, a devitalization treatment can be applied as a phytosanitary measure, if technically justified.
- [37] The TPG agreed to keep the original revised definition, as it clarifies that devitalization can only be considered a phytosanitary measure when applied to regulated plants as pests and not when aimed at preventing diversion from intended use. The TPG added further explanation to that effect.
- [38] **Pests vs. regulated pests:** Some comments suggested to revert to “pests” instead of “regulated pests” in the definition of “treatment (as a phytosanitary measure)”, arguing that the use of “regulated pests” narrows the scope, as for example ISPM 15 treatments can be applied without indicating specific regulated pests. The TPG noted that ISPM 15 treatments are targeted to all quarantine pests associated with the international movement of wood packaging material, and that by adopting ISPM 15, IPPC contracting parties have agreed that individual countries do not need to technically justify or specify pest-by-pest why they include ISPM 15 requirements in their legislation. In relation to specific phytosanitary treatments as outlined in ISPM 28, these are specifically targeted to regulated pests.
- [39] One contracting party commented that it is common practice to fumigate against e.g. contaminating pests that might not be regulated. One TPG member clarified that although fumigation may be conducted in this case, if it is not applied against a regulated pest, it is not considered a phytosanitary measure and thus not covered by the definition in ISPM 5.
- [40] The TPG discussed whether, upon interception of a new pest (even if it is not regulated yet), treatments applied as emergency actions would be contradictory to the Glossary definition of “emergency measure”, which is defined as a phytosanitary measure and therefore only targets regulated pests. One TPG member clarified that until the completion of a PRA, the pest could justifiably be subject to emergency measures.
- [41] The TPG considered the issue of phytosanitary measures with respect to new, non-regulated pests further under agenda item 9.
- [42] **Official procedure vs. phytosanitary procedure:** A comment suggested to replace “official procedure” with “phytosanitary procedure” in the definition of treatment (as a phytosanitary measure). The TPG agreed that a treatment is a phytosanitary procedure, but noted that the revision of the term aimed to clarify the definition of treatment (as a phytosanitary measure)

being an “official” procedure conducted or authorized by an NPPO, as opposed to non-official treatments applied by farmers to their crops.

### *Language versions of 2018 Amendments to ISPM 5*

[43] There were no comments on the Chinese or Spanish language versions. In the French language versions, the steward noted that for the definition of cut flowers, the current definition had not been properly copied from ISPM 5, instead the translators had retranslated the definition. The Russian language lead noted that during the Regional Workshop for Eastern Europe and Central Asia, translators suggested some changes in the explanatory text of the 2018 Amendments.

[44] The TPG:

- (2) *agreed* to the responses to the comments
- (3) *noted* that its responses to comments and the modified draft 2018 *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 FAO translation services.

### **5.2 Draft revision of ISPM 8: *Determination of pest status in an area* (2009-005)**

[45] The TPG lead introduced the draft ISPM and the consultation comments on consistency in use of terms and definitions<sup>8</sup>.

[46] He explained that, after considering the consultation comments, he had developed a proposal to rearrange some text from different sections of the draft ISPM, in order to more clearly reflect the general obligations of NPPOs, to distinguish them from the exchange of pest status information and thus create consistency between texts and headings. The rearrangements were presented in a conference room paper<sup>9</sup> and considered by the TPG. One TPG member was concerned that the rearrangement of text may be beyond their mandate. Another TPG member thought that although the concerns were valid, the proposals were responding to the comments and significantly improving the text. The TPG lead assured that no content had been lost, explaining that the proposal did not include changes of content and only included a rearrangement of the original text. The TPG agreed that the proposed restructuring would improve clarity, and deserved to be considered by the steward of the draft ISPM and SC-7.

[47] The TPG discussed the following issues in detail:

[48] **Scope:** Some comments expressed concern about possible confusion with ISPM 17 (*Pest reporting*). The TPG noted that the content of this draft ISPM would not conflict with that of ISPM 17, if it is made clear in the Scope and in section 4 that ISPM 8 only provides descriptions of the use of pest status for pest reporting.

[49] **Recommendation/good practice:** The TPG agreed that the words “recommendations” and “good practice” would confuse the intended level of obligation of NPPOs and were not consistent with the terminology used in ISPMs (‘may’, ‘should’, ‘shall’, ‘must’ and, in rare cases, ‘are encouraged to’) to carefully express the agreed level of obligation. The TPG reckoned that the Expert Drafting Group had probably used “recommendation” and “good practice” in order to avoid any perceived conflict or overlap with ISPM 17, but the TPG

---

<sup>8</sup> 2009-005; 07\_TPG\_2018\_Dec, 23\_TPG\_2018\_Dec

<sup>9</sup> CRP\_01\_TPG\_2018\_Dec

considered such conflicts could easily be avoided, as explained under the scope. The TPG therefore suggested modified wording for the scope.

- [50] **NPPO responsibilities:** Based upon several country comments on the wording and placing of the various NPPO responsibilities, one TPG member suggested that it would be logic, clearer and enable consistency between section texts and headings to separate the bullet points listing NPPO obligations currently in section 4 into general “NPPO responsibilities” (collected in a new upfront Section 1bis) and “NPPO exchange of pest status information” (in Section 4).
- [51] **Area vs. country:** A number of contracting parties commented on the use of “area” or “country” in the pest status definitions. The TPG considered that the introduction of “country” in the pest status categories is confusing and circular, because “area” as defined in the Glossary includes an officially defined country, part of a country or all or parts of several countries. One member noted that the text is often inconsistent when referring to country or area, suggesting that clarification is needed. The TPG agreed to clarify the concept by referring to the definition of “area” in the Background section.
- [52] In response to a consultation comment, the TPG noted that it was important to link the responsibility of the NPPO of the area to the determination of pest status.
- [53] The TPG also suggested to refer to “part or parts of an area” instead of using “country” in pest status categories, to clarify that, within an area, there can be different parts with differing pest status.
- [54] **Surveillance needed to determine pest status:** The TPG noted that the draft ISPM appears ambiguous on whether or not surveillance is a mandatory prerequisite for determining pest status. One member noted that there should be a clear distinction between general surveillance and surveys for specific pests. One member suggested that it was unreasonable to require surveys to determine pest status, but surveillance could be a requirement. The TPG recommended that the draft should be revised to clarify whether or not surveillance is a mandatory prerequisite for determining pest status and to reduce text ambiguity.
- [55] One member noted that the pest status categories “Absent: pest not recorded” and “Absent: pest free area” were essentially identical because both use surveillance in their determination. He suggested to remove the need to conduct surveillance to establish “absence: pest not recorded”. Another member disagreed, noting that there is a difference between conducting general surveillance and not recording a pest, and conducting specific surveillance to purposefully establish a pest free area (PFA) for a certain pest.
- [56] **Outline of requirements.** The TPG noted that this section resembled more an extended scope or contents section, and recalled previous TPG comments on the issue. They agreed on proposing a revised text to summarize the main requirements as set out in the ISPM, in consistency with the same section in other ISPMs.
- [57] **Places of production and production sites:** The TPG agreed with comments arguing for the inclusion of places of production and production sites alongside PFAs.
- [58] **Definition of terms:** Several comments suggested the TPG consider defining different terms, including “aetiology”, “transience” etc. The TPG disagreed to define “aetiology” in the Glossary as it does not have any specific IPPC meaning. In reference to the proposal to revise “transience”, the TPG did not see any immediate need but suggested that the proposal be channeled through the usual Call for Topics procedure, including outlining the rationale for revisiting the definition.

- [59] **Indigenous = autóctono:** One comment suggested to use “nativo” in the Spanish translation of “indigenous”. The TPG noted that ISPM 5, Appendix 1 in Spanish states that “autéctono” is the preferred translation for “indigenous”.
- [60] **Low pest prevalence:** One comment suggested to include “pest” in the pest status category “Present: at low prevalence”, however, the TPG noted that Table 1 describes categories of pest status, and therefore “pest” is implied. One member suggested that the pest status could be reworded to “present at low levels”, but the TPG considered that this would change the meaning and agreed to keep the original wording.
- [61] **Transience.** Some comments suggested to use “transient” in the pest status category “Present: not expected to establish”, as this is the definition of the term in the Glossary. The TPG discussed whether the use of “transient” would be appropriate in this context. One member clarified that in this draft “transient” as a pest status is used as a subcategory of “present”. One member explained that a transient pest may be considered to not being able to establish because of its biology, but also because of phytosanitary measures being applied towards its eradication.
- [62] The TPG agreed to modify the title of the category to “present: transient”, and to elaborate in the description, that it means that the pest is not going to establish (as is the Glossary definition of transient), but without repeating the term. They proposed to reword the description using the wording of the Annotated Glossary to “The pest is evaluated and determined as not expected to establish because conditions are not suitable or appropriate phytosanitary measures have been applied (e.g. during outbreaks in a PFA)”. The TPG underscored that this is to seek clarity only, not to change the meaning.
- [63] **Country or area in the context of “pest free area”.** The TPG noted that the ISPM deals with pest status in an area and introducing “country” in definitions would be confusing. The TPG discussed how the PFA concept is used in practice, and noted that it usually does not apply to an entire country. However, one member noted that in its definition “area” can include a country or a part of a country or several countries, and thus is more generally applicable.
- [64] The TPG noted that to mention both “area” and “entire country” in the pest status category is unclear. One member suggested that the category should refer to all areas that could be declared pest free according to ISPM 4 and noted that it was unclear why the “area” in this case refers only to an entire country. However, the TPG acknowledged that if the intention was to describe a PFA that covers a whole country exclusively in this pest status category, the title “Absent: the entire country is a pest free area” would better suit and would not require modification to the associated description.
- [65] **Exchange of pest status information.** The TPG suggested to focus section 4 on the NPPOs exchange of pest status information, and to move text on general responsibilities of NPPOs to a new section 1bis (as outlined before).
- [66] The TPG:
- (5) *noted* that recommendations on consultation comments on consistency would be transmitted to the steward and SC-7 for consideration.

### 5.3 Draft ISPM on *Authorization of entities to perform phytosanitary actions* (2014-002)

- [67] The TPG lead introduced the draft ISPM and the consultation comments on consistency in use of terms and definitions<sup>10</sup>. He explained that there were not many comments on consistency issues, noting that CPs had other issues with the concept of authorization and auditing.
- [68] The TPG discussed the following issues in detail:
- [69] **Auditing and supervision as phytosanitary actions:** Some contracting parties commented on the use of “auditing” and “supervision” in the draft, requesting clarification as they could refer to different activities and querying whether they can be deemed as phytosanitary actions. The TPG concluded that although they are not included in the definition of phytosanitary action as examples, they can be considered phytosanitary actions because they are applied to implement phytosanitary measures. Auditing an entity that provides phytosanitary services is ultimately for phytosanitary purposes, and can thus be considered a phytosanitary action that should be supervised by the NPPO. The TPG recommends that a definition of supervision is not needed in the Glossary, but its intended meaning in this standard should be clarified.
- [70] **Definition of “entity”:** Some CPs requested to define the term “entity” in the Glossary. The TPG concluded that entity is being used in its normal dictionary sense and need not be defined in the Glossary. One comment proposed to include the explanation on the use of the term “entity” in the definition section of the ISPM. The TPG considered, however, that this would be inconsistent with other ISPMs, and that the current explanation of entity as outlined in the section on requirements is sufficient.
- [71] One TPG member noted that in some languages it could be hard to translate something that covers both a legal body and a physical object (e.g. a treatment facility), and suggested that it should be clear that authorization refers to legal entities rather than to facilities. The TPG clarified that in the draft one of the criteria to be considered an entity is to have legal status, and this can extend to a single operator or a one-person company. The decision on who has a legal status is an issue beyond the mandate of the TPG.
- [72] **Non-Compliance vs. nonconformance.** The SC already replaced non-compliance with nonconformity in the draft ISPM on *Requirements for the use of fumigation as a phytosanitary measure*, and the TPG agreed that nonconformity should be used also in this draft, as appropriate.
- [73] **Measures vs. actions:** One comment proposed to change the title of the draft ISPM to “*Authorization of entities to perform phytosanitary measures*”. However, the TPG disagreed because phytosanitary measures include legislation and regulations, and entities can only be authorized to perform operations, i.e. “phytosanitary actions”.
- [74] **Phytosanitary Certificates (PC).** One comment suggested to use the text of the Convention to state that the standard does not cover PCs and that they can only be issued by public officers. The TPG recalled that, as per SC decision, quotes from the IPPC should never be paraphrased, and urged to quote the Convention text verbatim, if included.
- [75] **Authorization programme:** Several comments stated that the term “authorization programme” is not clear and suggested rewording in a number of paragraphs. One TPG member recalled the discussion on the use of “systems” vs. “programmes” during the SC and suggested that the SC-7 addresses these comments with a view to clarifying the text.

---

<sup>10</sup> 2014-002; 08\_TPG\_2018\_Dec, 24\_TPG\_2018-Dec

[76] **Task vs. action.** The TPG considered a comment proposing to exchange “phytosanitary action” with the non-Glossary word “task”, but agreed that this would change the meaning and the scope of the draft ISPM and recommended not to accept the proposed wording.

[77] **Monitoring vs. surveillance.** Some comments suggested to exclude “monitoring” from the requirements, noting that it may be covered in the definition of surveillance (e.g. monitoring survey). The TPG disagreed with this recommendation, and explained that in this context it refers to “monitoring” as defined in the Glossary (i.e. “an official ongoing process to verify phytosanitary situations”) and not to the surveillance of pests.

**Authorize vs. approve:** One comment cited the IPPC Style guide recommending to use the term “authorize” in context with entities (i.e. a person or legal body) and “approve” in context with facilities or documents. One member explained that the SC had deliberately changed “authorization” to “approval” in the sentence, because in some cases authorization of entities may require an NPPO to approve individuals within the entity and in this context it would refer to subsections of entities that may be individuals or facilities.

[78] **Capability vs. ability.** The TPG considered that changing “ability” to “capability” would change the meaning of the sentence in section 2, as ability suggests a legal capacity, whereas capability suggests the material requirements being available (facilities, personnel, equipment).

[79] **Outline of requirements.** The TPG considered the outline of requirements and recalled previous recommendations, provided to the SC, on the content of this section in ISPMs. They provided suggestions to improve the wording to outline the actual, major requirements contained in the draft.

[80] The TPG:

(6) *noted* that recommendations on consultation comments on consistency would be transmitted to the steward and SC-7 for consideration.

#### **5.4 Draft ISPM on *Requirements for the use of modified atmosphere treatments as a phytosanitary measure (2014-006)***

[81] The TPG lead introduced the draft ISPM and the consultation comments on consistency in use of terms and definitions<sup>11</sup>. She noted that, where possible, the draft ISPM should be consistent with the standards on requirements for the use of other types of treatment that have recently been adopted or recommended for adoption.

[82] The TPG discussed the following issues in detail:

[83] **Commodities and regulated articles.** A general comment suggested and the TPG agreed to adding “commodity or” before “regulated article” in the section on “Measuring Treatment Parameters”.

[84] **Definition of Modified Atmosphere treatment.** A number of comments requested that “modified atmosphere treatment” be defined in the Glossary. The TPG agreed with the request, because the Glossary also contains definitions for other treatment types, such as “fumigation” and “heat treatment”, and recommended the SC consider adding “modified atmosphere treatment” to the TPG work programme. They also recommended that the TPPT should provide input to the development of a definition to ensure its technical validity. In addition, the TPG

---

<sup>11</sup> 2014-006; 09\_TPG\_2018\_Dec, 25\_TPG\_2018\_Dec

disagreed with a comment proposing to define “modified atmosphere” in the scope of the standard, as the scope should not be providing explanations and definitions.

- [85] **Alignment with ISPM 42.** Some contracting parties provided comments and suggestions to align the draft standard with ISPM 42 (*Requirements for temperature treatments*). The TPG considered these and provided proposals that would improve consistency with both ISPM 42 and ISPM 28 (*Phytosanitary treatments for regulated pests*).
- [86] **Meet the level of critical parameters.** The TPG discussed whether it is appropriate to use “meet” the critical parameters, and if “met” is removed, would “critical parameters at the required level” make sense. The TPG recommended to remove “met”.
- [87] **Entity vs. treatment providers and treatment facilities.** The TPG discussed when and how to use these terms and recalled the same discussion during the TPG meeting in 2017 when reviewing the draft ISPM on *Requirements for the use of fumigation as a phytosanitary measure*. The TPG concluded that for clarity the appropriate term (treatment facility or treatment provider) should be used instead of entity whenever possible, in consistency with ISPM 15 and the draft ISPM on *Requirements for the use of fumigation as a phytosanitary measure*.
- [88] **Outline of requirements.** The TPG did not agree with one comment suggesting to use entity instead of parties in a sentence because the roles and responsibilities described in the outline of requirements extends beyond entities and also includes the NPPOs.
- [89] **General vs. generic.** One comment suggested to replace “generic” with “general” requirements. The TPG disagreed with the change as “generic” refers to the common requirements for modified atmosphere treatments and is used as such also in the other ISPMs on treatment requirements.
- [90] **Scientific references.** The TPG disagreed with including references to scientific articles in ISPMs, because they can quickly become outdated, there are no clear criteria for the selection of a certain article and ISPMs are the consolidation of a large amount of information from a multitude of sources. For those same reasons, the SC has agreed to apply this principle before.
- [91] **Target (regulated) pest.** Some comments suggested to add the qualifier “target” before pest or regulated pest in several instances throughout the draft standard. One member questioned whether it was necessary to include target, as phytosanitary measures should be aimed at regulated pests. Another member noted that for treatment standards it would be more relevant to refer to “target pests”. However, the TPG concluded to recommend using “regulated pest” instead of “target pest” in alignment with ISPM 42 and the draft ISPM on *Requirements for the use of fumigation as a phytosanitary measure*.
- [92] **Replacement or alternative for methyl bromide.** Some comments suggested using ‘alternative’ instead of ‘replacement’ for methyl bromide (MB), as modified atmosphere treatment is only one of several options to substitute MB. One member noted that the CPM recommendation asks to “replace” MB, however, other members thought that “alternative” still conveys the message that MB should be replaced by an alternative treatment. Thus, the TPG agreed with the proposed change.
- [93] **Entry points.** The TPG proposes to use the term “openings” to replace “entry points” in section 2 “Treatment Application” to refer to outlets of the treatment chamber. The TPG suggested that “entry point” could be confused with the Glossary term “point of entry”.

- [94] **Modified atmosphere in singular.** The TPG proposes to use modified atmosphere in singular instead of modified atmospheres throughout the draft.
- [95] **Definition of “hermetic” or “semi hermetic”.** One contracting party requested that these terms be defined in the Glossary. The TPG considered that they do not have a specific IPPC meaning and did not support this proposal.
- [96] **Describing entity.** The TPG proposed to remove the explanation that entity covers treatment providers and facilities, as the draft is proposed to be modified to use the appropriate term (treatment facility or treatment provider) instead of entity.
- [97] **Consignment vs. commodity.** One contracting party suggested that in section 5.3 (Labelling) commodities should be replaced with consignments, as they considered that labelling applies to consignments and not to commodities. However, the TPG does not support the change because they considered that “consignment” is too restrictive in that context, and commodities may be labelled one by one, not only as a consignment.
- [98] **Programme vs. protocol vs. procedure.** Some comments proposed to replace “treatment programmes” with “treatment protocols” or “treatment procedures”, for consistency. The TPG agreed that “treatment programmes” may be confused with the Glossary term “treatment schedule” which has a different meaning. The TPG therefore supported the change for “treatment procedure” and suggested that the steward revise the draft with regards to the use of the term “treatment protocol”, for consistency with the draft ISPM on *Requirements for the use of fumigation as a phytosanitary measure*.
- [99] **Inspection vs. check.** One contracting party suggested to use “check” instead of “inspect” documentation. The TPG considered that the current definition of inspection does not cover inspection of documents, and thus suggested to use “examine” to be consistent with ISPM 23 (*Guidelines on inspection*).
- [100] The TPG:
- (7) *noted* that recommendations on consultation comments on consistency would be transmitted to the steward and SC-7 for consideration.
  - (8) *invited* the SC to consider adding “modified atmosphere treatment” to the TPG work programme and to consider asking the TPPT’s input on defining the term.

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

### 6.1 “Quarantine area” (2012-006)

[101] The TPG lead introduced the paper<sup>12</sup>.

[102] She explained that the revision of the term “quarantine area” (2012-006) had been proposed by the Technical Panel on Pest Free Areas and Systems Approaches for Fruit Flies (TPFF) to clarify that quarantine areas also apply to transient pests. The TPG concluded that the need to revise the definition of “quarantine area” would depend on the content of the revised ISPM 8 (*Determination of pest status in an area*) (2009-005). Consequently, the SC in May 2013 changed the status of the subject to pending until after the revision of ISPM 8 (2009-005). During the SC May 2018 meeting, as the draft revision of ISPM 8 was presented to the SC for

---

<sup>12</sup> 10\_TPG\_2018\_Dec

submission to first consultation, the SC agreed to change the status of “quarantine area” on the TPG work programme to active.

[103] She further noted that “quarantine area” is currently only used in ISPM 9 (*Guidelines for pest eradication programmes*), and that “eradication area” is used in Annex 2 (*Control measures of an outbreak within a fruit fly pest free area*) of ISPM 26 (*Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies* (Tephritidae)).

[104] The TPG noted that in the draft revision of ISPM 8, “transient” is currently included as part of the pest status category: “present” and not as its own status. Therefore, the TPG agreed that no revision of the definition of “quarantine area” is needed. One member cautioned that as long as the revision of ISPM 8 is not adopted, the term should remain on the TPG work programme, because the pest status categories could be revised in response to consultation comments.

[105] The TPG:

- (9) *recommended* to the SC to note that the term “quarantine area” does not need revision, but should be retained on the TPG work programme until the adoption of the revised ISPM 8.

## 6.2. “Commodity” (2018-002)

[106] The TPG lead introduced the paper<sup>13</sup>.

[107] He explained that the TPG had suggested, and the SC agreed, to consider the definition of the term “commodity” as a consequence of the discussion on the different “commodity class” terms and the deletion of “commodity class” from the Glossary.

[108] He noted that “commodity” is frequently and consistently used in ISPMs to describe a “type” of material that is being moved, and is closely related to the term “consignment”, which describes a “quantity” of material being moved. Thus, a “consignment” may consist of several “commodities”, and “lot” has been defined as a part of a “consignment” containing only one single “commodity”. He emphasized that this distinction is extremely important, particularly for the implementation of ISPMs in national legislation.

[109] The TPG agreed that the deletion of the term “commodity” and its definition, to rely only on common dictionary meanings, would result in a great loss of stringency, in particular of the distinction between “type” and “quantity” and of the relation between the two concepts “commodity” and “consignment”. The TPG noted that the current definition of “commodity” is sufficiently distinct and clear, and need not be amended, as its meaning in ISPMs is sufficiently clear in all instances.

[110] Parameters needed to characterize a commodity in practice are currently only vaguely agreed upon in ISPMs. This is in contrast to parameters needed for characterizing a consignment, which are set out in the model phytosanitary certificate and further elaborated in ISPM 12. With ePhyto, harmonization of descriptors of commodities (although ePhyto refrains from using that term) are taken much further. It is suggested, that amendments in that respect to the “commodity” definition are currently not needed, but may be considered if needs arise.

[111] The TPG therefore agreed to recommend retaining the definition of “commodity” in the Glossary. The TPG also noted two inconsistent uses of “commodity” in two ISPMs, where “consignment” or “lot” may be the more appropriate term. Those inconsistent uses of “commodity” do not create serious confusion and should not trigger the need for any ink

---

<sup>13</sup> 11\_TPG\_2018\_Dec

amendments, but may be noted and archived by the Secretariat for any future revisions of the relevant ISPMs.

[112] The TPG:

- (10) *recommended* that the definition of the term “commodity” be retained in the Glossary as it is and that the SC remove the subject from the TPG work programme.
- (11) *invited* the SC to *note* the instances of the use of “commodity” that may need revision ([Appendix 4](#)) and *request* the Secretariat to archive them for future revision of the relevant ISPMs.

### 6.3. “Emerging pest” (2018-003)

[113] The Secretariat introduced the paper drafted by EPPO<sup>14</sup>, in which the RPPOs discuss questions on what “emerging pests” are, how to assess them, which entities could act and with which resources. This paper had been presented to the SPG 2018 and revised by the TC-RPPO to underscore the role of expert judgment in the assessment and decision making process, and that social factors should be considered alongside economic and environmental factors when assessing emerging pests. The paper also includes draft decision trees for decision making on whether a pest is emerging at a regional or global level, and the TC-RPPO had agreed to test these on candidate organisms at the next TC-RPPO meeting.

[114] The Secretariat further explained that the CPM Bureau is also discussing the issue in relation to “emergency situations”, suggesting there is a need to develop that concept and clarify which actions could be taken by the IPPC community in response to emerging pests. He noted that the IPPC has a clear mandate and some of the issues identified by contracting parties as emerging are beyond the mandate of the IPPC. He suggested that the IPPC Secretariat has a responsibility in the coordination of activities, but noted that other FAO divisions are better resourced to dealing with them on a practical level. He acknowledged that the concept of emergency action is embedded in the Convention text, however, considering the limited available resources, the Secretariat requested clarity on what activities to focus on.

[115] The TPG appreciated the additional information provided by the Secretariat on emergency situations, but noted that the SC had only requested them to define “emerging pest”.

[116] The Secretariat then introduced the discussion paper of the TPG lead<sup>15</sup> and explained the background of the proposal to define “emerging pest”, clarifying that the SC in May 2018 had tasked the TPG to discuss a possible definition upon request by the RPPOs. In that SC meeting it was noted that it may be difficult to provide a definition, as some countries consider emerging pests to be simply those that have changed their risk profile. It may be more useful to provide examples rather than to try defining the term too closely.

[117] One TPG member had prepared another document with potential definitions and introduced the paper<sup>16</sup>. He emphasized that a clear distinction should be made between the conceptual definition for “emerging pest” and the operational criteria and processes to evaluate whether a particular pest could be deemed as an emerging pest. He recalled the term “quarantine pest”, which is defined rather concisely in the Glossary, while the detailed criteria and processes for

---

<sup>14</sup> 19\_TPG\_2018\_Dec, TC-RPPO revised version in Appendix 4 of the Report of the 30<sup>th</sup> TC-RPPO, available at: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/86879/>

<sup>15</sup> 12\_TPG\_2018\_Dec

<sup>16</sup> 21\_TPG\_2018\_Dec

evaluating pests as quarantine pests (e.g. by conducting a PRA) as well as actions to be taken are spelled out in several ISPMs.

[118] The TPG considered several proposals for a definition of “emerging pest”, which all hinge upon the notion of “increased pest risk”, on emphasizing the recent and substantial change of pest risk and on the intermediate nature of the designation, and discussed the following main points.

[119] **Pest risk vs. damage or impact.** One member suggested to refer to “damage” or “impact” instead of “pest risk”, because pest risk refers to the potential effect of an emerging pest, whereas in many cases these have already caused substantial damage. Additionally, the Secretariat questioned how recently introduced pests (such as Fall Armyworm) could be covered by the definition, as there is no pest risk (as determined through a PRA) associated with these pests in the area but they may already have caused great damage. One member noted that the concept of “pest risk” is still valid even during an outbreak where pests have caused an impact or economic damage. One member noted that both the urgency and the magnitude of the damage affected by an emerging pest should be considered. One member was concerned about using “damage” in the definition as it is only one component of “pest risk”. He suggested that it would be better to consider the probability of a pest to be an emerging pest in another country, which is reflected in “pest risk”.

[120] The TPG noted that pest risk by definition already contains the concept of potential economic consequences, and therefore includes social, environmental and economic impact (see Supplement 2 to ISPM 5). One member disagreed with linking the definition to damage, as it would exclude “potential” pests, but would include pests that might cause serious damage but have no likelihood to establish elsewhere. The TPG concluded on the wording “pest risk or impact”, to ensure that both the potential and the actual impact is taken into account.

[121] **Perceived pest risk.** One proposed definition included the notion of “perceived pest risk” to highlight that (a) with emerging pests, the pest risk may not necessarily be very well investigated or understood yet, implying that further analysis may be needed, and (b), that in some cases, the actual pest risk may not have changed at all, but improved pest information has revealed that the organism presents a high pest risk previously unknown or underestimated. One member noted that pest risk is assessed by conducting a PRA. The TPG concluded that to include “perceived pest risk” would be an unnecessary complication.

[122] **Recently increased pest risk.** One member considered that “recently increased” would imply that the pest risk had been previously assessed, which may not always be the case, for example for newly introduced pests. Another member noted that this could be covered by the concept of the “perceived” pest risk. Furthermore, the proposed term referring to increased pest risk would still apply to a pest that is causing ongoing damage.

[123] **Which pests should be covered?** One member noted that both regulated and non-regulated pests could be emerging pests, and this could be made explicit by mentioning both categories in the definition, or implicit by not mentioning either of the two categories. Furthermore, one member noted that an emerging pest could be present or absent and, again, this could be made explicit by mentioning both pest statuses in the definition, or implicit by not mentioning either of them. The TPG agreed to only use “pest” in the definition.

[124] **Linking emerging pests and emergency actions** The TPG considered whether emergency (or urgent) action should be part of the definition of “emerging pest”. The TPG noted that “emergency action”, as defined in the Glossary, has a broader meaning, i.e. it would include but is not restricted to an action that may be taken in reaction to the detection of an emerging pest. One member noted several examples of serious (emerging) pests, where there are no

phytosanitary measures available to prevent their spread, and no action is sufficient to contain them. In these cases, measures may however be needed for the mitigation of the effects of the pests.

- [125] One member disagreed with linking the definition with the need to act, citing *Tuta absoluta* in Europe as an example, which was considered an emerging pest but at the time of appearance, it was already too late to be regulated, as there are no measures available for the pest.
- [126] One member noted that the next step after defining an emerging pest is to consider when an emergency situation occurs and what actions are to be taken. Another member was concerned that control actions are not always available and suggested that evaluation could be considered an action. One member agreed that emergency action is not necessarily the next step after designating a pest as emerging, suggesting that an evaluation of the situation is required before deciding on an appropriate action.
- [127] Another member suggested that if “action” is not added to the definition, the emerging pest will not be different from a quarantine pest or other regulated pest. However, it was proposed that the urgent action could also be taken by the trading partner, not the NPPO of the concerned area.
- [128] The TPG noted that the decision tree drawn by the TC-RPPO focuses on how to determine what is an emerging pest, and not to identify the action to be taken.
- [129] The TPG agreed that the definition should not include requirements, as these are set out in ISPMs or CPM recommendations. The TPG agreed that the definition should concisely describe the concept of an emerging pest but neither the criteria for evaluating individual pests nor any action that may be taken in an emergency situation.
- [130] **Emerging pests in different regions** One member questioned how to handle a pest that is high risk and emerging in one area but already exists in another where it does not cause problems. One member highlighted that for that very reason the proposed definition includes the wording ‘for an area’, because, as with all pests, the geographical variation of pest risk is considerable, and a pest may well be deemed emerging for one area and not for another. One member suggested that in areas where the pest is present, phytosanitary measures may be applied, whereas in areas where the pest is not (yet) present and phytosanitary measures have not been established, emergency actions may be applied temporarily.
- [131] **Where would the definition be used?** The TPG considered whether there is a need for further clarifying the concept of emerging pest and possible actions to be taken by the IPPC community (including the IPPC Secretariat) before or instead of defining a term. One member suggested that the CPM consider introducing a new mechanism for actions against pests that are not regulated, noting that phytosanitary measures as outlined in the Convention only apply to regulated pests.
- [132] One member cited the example of “plant health” as used for the International Year of Plant Health (IYPH) 2020: the term has not been defined for the Glossary, as it is difficult to agree on a universal concept, but the Steering Committee of IYPH have prepared a definition of “plant health” as it relates to the IYPH.
- [133] The TPG stressed that the definition should be conceptual and criteria for evaluating whether or not a pest is emerging would need to be developed by another body. Together these would contribute to decision making on a political level to determine possible actions.

- [134] **Should the definition be included in the Glossary?** The TPG discussed whether it would be likely that the definition of “emerging pest” will be included in ISPM 5 or used in strategic or discussion papers or guidance material (such as the Annotated Glossary). One member recalled that the SC in May 2018, at the recommendation of the TPG in 2017, have considered whether terms in general may be added to the Glossary, even if they are not used in ISPMs but in implementation materials for example.
- [135] The TPG agreed on a proposed definition for “emerging pest”: *A pest for which the pest risk or impact for an area has recently increased substantially, due to changes in pest-intrinsic factors, hosts, pathways or environment related factors.*
- [136] **Process.** The Secretariat clarified that the SC had requested the TPG to work on the definition of “emerging pest” but there has not yet been a discussion on whether it will be included in ISPM 5. The TPG was informed that the Bureau would be discussing the broader ‘emergency’ issue in their December 2018 meeting, and that a paper would be prepared for the CPM-14 (2019) on the RPPOs’ standpoint on emerging pests. The TPG stressed that their proposal will be addressed and presented to the SC, and the SC will then decide on the further process.
- [137] A paper containing TPG considerations on a definition for emerging pest was agreed by TPG ([Appendix 5](#)). This paper includes the proposed definition as well as explanations and the rationale usually included in definitions for the Glossary, plus some additional background and considerations addressed to the SC.
- [138] The TPG:
- (12) *agreed* to present a draft definition for “emerging pest” (2018-003) as outlined in Appendix 05 to the SC May 2019

#### **6.4. “Detection survey” (consequential to the revision of “survey” (2013-015))**

- [139] The TPG lead introduced the paper<sup>17</sup> and noted that the SC-7 had requested to analyze whether to include “absence” in the definition of “detection survey”.
- [140] The Glossary term “survey” was added to the *List of Topics for IPPC Standards* by the SC in May 2013, for the TPG to consider whether the concept of “absence” should be included in its definition. TPG proposed in the draft 2017 Amendments a revision to the definition of “survey” in accordance with the draft revision of ISPM 6, the use of the term in other ISPMs and the three types of surveys defined in the Glossary. During their review of consultation comments, SC-7 in May 2018 noted that the determination of absence of a pest is not part of the definition of “detection survey”. The SC-7 asked the TPG to consider whether the definition of “detection survey” should be amended, by ink amendment, to include “or absence”.
- [141] The TPG noted that “detection survey” is used in several instances throughout ISPMs when referring to determining or verifying absence of a pest. However, it is the only “survey” term where the definition does not contain reference to absence of pests.
- [142] The TPG considered the objective of a detection survey and agreed that it is undertaken to determine whether a pest is present or not, meaning that presence and absence are equally possible outcomes of a detection survey and it can thus be used as a way to determine that the pest is absent.
- [143] One member noted that “if” in the definition already expresses the concept of absence, and suggested that the conditional should be removed if adding “or absence”. The TPG discussed

---

<sup>17</sup> 13\_TPG\_2018\_Dec

alternative options, such as using “whether”, but because “if present” is conditional but not very explicit, finally agreed to remove the conditional altogether by revising the wording to “... determine presence or absence of pests”.

[144] One member suggested to include in the definition “in an area, place of production or production site” to be consistent with the definition of survey, and to clarify that it does not address detection of a pest in a consignment. Some members suggested that the addition may be redundant but the TPG agreed that it improves clarity, especially when the definition is read by itself, not along with the other definitions.

[145] The TPG considered whether to use “pest” in singular or plural, and one member noted that a survey could look for multiple pests, so the TPG agreed to leave “pests”.

[146] **Translation issue:** TPG members identified several issues related with the translation of the term and definition. The Chinese language lead noted that in Chinese *detection survey* is literally translated as “presence survey”, and wondered whether the addition of “or absence” would affect the translation. Similarly, the Russian language lead noted that it would not be necessary to add “of absence” in the Russian translation. The Spanish language lead reiterated that the correct Spanish translation of survey should be “prospección”. The TPG noted those issues and recalled that translations may use more or other words in a definition if necessary to express the intended meaning.

[147] The TPG agreed that the revised definition should not be proposed as an ink amendment, as additional modifications to the text have been made.

[148] The TPG:

(13) *proposed* the revision of “detection survey” (consequential to the revision of “survey” (2013-015)) in the draft 2019 Amendments to the Glossary (1994-001) to be presented to SC May 2019.

## 6.5 “Inspection” (2017-005)

[149] The TPG lead introduced the papers<sup>18</sup>. She recalled that the revision of the term was proposed to adequately reflect current inspection practices that may also include examination methods other than visual, while still emphasizing the main difference between inspection and testing, the first being a visual examination while the latter is not.

[150] During the SC May 2018 meeting, the SC members did not reach consensus on the new revised definition, particularly on the inclusion of assistive methods in inspection and the potential overlap with the definition of test. During an e-forum the SC members continued their discussion, and they also noted that inspection of a consignment, as outlined in ISPM 23, includes three distinct technical requirements: examination of documents, verification of identity and integrity of the consignment, and visual examination for pests (i.e. “inspection” as currently defined in the Glossary). The SC thus requested the TPG to reconsider the revision of “inspection”, especially in relation to the definition of “test” and its use in ISPM 23.

[151] The TPG lead noted that both in its current definition and in the proposed revision, inspection covers only one aspect of the inspection of a consignment. She therefore proposed to introduce a new term “phytosanitary inspection”, to be defined as “*Official procedures for determination of compliance of consignments with phytosanitary regulations including examination of associated documents, verification of identity and integrity and inspection*”. The new term is already being used in ISPM 23 and would cover all technical requirements of inspection of a

<sup>18</sup> 14\_TPG\_2018\_Dec; 15\_TPG\_2018\_Dec

consignment. Some members noted that “phytosanitary inspection” is used in several ISPMs, including ISPM 15, ISPM 20, ISPM 23 and ISPM 31, where it refers only to the physical inspection of consignments, including sampling. The definition of “inspection” would therefore maintain the focus on visual examination for presence of pests, but was proposed to be modified to refer to phytosanitary import requirements instead of phytosanitary regulations to improve its alignment with ISPM 23.

[152] One member noted that including “phytosanitary import requirements” in the definition of “inspection” would not be compatible with inspection of places of production, for which “phytosanitary import requirements” do not apply. The TPG discussed whether there should be a distinction between inspection of consignments and inspection of areas (places of production).

[153] One member was concerned that the inclusion of the new term “phytosanitary inspection” in the Glossary could imply that “inspection” is not a phytosanitary measure. In addition, some members worried that this proposal would require a lot of ink amendments for the consistent use of the two terms in all ISPMs, including a potential revision of ISPM 23. The TPG acknowledged that in ISPM 23 inspection is used in two different ways: physical inspection of a consignment for pests and verification of compliance with phytosanitary regulations. Another member, however, considered that ISPM 23 is sufficiently clear in outlining the three elements of inspection and suggested that the Glossary definition of “inspection” should be revised instead.

[154] The TPG discussed the possibility of using “clearance (of a consignment)” to cover the combination of the three activities in inspection instead of introducing the new term “phytosanitary inspection”. The TPG noted that in the definition it is not clear as to whether “clearance” is the result of an “inspection” or the process of a particular type of inspection, and may therefore need to be revised. Another member suggested to use “release (of a consignment)”, which would happen after a consignment is cleared. However, some members argued that release is strictly about import and may not extend to all applications of inspection.

[155] The TPG agreed to dismiss the amendments to include “olfactory, acoustic or other examination tools” in the definition of inspection, as these additions are not strictly necessary. However, the conflict between ISPM 23 and the Glossary definition remains unresolved, as the examination of documentation is not included in the current definition of “inspection”.

[156] The TPG considered revising the definition to clarify that inspection covers not only the visual examination of plants, plant products and other regulated articles, but also the determination of compliance with phytosanitary regulations, including the examination of relevant documentation. One member noted that typically an inspection would start with the examination of documents, followed by the examination of the consignment. One member thought that determination of compliance is not clear enough. One member suggested to exchange “or” with “and” between the two concepts, but the TPG maintained that in IPPC terminology (in the English version) “or” includes the concept of “and” and that this modification was not necessary.

[157] The TPG agreed to continue working on the definition of “inspection” in their next meeting, and to withdraw their previous proposal for including assistive methods in the definition. Several members proposed to separate “inspection (of a consignment)” from “inspection (of a place of production or production site)”.

[158] The TPG:

(14) *agreed* to continue the revision of “inspection” (2017-005) in their next meeting.

## 7. Review of ISPMs for consistency of terms and style

### 7.1 General recommendations on use of terms in ISPMs

[159] The Secretariat introduced the paper<sup>19</sup> recalling that the *General recommendations on use of terms in ISPMs* are published in the *IPPC Style guide* and noting that there are a few editorial amendments proposed.

[160] One member proposed to consider adding a note in the general recommendations on “programme/protocol/procedure/schedule”, as there seemed to be still some confusion on the use of the different terms, particularly in the standards on requirements for the use of different types of treatments. TPG maintained that the Glossary term “treatment schedule” should be used whenever this is the intended meaning. One member noted that “programme” is used in a very different sense in ISPM 9 (*Guidelines for pest eradication programmes*) and thought that adding a general recommendation may lead to confusion. One member suggested to add some explanation to the Annotated Glossary, but the TPG agreed that there is no need.

[161] The TPG agreed to the suggested amendments and modified the *General recommendations on use of terms in ISPMs* accordingly. The Secretariat agreed to incorporate the amendments into the *IPPC Style guide*.

### 7.2 Consistency of adopted ISPMs (standard by standard)

[162] The Secretariat updated the TPG on the standards, which have been republished after the incorporation of approved ink amendments since the last TPG meeting<sup>20</sup> and noted that this list will be updated again in 2019.

### 7.3 Consistency review of “commodity class” across ISPMs (2018-004)

[163] The TPG lead introduced the paper<sup>21</sup>.

[164] In most cases it was suggested to replace “commodity class” by “commodity” without impacting the meaning. When the term was used in conjunction with “commodity”, it was proposed to remove “or commodity class”.

[165] The lead invited the TPG to consider the use of “commodity categories”, which is used several times in ISPM 32 (*Categorization of commodities according to their pest risk*) and the phrase “commodity’s type”, which is used once in ISPM 39 (*International movement of wood*).

[166] One member suggested that there is no need to modify the phrase “commodity categories” in these instances, as it is used in a normal English meaning and the title of ISPM 32 reflects that this standard is about categories of commodities. It was stated that even the phrase “commodity class” can still be used, without having a definition and just in the normal dictionary meaning.

[167] “Commodity’s type” in ISPM 39 is also used in its normal English meaning, so the TPG agreed to leave it unchanged.

[168] The TPG:

(15) *invited* the SC to review and approve the ink amendments proposed in [Appendix 6](#) to remove reference to “commodity class” from adopted ISPMs.

---

<sup>19</sup> 16\_TPG\_2018\_Dec

<sup>20</sup> List of proposed or approved ink amendments is available on the IPP: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/82115/>

<sup>21</sup> 17\_TPG\_2018\_Dec

## 8. Annotated Glossary: 2019 final version

[169] 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 2018 intermediate version, which was submitted to the TPG for comments in June 2018, and noted that one TPG member had submitted comments. Another TPG member had prepared a conference room paper with additional comments<sup>22</sup>.

[170] The TPG discussed those comments and agreed on a range of changes to the Annotated Glossary. Major discussion points were as follows:

- The notes on “parasitoid” and “process load” were deleted. One member noted that they had been included because terms that are only used in one ISPM should be defined there and not in the Glossary. However, since these terms may be used in future ISPMs their definition should be retained in the Glossary. One member wondered whether terms that are defined in an ISPM but are subsequently used in another should be added to ISPM 5, and the TPG noted that the SC and CPM would have to decide such cases. Accordingly, note 4 (*Terms relating to biological control*) was also deleted, but the empty note retained to avoid confusion from renumbering.
- Note 8 on “surveillance” was revised to align with the adopted revised ISPM 6, where the three different kinds of surveys defined in the Glossary are considered to be part of “specific surveillance”. In addition, one member suggested that even if monitoring survey is included in monitoring, this overlap should not cause confusion, and the need to revise the terminology was removed from the note.
- Note 11 on “presence and movements of pests”: One member proposed to modify the explanation on “introduction” to clarify that movement of pests by human agency can be both intentional and unintentional. It was highlighted that the Glossary defines “introduction (of a pest)”, and that if introduction is not referring to a pest, the Glossary definition does not apply. The TPG agreed that when a term is not used in the Glossary sense but in the dictionary sense, it should not be bolded (and used without quotation mark, except for emphasis). The TPG also agreed to replace “exotic” with “non-indigenous” as Appendix 1 of ISPM 5 recommended not to use “exotic”. One member suggested to add additional explanation to the paragraph on “spread”, to recommend using “spread” when considering pest species and “dispersal” when considering individual specimens of pest. However, the TPG did not agree to the addition as it is already covered in the *General recommendations on use of terms in ISPMs*. Finally, the TPG agreed to delete a sentence from the note that refers to the 1951 text of the Convention, as it was considered unnecessary.
- Note 12 on “Inspection and pest freedom”: One member suggested that since the statement “practically free from pests” on phytosanitary certificates has become optional, the last sentence of the note could be deleted as it was deemed unnecessary historical information. However, to retain the reference to the revised text of the IPPC (1997), part of the removed text was moved to earlier in the paragraph. One member questioned whether “practically free” needed to be defined in the Glossary.
- Appendix 2: The first sentence was modified to highlight that the Glossary work is an ongoing process. The explanation of “effective dose” was simplified to focus on the outcome in the explanation rather than the process.

---

<sup>22</sup> CRP\_02\_TPG\_2018\_Dec

[171] The TPG lead agreed to prepare a 2018 final version of the Annotated Glossary based on the TPG comments, to be finalized for publication in spring of 2019.

[172] The TPG:

- (16) *agreed* that the 2018 version of the Annotated Glossary would be modified after the meeting by Ms Beatriz MELCHO and sent to the TPG for final agreement.
- (17) *invited* the SC to review the 2018 version of the Annotated Glossary and asked the Secretariat to publish it on the IPP.

## 9. Explanation of Glossary terms

[173] The following terms were discussed.

### *Emergency action*

[174] During agenda item 5.1, the TPG discussed the need to review the term “emergency action” and how it would apply to phytosanitary measures for a new pest that is discovered e.g. in an imported consignment and is not yet regulated. The TPG considered it appropriate that this situation could be covered by “emergency action”, however, since the definition refers back to phytosanitary actions and therefore to the implementation of phytosanitary measures, it is directed against regulated pests only.

[175] One member noted that Article VII/6 of the Convention states that: “*Nothing in this Article shall prevent any contracting party from taking appropriate emergency action on the detection of a pest posing a potential threat to its territories or the report of such a detection.*” The TPG considered that in this case the text of the Convention provides the overarching concept and justifies NPPOs taking action on any pest posing a “potential threat”, including non-regulated pests. The TPG discussed whether or not an emergency action would be considered a phytosanitary measure in this case. One member proposed to revise the definition of “emergency action” by removing “phytosanitary” from “phytosanitary action” to clarify that an emergency action can be targeting both regulated and non-regulated pests. One member suggested to exchange “phytosanitary” with “official” to emphasize that any action taken during an emergency should be under the authority of the NPPO.

[176] One member noted that “emergency action” links with several other terms in the Glossary, including “phytosanitary action”, “emergency measure” or “provisional measure”, which all refer back to “phytosanitary measures”, and all should be considered during a potential revision of “emergency action”. He also suggested that the explanatory note 10 in the annotated Glossary may need to be amended accordingly. One member recalled the discussion during agenda item 6.3 on the definition of “emerging pest”, noting that “emergency actions” would often target pests that may be considered emerging, and clarity in the definition of the term would be beneficial in view of the ongoing discussion on “emergencies” in the IPPC community.

[177] The TPG agreed to propose to the SC to add the revision of “emergency action” to the work programme. As a starting point for the work, the following draft definition was suggested: A prompt official phytosanitary action undertaken in a new or unexpected phytosanitary situation.

### *Clearance (of a consignment)*

[178] One member recalled the note on “interception (of a pest)” in the Annotated Glossary because he considered that interception implies the pest is prevented from entry, an action that goes beyond the mere “detection” as stated in the definition. He stated that in practice interception means that an action (e.g. refusal or treatment) is taken after a pest is detected, but the current

definition does not reflect this action. Another member clarified that “interception (of a consignment)” would cover the official action taken, noting that a consignment may be intercepted because of the interception of a pest on the consignment.

- [179] One member noted that the definition of “clearance (of a consignment)” is similar as it is the verification of compliance with phytosanitary regulation, but differs in that as opposed to “interception (of a consignment)”, this action results in the release of the consignment. The TPG agreed to revise the associated note in the Annotated Glossary. One member noted that in the process of clearance, consignments are either released or intercepted and highlighted that clearance refers to the process. Agreeing to this, one member suggested revising the definition of “clearance (of a consignment)”, in order to be more explicit in referring to the process of verification, rather than the result, because otherwise “clearance (of a consignment)” and “release (of a consignment)” would be synonymous. The explanation of the term “clearance (of a consignment)” in the Annotated Glossary was revised to reflect that “interception” could be the result of “clearance” and “entry” was removed.
- [180] The TPG agreed to propose to the SC to add the revision of “clearance (of a consignment)” to the work programme. As a starting point for the work, the following draft definition was suggested: Process of Verification ~~verifying~~ of compliance with phytosanitary regulations {consider inclusion of “resulting in interception or release”}.

#### ***General surveillance/Specific surveillance***

- [181] One member noted that the revised ISPM 6 resulted in a slight change in the meaning of general and specific surveillance, which was incorporated in note 8 of the Annotated Glossary. Another member suggested that it may be desirable to include the definitions for those two terms also in ISPM 5, to provide clarity without having to read ISPM 6.
- [182] The TPG considered that specific surveillance in ISPM 6 corresponds to the old definition of “survey”, which is currently under revision in the 2017 Amendments of ISPM 5 and will be presented to CPM-14 for adoption. One member recalled that the previous version of ISPM 6 referred to “specific surveys” for what is now called “specific surveillance”. One member recalled that during discussions on the revision of ISPM 6 there was the need to distinguish between surveys (limited in time, targeting specific pests) and general surveillance (ongoing, not necessarily targeted to specific pests). One member suggested that the definition of “surveillance” would be equivalent to “general surveillance” and that for “survey” equivalent to “specific surveillance”.
- [183] One member suggested that it would be beneficial to develop a definition for “general surveillance”, to clarify what is included in the concept (e.g. analyzing available information versus physically going to the field). The TPG agreed to ask the SC to consider adding the terms “general surveillance” and “specific surveillance” to the TPG work programme.
- [184] The TPG:
- (18) *invited* the SC to consider adding to the *List of topics for IPPC standards* the following terms: “emergency action”, “clearance (of a consignment)”, “general surveillance” and “specific surveillance”.

## 9.1 Draft explanatory document on ISPM 16 (*Regulated non-quarantine pests: concept and application*)

- [185] The lead introduced the document<sup>23</sup>. He recalled the SC in May 2018 tasked the TPG with reviewing and finalizing the draft explanatory document on ISPM 16 in collaboration with the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC) with a view to have it published. A first draft had been prepared in 2002 soon after adoption of ISPM 16, but due to other priorities it had never been finalized. The TPG, when discussing the definition of “regulated non-quarantine pest” (RNQP) in 2017, felt that the draft explanatory document was still useful.
- [186] One member noted that currently only the European Union and few other countries are using the RNQP concept and questioned whether parts of the document should be added to the Annotated Glossary. Another member emphasized that an available explanatory document would have been useful for the development of guidance material by EPPO and the EU and suggested that it should be published by IPPC.
- [187] Some members thought an explanatory document on ISPM 16 would be very useful to clarify the concept of RNQPs, but noted that the document needs to be revised and updated, because it is based on a draft from 2010 and some parts are clearly outdated.
- [188] One member had found it intriguing that RNQPs could include pests of potted plants for indoor use (plants for planting by definition), as he believed the original rationale of regulating some common, widely distributed pests had probably been to ensure pest free propagation material. One member disagreed with the examples given for RNQPs. One member questioned whether seeds should be covered, as they are also plants for planting.
- [189] One member suggested that plants as pests should not be discussed in the explanatory document, as they are not explicitly included in ISPM 16. However, another member suggested that if the intention was to clarify whether plants as pests can be categorized as RNQPs, then it could be appropriate to include them. She wondered whether it was more about plants as pests that are intentionally imported rather than weeds introduced as contaminants, and which could become invasive if diverted from their intended use. She suggested that additional ideas could be included in a different paper, whereas the explanatory document should focus on the content of ISPM 16.
- [190] One member thought that the concept of RNQPs was developed to give the NPPO the possibility to refuse plants for planting at import if they are infested with non-quarantine pests. This would allow the NPPO to regulate for the possibility that the consignment is diverted from its intended use, which for potted indoor plants is to remain planted. Another member thought it was well explained in both ISPM 16 and the explanatory document that even if the risk is much lower for plants that will remain planted, countries still have the right to regulate them.
- [191] One member noted that the EU/EPPO had been working on a programme for RNQPs during the last few years and suggested that some of their experts be consulted during the development of the explanatory document.
- [192] The Secretariat reminded the TPG of the SC recommendation to consider this document in collaboration with the IC and suggested that the IC’s involvement would be useful because it was clearly an implementation problem, and it would strengthen collaboration between standard setting and implementation. However the TPG considered that they would have to thoroughly revise the document before sharing it with the IC. The TPG noted that explanatory

---

<sup>23</sup> 18\_TPG\_2018\_Dec

documents are strictly speaking tools to explain the content of the associated ISPM and should not go beyond that. The TPG agreed to continue working on the document in their next meeting. The new TPG lead will prepare a new draft considering the discussion during this meeting and with input from TPG members and experts.

[193] The TPG:

(19) *agreed* to continue working on the explanatory document for ISPM 16 during their next meeting.

## 10. TPG work plan

[194] The TPG updated its work plan for 2019 ([Appendix 7](#)). This work plan will be presented to SC May 2019. 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.

[195] The TPG noted that several terms on the TPG work programme are pending the *Focused revision of ISPM 12* (2015-011). As Specification 67 for this topic has been approved by the SC in 2018, the TPG suggested that if Secretariat resources allow, this topic be progressed and an EWG be convened in 2019, potentially on the margins of the next TPG meeting. The Steward agreed to raise this issue during the SC May 2019 meeting.

[196] The TPG noted that the 2019 Amendments to ISPM 5 contain only one proposed term (“detection survey”). The Secretariat suggested that in this case, and at the discretion of the SC, consultation of the 2019 Amendments may be delayed to 2020.

[197] The TPG:

(20) *invited* the SC to note the TPG work plan 2019 ([Appendix 7](#)).

## 11. Any other business

[198] The Secretariat noted that the term of Mr Ebbe NORDBO (Denmark) would be ending in 2019. Mr NORDBO informed that pending approval by the SC and continued support by EPPO he would be willing to continue as a member for a 3<sup>rd</sup> term or as an invited expert. The TPG supported continuing his membership, or if he would not be confirmed for a 3<sup>rd</sup> term to suggest the SC invites him as an expert to future TPG meetings. The Secretariat invited Mr NORDBO to confirm his RPPO support by end February 2019, so that if necessary a call for experts could be launched. The Secretariat stressed the importance of the continuity of TPG membership.

[199] The TPG:

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

## 12. Date and venue of the next meeting

[200] The week of 18-21 November 2019 was proposed as tentative dates for the 2019 TPG meeting. The Secretariat confirmed that the meeting during these dates would take place at FAO HQ in Rome, Italy.

### **13. Closing of the meeting**

- [201] The Secretariat thanked the TPG members for their contributions to the work of the TPG and thanked the Italian NPPO for hosting the meeting again.
- [202] The TPG members expressed their appreciation to the Chairperson of the meeting. Mr Rajesh RAMARATHNAM thanked the SC and the TPG for welcoming him as an invited expert and is looking forward to contributing as a member to the panel.
- [203] The Chairperson also thanked the Secretariat for their support, wished all the TPG members safe travels and closed the meeting.



AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER
5.3 Draft ISPM on <i>Authorization of entities to perform phytosanitary actions (2014-002)</i> - Consultation comments on terms and consistency, including translation issues - Addendum comments from RW Africa	2014-002 08_TPG_2018_Dec_Rev 24_TPG_2018_Dec	ORLINSKI
5.4 Draft ISPM on <i>Requirements for the use of modified atmosphere treatments as a phytosanitary measure (2014-006)</i> - Consultation comments on terms and consistency, including translation issues - Addendum comments from RW Africa	2014-006 09_TPG_2018_Dec_Rev 25_TPG_2018_Dec	NING
<b>6. Subjects on the TPG work programme</b> 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 2019.		
6.1 "Quarantine area" (2012-006)	10_TPG_2018_Dec	• BOUHOT-DELDUC
6.2 "Commodity" (2018-002)	11_TPG_2018_Dec	NORDBO
6.3 "Emerging pest" (2018-003) ❖ Paper on emerging pests presented to SPG 2018 and revised by the TC-RPPO 2018 (in track changes) ❖ Draft definition "emerging pest"	12_TPG_2018_Dec 19_TPG_2018_Dec_Rev 21_TPG_2018_Dec	BLOEM/GORITSCHNIG NORDBO
6.4 "Detection survey" (consequential to the revision of "survey" (2013-015))	13_TPG_2018_Dec	BOUHOT-DELDUC
6.5 "Inspection" (2017-005) - Proposed ink amendments to ISPM 23: Guidelines for Inspection	14_TPG_2018_Dec 15_TPG_2018_Dec	MELCHO
<b>7. Review of ISPMs for consistency of terms and style</b>		
7.1 General recommendations on consistency (as modified following the TPG 2017 and noted by the SC. To be reviewed and completed as needed)	16_TPG_2018_Dec	Secretariat
7.2 Consistency of adopted ISPM (standard by standard) - List of standards that have gone through the consistency review	<a href="#">List of ink amendments proposed or approved for ISPMs</a> (work area; log on needed)	Secretariat
7.3 Consistency review of "commodity class" across ISPMs (2018-004)	17_TPG_2018_Dec	• ORLINSKI
<b>8. Annotated Glossary: 2018 intermediate version</b> <i>[The Annotated Glossary, version 4, was finalized at TPG 2015 and published in March 2016. The next version should be finalized for publication in 2019. The TPG considers yearly which amendments need to be made and produces an intermediate version. The 2017 intermediate version is posted in the TPG work area. The 2018 intermediate version was prepared by Ms Beatriz Melcho and submitted to the TPG for comments (in June 2018). Ms Laurence Bouhot-Delduc provided comments]</i>	<a href="#">Web link to the 2016 Annotated Glossary</a>  <a href="#">Web link to the 2018 intermediate version</a> (work area; log on needed)	MELCHO

AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER
<b>9. Explanation of Glossary terms</b> 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 Draft explanatory document on ISPM 16 ( <i>Regulated non-quarantine pests: concept and application</i> )	18_TPG_2018_Dec <a href="#">Link to ISPM 16</a>	NORDBO
<b>10. TPG work plan</b>	-	
10.1 TPG work plan for 2019-2020 The TPG will update its work plan for the coming year, based on discussions at the meeting, to be presented to the SC May 2019 for noting.	To be prepared during the meeting	Secretariat
<b>11. Any other business</b>		
<b>12. Date and venue of the next meeting</b>	-	Secretariat
<b>13. Close of the meeting</b> - Evaluation	<a href="#">Link to survey</a>	Chairperson

**Appendix 2: Documents list**

<b>DOCUMENT NO.</b>	<b>AGENDA ITEM</b>	<b>DOCUMENT TITLE</b>	<b>DATE POSTED / DISTRIBUTED</b>
<b>Draft ISPMS</b>			
1994-001_Rev	5.1	Draft 2018 amendments to ISPM 5	2018-11-05 2018-11-12
2009-005	5.2	Draft revision of ISPM 8: <i>Determination of pest status in an area</i>	2018-11-05
2014-002	5.3	Draft ISPM on <i>Authorization of entities to perform phytosanitary actions</i>	2018-11-05
2014-006	5.4	Draft ISPM on <i>Requirements for the use of modified atmosphere treatments as a phytosanitary measure</i>	2018-11-05
<b>Other Documents</b>			
01_TPG_2018_Dec	2.3	Draft Annotated Agenda	2018-11-05 2018-11-09 2018-11-12 2018-11-14 2018-11-16 2018-11-26 2018-11-28
02_TPG_2018_Dec	3.1	Documents List	2018-11-05 2018-11-09 2018-11-12 2018-11-14 2018-11-16 2018-11-26 2018-11-28
03_TPG_2018_Dec	3.2	Participants List	2018-11-05
04_TPG_2018_Dec	3.3	Local Information	2018-11-05
05_TPG_2018_Dec	4.2	Extracts from other meeting reports of relevance to the TPG	2018-11-26
06_TPG_2018_Dec_Rev	5.1	Consultation comments on terms and consistency – Draft 2018 Amendments to ISPM 5: <i>Glossary of phytosanitary terms</i> (1994-001)	2018-11-05 2018-11-09
07_TPG_2018_Dec	5.2	Consultation comments on terms and consistency, including translation issues - Draft revision of ISPM 8: <i>Determination of pest status in an area</i> (2009-005)	2018-11-05
08_TPG_2018_Dec_Rev	5.3	Consultation comments on terms and consistency, including translation issues - Draft ISPM on <i>Authorization of entities to perform phytosanitary actions</i> (2014-002)	2018-11-05 2018-11-26

DOCUMENT NO.	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE	DATE POSTED / DISTRIBUTED
09_TPG_2018_Dec_Rev	5.4	Consultation comments on terms and consistency, including translation issues - Draft ISPM on <i>Requirements for the use of modified atmosphere treatments as a phytosanitary measure</i> (2014-006)	2018-11-05 2018-11-09
10_TPG_2018_Dec	6.1	Discussion paper "Quarantine area" (2012-006)	2018-11-05
11_TPG_2018_Dec	6.2	Discussion "Commodity" (2018-002)	2018-11-05
12_TPG_2018_Dec	6.3	Discussion paper "Emerging pest" (2018-003)	2018-11-05
13_TPG_2018_Dec	6.4	Discussion paper "Detection survey" (consequential to the revision of "survey" (2013-015))	2018-11-05
14_TPG_2018_Dec	6.5	Discussion paper "Inspection" (2017-005)	2018-11-05
15_TPG_2018_Dec	6.5	Proposed ink amendments to ISPM 23 – Guidelines for Inspection	2018-11-05
16_TPG_2018_Dec	7.1	General recommendations on consistency	2018-11-05
17_TPG_2018_Dec	7.3	7.3 Consistency review of "commodity class" across ISPMs (2018-004)	2018-11-05
18_TPG_2018_Dec	9.1	Draft explanatory document on ISPM 16 ( <i>Regulated non-quarantine pests: concept and application</i> )	2018-11-05
19_TPG_2018_Dec_Rev	6.3	EPPO Paper on emerging pests presented to SPG 2018 and revised by TC-RPPO 2018 (in Track changes)	2018-11-05 2018-11-14
20_TPG_2018_Dec	5.1	Proposed draft translations of terms - Chinese	2018-11-09
21_TPG_2018_Dec	6.3	Draft definition "emerging pest" - Nordbo (2018-003)	2018-11-16
22_TPG_2018_Dec	5.1	Addendum Consultation comments on terms and consistency – Draft 2018 Amendments to ISPM 5: <i>Glossary of Phytosanitary terms</i> (1994-001)	2018-11-28
23_TPG_2018_Dec	5.2	Addendum - Consultation comments on terms and consistency, including translation issues - Draft revision of ISPM 8: <i>Determination of pest status in an area</i> (2009-005)	2018-11-28
24_TPG_2018_Dec	5.3	Addendum - Consultation comments on terms and consistency, including translation issues - Draft ISPM on <i>Authorization of entities to perform phytosanitary actions</i> (2014-002)	2018-11-28
25_TPG_2018_Dec	5.4	Addendum - Consultation comments on terms and consistency, including translation issues - Draft ISPM on <i>Requirements for the use of modified atmosphere treatments as a phytosanitary measure</i> (2014-006)	2018-11-28
CRP_01_TPG_2018_Dec	5.2	<i>Draft Revision of ISPM 8</i> – TPG amendments (2009-005)	2018-12-02
CRP_02_TPG_2018_Dec	8	Annotated Glossary 2018 => 2019: comments from Ebbe Nordbo	2018-12-02

<b>IPP LINKS:</b>	<b>Agenda item</b>
<a href="#">Current specification: TP5 (TPG) (2016)</a>	2.4
<a href="#">Previous meetings of the TPG (December 2017)</a>	4.1
<a href="#">Current work plan</a> (work area; log on needed)	4.3
<a href="#">List of ink amendments proposed or approved for ISPMs</a>	7.2
<a href="#">2016 Annotated Glossary</a>	8
<a href="#">Web link to the 2018 intermediate version</a> (work area; log on needed)	8
<a href="#">Link to ISPM 16</a>	9.1

**Appendix 3: Participants list****TPG members:**

Participants details			TPG member's term	
Name, mailing, address, telephone	Participant role	Email address	begins	ends
<b>Ms Laurence BOUHOT-DELDUC</b> Ministry of Agriculture and Food, General directorate for food Sub-directorate for plant quality, health and protection 251 rue de Vaugirard 75732 Paris Cedex 15 <b>FRANCE</b> Tel: (+33) 149558437	French / Steward	<a href="mailto:laurence.bouhot-delduc@agriculture.gouv.fr">laurence.bouhot-delduc@agriculture.gouv.fr</a>	May 2013	2023 (1 <sup>st</sup> term: 2013-- 2018)
<b>Ms Beatriz MELCHO</b> Ministry of Livestock, Agriculture and Fisheries, General Direction of Agricultural Services, Plant Protection Division Avda. Millan 4703 CP 12900 Montevideo, <b>URUGUAY</b> Tel: (+598) 2 309 8410 ext 267	Spanish	<a href="mailto:bmelcho@mgap.gub.uy">bmelcho@mgap.gub.uy</a> ; <a href="mailto:bemelcho@hotmail.com">bemelcho@hotmail.com</a> ;	Nov 2010	2020 (1 <sup>st</sup> term: 2010- 2015)
<b>Ms Hong NING</b> Plant Quarantine Station of Sichuan Agricultural Department No. 4 Wuhouci Street, Chengdu, Sichuan, 610041 <b>PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA</b> Tel: (+86) 28 85505251 Fax: (+86) 28 85505251	Chinese	<a href="mailto:ninghong2006@aliyun.com">ninghong2006@aliyun.com</a> ;	Sept 2012	2022 (1 <sup>st</sup> term: 2012-- 2017)
<b>Mr Ebbe NORDBO</b> <b>DENMARK</b> Tel: (+45) 46358095 Mobile: (+45) 28740095	English / Assistant Steward	<a href="mailto:ebbenordbo@outlook.com">ebbenordbo@outlook.com</a> ;	May 2013	2019 (1 <sup>st</sup> term: 2009- 2014)
<b>Ms Shaza Roshdy OMAR</b> 8 Kamal El-Din Salah street Garden City, Cairo <b>EGYPT</b> Mobile: (+20) 227972454 Fax: (+20) 227963989	Arabic	<a href="mailto:shaza.roshdy@gmail.com">shaza.roshdy@gmail.com</a> ;	Oct 2012	2022 (1 <sup>st</sup> term: 2012-- 2017)
<b>Mr Andrei ORLINSKI</b> European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization 21 bd. Richard Lenoir 75011 Paris, <b>FRANCE</b> Tel: (+33) 1 45 20 77 94 ; (+33) 1 84790743 Fax: (+33) 1 70 76 65 47	Russian	<a href="mailto:Orlinski@eppo.int">Orlinski@eppo.int</a> ;	Nov 2010	2020 (1 <sup>st</sup> term: 2010- 2015)

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

*TPG member not attending the 2018 December meeting:*

Participants details			TPG member's term	
Name, mailing, address, telephone	Participant role	Email address	begins	ends
<b>Ms Stephanie BLOEM</b> Executive Director North American Plant Protection Organization (NAPPO) 1730 Varsity Drive, Suite 300, Room 310, Raleigh, North Carolina 27606, <b>USA</b> Tel: (+1) 919 617 4040 Mobile: (+1) 919-480-4761	English	<a href="mailto:SBloem.NAPPO@gmail.com">SBloem.NAPPO@gmail.com</a> ; <a href="mailto:Stephanie.Bloem@NAPPO.org">Stephanie.Bloem@NAPPO.org</a> ;	Nov 2013	2018

**Others:**

Participants details		
Name, mailing, address, telephone	Participant role	Email address
<b>Mr Rajesh RAMARATHNAM</b> Senior Specialist (International Phytosanitary Standards): International Phytosanitary Standards Section Plant Protection Division, CFIA-ACIA 59 Camelot Drive, Ottawa ON K1A OY9 CANADA Tel: (+1) 613-773-7122 Fax: (+1) 613-773-7252	Invited expert	<a href="mailto:rajesh.ramarathnam@canada.ca">rajesh.ramarathnam@canada.ca</a> ;
<b>Ms Sandra GORITSCHNIG</b> Standard Setting Associate IPPC Secretariat Rome, <b>ITALY</b> Tel: (+39) 06570 50160	IPPC Secretariat	<a href="mailto:Sandra.Goritschnig@fao.org">Sandra.Goritschnig@fao.org</a> ;
<b>Ms Janka KISS</b> Standard Setting Associate IPPC Secretariat Rome, <b>ITALY</b> Tel: +(39) 06 5705 2454	IPPC Secretariat	<a href="mailto:Janka.Kiss@fao.org">Janka.Kiss@fao.org</a> ;
<b>Ms Adriana MOREIRA</b> Standard Setting Officer IPPC Secretariat Rome, <b>ITALY</b> Tel: (+39) 065705 5809	IPPC Secretariat	<a href="mailto:Adriana.Moreira@fao.org">Adriana.Moreira@fao.org</a> ;
<b>Ms Aixa DEL GRECO</b> Standard Setting Associate IPPC Secretariat Rome, <b>ITALY</b> Tel: +(39) 06 570 50285	IPPC Secretariat	<a href="mailto:Aixa.DelGreco@fao.org">Aixa.DelGreco@fao.org</a>
<b>Mr Avetik NERSISYAN</b> Standard Setting Unit Leader IPPC Secretariat Rome, <b>ITALY</b> Tel: +(39) 06 570 50170	IPPC Secretariat	<a href="mailto:Avetik.Nersisyan@fao.org">Avetik.Nersisyan@fao.org</a>
<b>Ms Sarah BRUNEL</b> Implementation Facilitation Unit Officer IPPC Secretariat Rome, <b>ITALY</b> Tel: (+39) 065705 53768	IPPC Secretariat	<a href="mailto:Sarah.brunel@fao.org">Sarah.brunel@fao.org</a>
<b>Mr Shoki AL DOBAI</b> Implementation and Support Team Unit Leader IPPC Secretariat Rome, <b>ITALY</b> Tel: +(39) 06 570 52730	IPPC Secretariat	<a href="mailto:Shoki.AIDobai@fao.org">Shoki.AIDobai@fao.org</a>

## Appendix 4: Proposed ink amendments on inconsistent uses of *commodity* in ISPMs

### Background

The TPG in their 2017 meeting suggested to consider the definition of the term *commodity* as a consequence of the discussion on the different *commodity class* terms and the deletion of *commodity class* from the Glossary. The SC in May 2018 added the term “commodity” to the TPG work programme.

In their 2018 meeting the TPG discussed the term and recommended retaining the current definition of *commodity* in the Glossary. The TPG noted a number of inconsistent uses of *commodity* in several ISPMs, where *consignment* may be a better option to describe the material. The TPG considered that these did not require ink amendments immediately but should be noted and archived by the Secretariat for any future revisions of the relevant ISPMs.

**Table 1: Proposed changes across ISPMs in relation to the use of “commodity”:**

Row	ISPM	Section / para	Current text	Proposed text	Rationale
1.	12	5. Guidelines and Requirements for Completing Sections of a Phytosanitary Certificate for Export	<b>Declared means of conveyance:</b> _____ This section refers to how the <b>commodity</b> is transported when leaving the certifying country.	<b>Declared means of conveyance:</b> _____ This section refers to how the <b>consignment</b> is transported when leaving the certifying country.	<i>Consignment</i> would reflect the intended meaning better than <i>commodity</i> in this case
2.	31	APPENDIX 4: Sampling for pests with an aggregated distribution: beta-binomial based sampling	In the case of aggregated spatial distribution, sampling can be adjusted to compensate for aggregation. For this adjustment to apply, it should be assumed that the <b>commodity</b> is sampled in clusters (for example, boxes) and that each unit in a chosen cluster is examined (cluster sampling). In such cases, the proportion of infested units, <i>f</i> , is no longer constant across all clusters but will follow a beta density function.	In the case of aggregated spatial distribution, sampling can be adjusted to compensate for aggregation. For this adjustment to apply, it should be assumed that the <b>consignment/lot</b> is sampled in clusters (for example, boxes) and that each unit in a chosen cluster is examined (cluster sampling). In such cases, the proportion of infested units, <i>f</i> , is no longer constant across all clusters but will follow a beta density function.	<i>Consignment</i> or <i>lot</i> would reflect the intended meaning better than <i>commodity</i> in this case

## Appendix 5: TPG considerations on a definition for “emerging pest”

(Prepared by TPG 2019-01-09, to SC)

### *Introduction, addressed to the SC.*

- [1] The CPM and several CPM bodies, including the Bureau, TC-RPPO, SPG and SC, have been and continue to be engaged in developing concepts on *emergency* and *emerging pest*. During their discussions, various suggestions as to the definition of emerging pests and other, related terms have been produced. Following a request from the RPPOs, the SC in its May 2018 meeting tasked the TPG with defining the term *emerging pest* because it would be beneficial for the IPPC to have a common understanding of what was meant when that term is used.
- [2] This paper, in presenting TPG’s proposal for a definition of *emerging pest*, includes replies to some of the suggestions from other CPM bodies and refers to general Glossary principles.
- [3] The paper builds in particular upon three documents presented to the TPG December 2018 meeting<sup>24</sup>, and the comments made by members of the IPPC Secretariat’s three units during the TPG discussion in December 2018.
- [4] Over the recent years, the many fora and meetings involved have used a range of terms related to *emerging pest* and *emergency*, e.g. ‘emergency plant health situation’, ‘plant health emergencies’, ‘emergency pest situation’, ‘emergency situations’, ‘IPPC emergencies’, etc. The SPG in 2018<sup>25</sup> decided to seek agreement on what an *emergency* is and requested one of its members to present a paper on the issue to CPM in 2019 for discussion. The TPG suggests that the definition of *emerging pest* could be developed independently of the concept of *emergency*, whereas the concept *emergency* would probably need to refer to *emerging pest*.
- [5] The following Sections of this paper constitute TPG’s reply to SC’s request for TPG defining *emerging pest*. The TPG has developed the draft definition acknowledging the usual function and constraints of Glossary definitions, under the assumption that, if agreed upon, the term and definition may be included in the Glossary of phytosanitary terms (ISPM 5).
- [6]

---

<sup>24</sup> 19\_TPG\_2018\_Dec “Emerging pests” as prepared by EPPO, presented to the SPG in October 2018 and revised by the TC-RPPO in November 2018.

12\_TPG\_2018\_Dec “Terms and definitions – EMERGING PESTS” as prepared by Stephanie Bloem.

21\_TPG\_2018\_Dec “Draft definition: Emerging pest” as prepared by Ebbe Nordbo.

<sup>25</sup> Report of the SPG meeting 2018 available at: <http://www.ippc.int/en/publications/86797/>

***Draft definition of ‘emerging pest’***

- [7] Following discussions at CPM and in various CPM bodies, RPPOs in 2017 considered they would benefit from sharing methodologies to categorize emerging pests. In order to use the same criteria for what constitutes an emerging pest, the TC-RPPOs proposed adding the term “emerging pest” to the TPG work programme. In May 2018, the SC added the term to the TPG work programme. The TPG discussed the term at its December 2018 meeting.
- [8] The draft definition is based on the presumption that the single outstanding characteristic of the emerging pests is the recent, substantial increase in their pest risk or impact:

***Proposed definition:***

<b>emerging pest</b>	A <b>pest</b> for which the <b>pest risk</b> or impact for an <b>area</b> has recently increased substantially, due to changes in pest-intrinsic factors, hosts, <b>pathways</b> or environment related factors
----------------------	---

- [9] The following detailed explanatory points may be considered when reviewing the proposal:
- As regards ‘pest risk’.***
- [10] Basically, the very concept ‘emerging’ denotes that a change is taking or has taken place. Given the pest examples highlighted and the apparent intent of the CPM Bureau, the change regards *pest risk* in its IPPC sense. Such change is not necessarily intrinsic to the pest itself (such as biology or behavior), but may regard all factors making up or influencing the pest risk. Therefore, it is appropriate and important that the definition explicitly points to the change of *pest risk*.
- [11] Pest risk (for quarantine pests) is defined as “the probability of introduction and spread of a pest and the magnitude of the associated potential economic consequences”. Being one of the most fundamental IPPC terms, it is used very frequently in ISPMs and not only for the categorization of pests as quarantine pests. The definition aligns with the common understanding of ‘risk’ as being the combined probability of an event and the possible consequences of that event, and in particular aligns with the analogue risk definitions with the other standard-setting organizations (OIE and Codex Alimentarius) under SPS.
- [12] It should be recalled, that the understanding of ‘economic consequences’ includes environmental considerations (cf. ISPM 2 core text, ISPM 5 Supplement 2, and ISPM 11 core text and Annexes 1 and 4) and social considerations (cf. ISPM 5 Supplement 2, and ISPM 11 core text and Annex 4).
- [13] The comprehensive term *pest risk* implicitly includes all the criteria suggested by the CPM Bureau to be used in the emerging pest context for assessing pests, but is not limited to those. *Pest risk* is the most appropriate term in the definition of *emerging pest*, because it is desirable that the definition, as with any Glossary term, is not too exclusive, and that emphasis is on the recent substantial increase. By using *pest risk* in the definition it is avoided that the definition consists of a range of criteria and a ‘formula’ on how many of and to what extent those criteria should be fulfilled. The TPG suggests that such criteria belong in the subsequent screening and risk assessment process for emerging pests (see also Section on ‘TPG replies to considerations of other CPM bodies’).

***As regards ‘impact’.***

- [14] Whereas ‘pest risk’ comprehensively captures concerns regarding the probability and consequences of pest introductions, its definition uses the wording ‘potential’ for the consequences. The word ‘potential’ could be interpreted as not including impacts already unfolding in the area in question. Following that line of interpretation, it could be understood as if *emerging pest* could not be used for a pest in an area where it is already present. This would seem an undesirable restriction. Therefore, the wording ‘or impact’ was added following ‘pest risk’, to ensure that both the potential and actual impact is taken into account. In that context, TPG had considered whether ‘impact’ should be qualified as e.g. ‘actual impact’ or ‘manifested impact’ to further distinguished it from the ‘potential consequences’ as implicit with ‘pest risk’, but decided this would be an unnecessary complication.

***As regards ‘for an area’.***

- [15] The wording ‘for an area’, thus referring to a country, part of a country, or all or parts of several countries, is needed in the definition, because the ‘seriousness’ of a pest is always geographically specific. This holds true also in cases where an ‘emerging pest’ is of concern to extraordinarily large parts of the world. Even in that situation it is conceptually, strategically and operationally important that the pest can be analyzed, designated and handled at the appropriate geographical level, as feasible and agreeable.

***As regards ‘recently’.***

- [16] The word ‘recently’ highlights the temporary nature of designating a pest as ‘emergent’. The word implies that, after some time and following re-assessments of the pest situation, the designation of the pest as ‘emerging’ would be withdrawn.

***As regards ‘increased substantially’.***

- [17] The wording ‘increased substantially’ for the pest risk or impact is the major distinguishing characteristic of ‘emerging pests’ compared to other pests, highlighting the extraordinary seriousness and acuteness of the increase in pest risk or impact. Notably, the increase could be from a perceived zero pest risk, i.e. with an organism not previously known as a pest, which means that the definition of an ‘emerging pest’ could also include what is sometimes called a ‘new pest’.

***As regards ‘due to’.***

- [18] The definition carries on, starting with the wording ‘due to’, by stating in general terms the types of factors that can have contributed to the increased pest risk or impact. It may seem obvious that such types of factors contribute to pest risk or impact and that mentioning them therefore is redundant. However, it is important that the definition underlines that there is a multitude of factors that may trigger a sudden, dramatic increase in pest risk or impact, and not just, e.g., a change in the pest’s biology.

***As regards ‘pest-intrinsic factors’.***

- [19] ‘Pest-intrinsic factors’ covers factors pertaining to the pest’s biology in broad terms, e.g. its virulence or aggressiveness, its host range or vectoring range, its reproduction rate, etc.

***As regards ‘hosts, pathways or environment related factors’.***

- [20] This wording covers pest-extrinsic factors, changes in which may increase *pest risk* or impact, including e.g. host susceptibility, increase in the value of crops or ecosystem services, changes of crops or in plant production practices, trade, climate or others.

***As regards ‘or’.***

- [21] As with all ISPMs, ‘or’ in both uses in the definition includes the accumulative ‘and’. ‘Or’ does not mean the exclusive ‘either...or’, when not written that way. Thus, ‘pest risk or impact’ may mean pest risk, impact or both. Likewise, pest risk or impact changes may be due to just one of the factor types or any combination of the factor types.

***As regards ‘pest’.***

- [22] The definition covers regulated as well as non-regulated pests by not mentioning either of these pest categories. The TPG had considered whether to explicitly stating the inclusiveness by initiating the definition as: ‘A regulated or non-regulated pest for which...’, but decided this is not needed and could introduce confusion, e.g. where a pest is regulated in only part of an area.
- [23] Likewise, the definition covers pests irrespective of the pest status in the area, i.e. irrespective of whether the pest is present (and to which extent) or absent, by not mentioning either of these pest statuses.

***Other considerations.***

- [24] The TPG had considered using the ‘perceived pest risk’ rather than ‘pest risk’, so as to also cover the situation where the pest risk or impact may in reality not have changed at all, but where through improved pest information it has become clear that a previously unknown, neglected or underestimated pest is actually associated with high pest risk or serious impacts. However, the TPG concluded this would form an unnecessary and undesirable complication.

***Other considerations, addressed to the SC******Definition versus criteria.***

[25] Quoting the report of the CPM Bureau June 2017<sup>26</sup> meeting,

“The Bureau discussed priorities and criteria for emerging issues. (...) The Bureau discussed which pests should be regarded as emerging issues for IPPC action. It was thought best that actions would apply to pests that

- had made a continental jump,
- have a wide host range and
- where hosts are widely distributed, have large potential for damage and economic loss across continents,
- there is an evidence of a shift in the risk,
- they have an impact on natural environment as well as on production,
- have an ability for crop destruction and the ability to eliminate entire production areas.

Examples are *Tuta absoluta*, and pine wood nematode.”

[26] Carrying on from there, the TC-RPPO November 2018 paper on Emerging pests<sup>27</sup> (in Section 6. Criteria and Assessment) states that:

“It is not clear from the Bureau report how the different criteria were intended to interact. If all criteria must be met then few if any organisms would qualify. If only one of the criteria has to be satisfied there could be several hundred candidates. A decision tree or scoring matrix is needed to apply the criteria in practice (...) Factors other than those identified by the Bureau could be incorporated. For example, for an organism to be a globally emerging pest, it might be considered a requirement that it poses a threat to at least two continents. (...) it was agreed that social factors should be considered alongside economic and environmental (...) It was also agreed that a slightly adapted version might be used for assessment of emerging pests at regional level, but that because of wide variations in land area and population the threshold figures would be different for each region (...) Once identified as an ‘emerging pest’ it could be subjected to an analysis to confirm (or not) whether it is a ‘priority emerging pest’ by assessing its risks relative to other ‘emerging pests’(...)”.

[27] The SPG in 2018<sup>28</sup> noted that “it was not clear how many of the criteria listed would have to be met for a pest to qualify as an emerging pest. It was proposed to include “if a pest is threatening more than one continent” in the list of criteria. It was suggested that PRA be used as a response rather than for defining measures.”

[28] Already at the SC meeting in May 2018, “SC members indicated that: not all the criteria have to be fulfilled at the same time, some criteria (e.g. wide host range) are not restricted to emerging pests, and the term should not apply only to continental jump of a pest into a new region. It was noted that it may be difficult to provide a definition, as some countries consider emerging pests to be simply those that have changed their risk profile. It may be more useful to provide examples than to try to define the term too closely”.

[29] With those lengthy quotes, the TPG agrees with the notion that the above ‘bulleted’ considerations constitute a set of (draft) **operational criteria** that, once agreed, may be used for assessing whether a pest should be deemed an ‘emerging pest’. Those criteria (apart from the notion of the 4<sup>th</sup> bullet: ‘a shift in the risk’) are not suitable for being listed in a definition. A

<sup>26</sup> Report of the CPM Bureau June 2017 available at: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/84687/>

<sup>27</sup> 08\_TC-RPPO\_2018, available at <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/86608/>

<sup>28</sup> Report of the SPG meeting 2018 available at: <http://www.ippc.int/en/publications/86797/>

Glossary definition provides a relatively brief, agreed description of an overarching concept associated with a designated term. Definitions are not suited to describe how individual elements should interact or be weighed against each other.

- [30] Accentuating this observation is the fact that currently no consensus exists as to how the listed elements should interact or be weighed against each other for the practical pest assessment. Definitions need to be robust over time, and with no clear conceptual understanding of the elements’ mutual relations, it would not be feasible to include the elements in a definition.
- [31] The definition of e.g. *quarantine pest* illustrates the above considerations: the definition describes the underlying concept without listing a range of operational criteria that are relevant for assessing whether a particular pest could be categorized a quarantine pest.
- [32] In conclusion, defining emerging pest (explaining the concept) and setting criteria (listing and quantifying conditions and thresholds) for assessing particular pests are two different issues.

### ***The notion of ‘action’ in the definition***

- [33] It had been suggested that the definition of *emerging pest* should include a statement to the effect that action is required for such pests, e.g. by stating ‘requiring actions to be taken’, or similar.
- [34] The TPG strongly recommends that the general principle be respected, that definitions do not set requirements, but merely describe the meaning of a term. In other words, definitions are never normative, only descriptive. Definitions do not suggest whether countries (or other entities) should or should not carry out certain procedures or activities, and the Glossary thus leaves it to the Convention and ISPMs to set out the agreed requirements.
- [35] Again, the definition of e.g. *quarantine pest* illustrates this: it does not require that quarantine pests should be officially controlled, but refers to the fact that, if present, quarantine pests are being officially controlled (implicitly: following an analysis and decision to that effect).
- [36] If the definition for *emerging pests* was to mention ‘action’ without being normative, it would have to refer to an established fact rather than to a requirement. As an example, the definition could then read: “*A pest [current definition] ..., and for which it has been officially deemed that actions are required*”. However, the inclusion of a statement to the effect that action is required would imply that a pest can only become designated as an *emerging pest* once it has been decided to take action against it. To TPG’s understanding, this would contradict the outcome from several discussions within CPM bodies, whereby a pest may be deemed an emerging pest as one conclusion, whereas the question of whether that pest should be subject to actions (and which actions) would be a separate conclusion, - possibly even reached by separate procedures and in separate fora.

## Appendix 6: Proposed ink amendments – consistency review “commodity class” (2018-004)

### Background

In November 2015, the Standards Committee (SC) added the term “commodity class” (2015-013) to the *List of topics for IPPC standards* and asked the Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG) to review this term in light of the recent discussions on the concept of a commodity standard and commodity classes within the context of ePhyto and consider deletion of the term.

In their December 2017 meeting, the TPG discussed the term “commodity class” as well as associated terms defining different commodity classes and proposed deletion of “commodity class” in the 2018 Amendments to ISPM 5. In their December 2018 meeting the TPG reviewed the use of “commodity class” in ISPMs and proposed the below ink amendments to ensure consistent use of Glossary terms.

**Table 1: Proposed changes across ISPMs in relation to the use of “commodity class”**

Row	ISPM	Section / para	Current text	Proposed text	Rationale
1.	13	Article 6.1 Required information (for notification)	<i>Identity of consignment.</i> Consignments should be identified by the phytosanitary certificate number if appropriate or by references to other documentation and including commodity class and scientific name (at least plant genus) for plants or plant products.	<i>Identity of consignment.</i> Consignments should be identified by the phytosanitary certificate number if appropriate or by references to other documentation and including <del>commodity class</del> commodity and scientific name (at least plant genus) for plants or plant products.	Reference to a ‘commodity’ instead of ‘commodity class’ in the documentation accompanying a consignment is enough (and even better) for consignment identification
2.	16	Article 4.2 “Intended use”	The “intended use” of plants for planting may be: - growing for direct production of other commodity classes (e.g. fruits, cut flowers, wood, grain) - to remain planted (e.g. ornamentals) - increasing the number of the same plants for planting (e.g. tubers, cuttings, seeds).	The “intended use” of plants for planting may be: - growing for direct production of other <del>commodity classes</del> commodities (e.g. fruits, cut flowers, wood, grain) - to remain planted (e.g. ornamentals) - increasing the number of the same plants for planting (e.g. tubers, cuttings, seeds).	Reference to direct production of other ‘commodities’ instead of ‘commodity classes’ is enough for specifying the “intended use” of plants for planting.
3.	16	Article 6.4 Non-compliance	Phytosanitary action taken for non-compliance with phytosanitary import requirements for RNQPs should be in accordance with the principles of non-discrimination and minimal impact. Options include: - downgrading (change commodity class or intended use) - treatment - redirection for another purpose (e.g. processing) - redirection to origin or another country - destruction.	Phytosanitary action taken for non-compliance with phytosanitary import requirements for RNQPs should be in accordance with the principles of non-discrimination and minimal impact. Options include: - downgrading (change <del>commodity class</del> commodity or intended use) - treatment - redirection for another purpose (e.g. processing) - redirection to origin or another country - destruction.	‘Change of commodity or intended use’ is clearer for understanding than ‘change commodity class or intended use’.
4.	21	Article 1.1 Intended use	The intended use of plants for planting may be: - growing for direct production of other commodity classes (e.g. fruits, cut flowers,	The intended use of plants for planting may be: - growing for direct production of other <del>commodity classes</del> commodities (e.g. fruits, cut flowers, wood,	Reference to direct production of other ‘commodities’ instead of ‘commodity

Row	ISPM	Section / para	Current text	Proposed text	Rationale
			wood, grain) - increasing the number of the same plants for planting (e.g. tubers, cuttings, seeds, rhizomes) - to remain planted (e.g. ornamentals); this includes plants that are intended to be used for amenity, aesthetic or other use.	grain) - increasing the number of the same plants for planting (e.g. tubers, cuttings, seeds, rhizomes) - to remain planted (e.g. ornamentals); this includes plants that are intended to be used for amenity, aesthetic or other use.	classes’ is enough for specifying the “intended use” of plants for planting.
5.	24	Outline of Requirements 2 <sup>nd</sup> para	Equivalence generally applies to cases where phytosanitary measures already exist for a specific pest associated with trade in a commodity or commodity class. Equivalence determinations are based on the specified pest risk and equivalence may apply to individual measures, a combination of measures, or integrated measures in a systems approach.	Equivalence generally applies to cases where phytosanitary measures already exist for a specific pest associated with trade in a commodity <del>or commodity class</del> . Equivalence determinations are based on the specified pest risk and equivalence may apply to individual measures, a combination of measures, or integrated measures in a systems approach.	In terms of equivalence of phytosanitary measures, it is clearer for understanding to consider a ‘pest associated with trade in a commodity’ than a ‘pest associated with trade in a commodity or commodity class’.
6.	24	Article 2.3 Technical justification for equivalence 2 <sup>nd</sup> para	Although the alternative measures need to be examined, a new complete pest risk assessment may not necessarily be required since, as trade in the commodity or commodity class is already regulated, the importing country should have at least some PRA-related data.	Although the alternative measures need to be examined, a new complete pest risk assessment may not necessarily be required since, as trade in the commodity <del>or commodity class</del> is already regulated, the importing country should have at least some PRA-related data.	In terms of regulation and PRA, it is more practical to consider the ‘trade in the commodity’ than the ‘trade in the commodity or commodity class’.
7.	24	Article 2.4 Non-discrimination in the application of the equivalence of phyto-sanitary measures 1 <sup>st</sup> para	The principle of non-discrimination requires that when equivalence of phytosanitary measures is granted for one exporting contracting party, this should also apply to contracting parties where the status of the relevant pest is the same and similar conditions for the same commodity or commodity class and/or pest.	The principle of non-discrimination requires that when equivalence of phytosanitary measures is granted for one exporting contracting party, this should also apply to contracting parties where the status of the relevant pest is the same and similar conditions for the same commodity <del>or commodity class</del> and/or pest.	The wording ‘similar conditions for the same commodity and/or pest’ is simpler and more precise than ‘similar conditions for the same commodity or commodity class and/or pest’ without changing the sense.
8.	24	Article 2.4 Non-discrimination in the application of the equivalence of	It should be recognized that equivalence of phytosanitary measures does not, however, mean that when a specific measure is granted equivalence for one exporting contracting party, this applies automatically to another contracting party for the same commodity or commodity class or pest. Phytosanitary measures should always be considered in the context of the pest status and phytosanitary regulatory system of	It should be recognized that equivalence of phytosanitary measures does not, however, mean that when a specific measure is granted equivalence for one exporting contracting party, this applies automatically to another contracting party for the same commodity <del>or commodity class</del> or pest. Phytosanitary measures should always be considered in the context of the pest status and	The wording ‘for the same commodity or pest’ is simpler and more precise than ‘for the same commodity or commodity class or pest’ without changing the sense.

Row	ISPM	Section / para	Current text	Proposed text	Rationale
		phyto-sanitary measures 1 <sup>st</sup> para	the exporting contracting party, including the policies and procedures.	phytosanitary regulatory system of the exporting contracting party, including the policies and procedures.	
9.	24	Article 3.2 Existing measures 2 <sup>nd</sup> para	Where new commodities or commodity classes are presented for importation and no measures exist, contracting parties should refer to ISPM 11 (Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests) and ISPM 21 (Pest risk analysis for regulated non-quarantine pests) for the normal PRA procedure.	Where new commodities <del>or commodity classes</del> are presented for importation and no measures exist, contracting parties should refer to ISPM 11 (Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests) and ISPM 21 (Pest risk analysis for regulated non-quarantine pests) for the normal PRA procedure.	In the context of PRA, it is more precise to consider commodities rather than 'commodity classes' as potential pest pathways.
10.	38	Scope 1 <sup>st</sup> para	This standard provides guidance to assist national plant protection organizations (NPPOs) in identifying, assessing and managing the pest risk associated with the international movement of seeds (as a commodity class).	This standard provides guidance to assist national plant protection organizations (NPPOs) in identifying, assessing and managing the pest risk associated with the international movement of seeds (as a <del>commodity class</del> commodity).	It is proposed to replace the term 'seeds (as a commodity class)' by 'seeds (as a commodity)' in the Glossary.
11.	38	Scope 3 <sup>rd</sup> para	Under ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms) seeds (as a commodity class) are intended for planting and not for consumption. Viable seeds, which are a sample of a seed lot, imported for laboratory testing or destructive analysis are also addressed by this standard.	Under ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms) seeds (as a <del>commodity class</del> commodity) are intended for planting and not for consumption. Viable seeds, which are a sample of a seed lot, imported for laboratory testing or destructive analysis are also addressed by this standard.	It is proposed to replace the term 'seeds (as a commodity class)' by 'seeds (as a commodity)' in the Glossary.
12.	Draft ISPM on International movement of cut flowers and foliage	BACK-GROUND	Cut flowers are a short-lived commodity that may be a pathway for pest entry, although this may not always lead to establishment. Phytosanitary measures such as inspection, certification and treatments often involve a variety of phytosanitary actions to reduce the associated pest risk. Guidelines on how to minimize the pest risk from quarantine pests present in cut flowers prior to import may facilitate international trade in this commodity class.	Cut flowers are a short-lived commodity that may be a pathway for pest entry, although this may not always lead to establishment. Phytosanitary measures such as inspection, certification and treatments often involve a variety of phytosanitary actions to reduce the associated pest risk. Guidelines on how to minimize the pest risk from quarantine pests present in cut flowers prior to import may facilitate international trade in this <del>commodity class</del> commodity.	In terms of risk from quarantine pests present in cut flowers, it is clearer for understanding to consider 'international trade in this commodity' than 'international trade in this commodity class'.  It is proposed to delete the term 'cut flowers and branches (as a commodity class)' from the Glossary.

## Appendix 7: TPG Work Plan 2019-2020

(Prepared by the Secretariat, last updated 2018-12-21)

[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 18-21 November 2019. Tentative deadline for submitting meeting documents is 1 October 2019.**

**TABLE 1 - REGULAR TASKS**

Regular tasks		Detailed task	Responsible	Deadline	Comments
<b>1. Meeting reports: preparation and update to SC</b>	<b>December 2018</b>	Draft report to Steward, Chairperson and rapporteur	Secretariat	2019-01-15	
		Steward, Chairperson and rapporteur send back draft report	Steward, Chair & rapporteur	2019-01-25	
		Secretariat finalizes report and sends to TPG	Secretariat	2019-01-28	
		TPG review report and send comments	All	2019-02-05	
		Final report	Secretariat	2019-02-12	(To allow review in Secretariat)
	<b>Update for SC May 2018</b>	Prepare update (incl. decisions) from December 2018 meeting for SC May 2018	Secretariat with stewards	2019-03-16	Secretariat to draft; steward to respond by 23/3 tent.
<b>2. Draft ISPMs in 1<sup>st</sup> consultation (except Amendments, see 3)</b>	Going to SC-7 / 2 <sup>nd</sup> consultation	Terms and consistency comments extracted.	Secretariat	2018-10-04	1 <sup>st</sup> 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 <b>stewards</b>	2018-12-20	Comments from TPG on these will not be solicited, documents will be finalized by Secretariat and Steward (15/02 deadline for

Regular tasks		Detailed task	Responsible	Deadline	Comments
					stewards to send Sec. responses to comments and revised draft)
		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
<b>3. Terms and definitions (incl. Amendments to the Glossary)</b>	<b>2017 Amendments</b>	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 <sup>st</sup> Consultation		2017-07 to 09	
		Draft amendments and 1 <sup>st</sup> Cons. comments reviewed		TPG 2017-12	
		Finalize amendments and responses	Secretariat and <b>steward</b>	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 <sup>nd</sup> 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 <sup>nd</sup> Consultation		2018-07 to 09	
		Consultation by email on 2 <sup>nd</sup> Cons. comments	ALL	TBD, in 2018-10	If Steward feels consultation is needed. The draft Amendments and responses to 2 <sup>nd</sup> Cons. comments are submitted to SC November

Regular tasks	Detailed task	Responsible	Deadline	Comments
	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	in 2019-01-15	The translations will be ready for review around the beginning of January and must be posted by 1 March for CPM.
<b>2018 Amendments</b>	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		TPG 2018-12	
	Finalize amendments and responses	Secretariat and <b>steward</b>	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 <sup>nd</sup> 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 <sup>nd</sup> Consultation		2019-07 to 09	
	Consultation by email on 2 <sup>nd</sup> Cons. comments	ALL	in 2019-10	If Steward feels consultation is needed. The draft Amendments and responses to 2 <sup>nd</sup> Cons. comments are submitted to SC November

Regular tasks	Detailed task	Responsible	Deadline	Comments
	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.
<b>2019 Amendments</b>	Volunteers sends draft meeting papers to Secretariat	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 2019-01-10
	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 <b>steward</b>	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 <sup>nd</sup> 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 <sup>nd</sup> Consultation		2020-07 to 09		

Regular tasks	Detailed task		Responsible	Deadline	Comments
	Consultation by email on 2 <sup>nd</sup> Cons. comments		ALL	TBD, in 2020-10	If Steward feels consultation is needed. The draft Amendments and responses to 2 <sup>nd</sup> 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 2021-01	The translations will be ready for review around the beginning of January and must be posted by 1 March for CPM.
<b>4. Annotated Glossary – (to be published every 3 years)</b>	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	2019-02-15	All to review / provide comments during TPG 2018 meeting
To review update		All	TPG meeting	To be approved by SC via e-decision asap in 2019.	
<b>5. Explanation of Glossary terms</b>	Members to identify before the meeting some Glossary terms/definitions requiring further explanations (and not already explained in other places, such as the Annotated Glossary)		All	2019-10-01	
<b>6. Review of membership</b>	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)**

<b>One-off tasks</b>	<b>Detailed task</b>	<b>Responsible</b>	<b>Deadline</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>7. Review of ISPMs for consistency and style (other than in draft ISPMs)</b>	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	
<b>8. Other tasks</b>	General recommendations on consistency: yearly updates as needed	Secretariat with stewards	2019-01-07	
	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):	Beatriz Melcho	2019-10-01	For discussion at the TPG 2019-12 meeting

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

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

Term	Status	Lead	Comments & next steps
1. bulbs and tubers (as a commodity class) (2017-001)	To SC-7 2019	Shaza Roshdy Omar	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 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.</li> <li>- SC 2017-05 added “bulbs and tubers (as a commodity class)” to the LOT.</li> <li>- TPG 2017-12 proposed deletion in the 2018 Amendments.</li> <li>- SC 2018-05 agreed with TPG proposal for deletion and approved it for the first consultation.</li> <li>- TPG 2018-12 discussed first consultation comments and left their proposal for deletion unchanged.</li> </ul>
2. commodity (2018-002)	To SC May 2019	Ebbe Nordbo	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- TPG 2017-12 proposed to add to the LOT following discussions on the definition of commodity class.</li> <li>- SC 2018-05 added to LOT.</li> <li>- TPG 2018-12 discussed the term, suggested no change and recommended to SC to remove from LOT.</li> </ul>
3. commodity class (2015-013)	To SC-7 2019	Andrei Orlinski	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 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.</li> <li>- 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.</li> <li>- 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.</li> <li>- TPG 2017-12 proposed deletion in the 2018 Amendments.</li> <li>- SC 2018-05 agreed with TPG proposal for deletion and approved it for the first consultation.</li> <li>- TPG 2018-12 discussed first consultation comments and left their proposal for deletion unchanged.</li> </ul>

	Term	Status	Lead	Comments & next steps
4.	confinement (2016-002)	To CPM-14 (2019)	Ebbe Nordbo	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- TPG 2015-12 recommended inclusion on LOT for revision.</li> <li>- SC 2016-05 added to LOT.</li> <li>- TPG 2016-12 recommended for deletion in the draft 2017 Amendments.</li> <li>- SC 2017-05 agreed with TPG proposal for deletion and approved it for the first consultation.</li> <li>- TPG 2017-12 considered first consultation comments and left their recommendation (term to be deleted) unchanged.</li> <li>- SC-7 2018-05 reviewed consultation comments, agreed with TPG proposal for deletion (no change) and approved it for the second consultation.</li> <li>- SC 2018-11 reviewed second consultation comments and approved the deletion of the term for adoption.</li> </ul>
5.	cut flowers and branches (as a commodity class) (2012-007)	To SC-7 2019	Laurence Bouhot-Delduc	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 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>.</li> <li>- TPG 2013 proposal submitted to SC May 2013 in Amendments (2013).</li> <li>- 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.</li> <li>- 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.</li> <li>- 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.</li> <li>- 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.</li> <li>- SC 2017-05 removed the pending status of “cut flowers and branches (as a commodity class)”.</li> <li>- TPG 2017-12 proposed deletion in the 2018 Amendments.</li> <li>- SC 2018-05 agreed with TPG proposal for deletion and approved it for the first consultation.</li> <li>- TPG 2018-12 discussed first consultation comments and left their proposal for deletion unchanged.</li> </ul>
6.	detection survey (consequential to the revision of “survey” (2013-015))	To SC May 2019	Laurence Bouhot-Delduc	<p>SC-7 2018-05 asked the TPG to consider whether the definition of “detection survey” should be amended to include “or absence”.</p> <p>TPG 2018-12 discussed the term and proposed revision in 2019 Amendments to ISPM5.</p>
7.	emerging pest (2018-003)	To SC May 2019	Ebbe Nordbo	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- SC 2018-05 considered proposal from TC-RPPOs and agreed to include the term in the TPG work programme</li> <li>- TPG 2018-12 TPG proposed a draft definition of “emerging pest” – for SC to consider future steps.</li> </ul>

Term	Status	Lead	Comments & next steps
8. fruits and vegetables (as a commodity class) (2017-003)	To SC-7 2019	Andrei Orlinski	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 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.</li> <li>- SC 2017-05 added “fruits and vegetables (as a commodity class)” to the LOT.</li> <li>- TPG 2017-12 proposed deletion in the 2018 Amendments.</li> <li>- SC 2018-05 agreed with TPG proposal for deletion and approved it for the first consultation.</li> <li>- TPG 2018-12 discussed first consultation comments and left their proposal for deletion unchanged.</li> </ul>
9. grain (as a commodity class) (2017-004)	To SC-7 2019	Laurence Bouhot-Delduc	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 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.</li> <li>- SC 2017-05 added “grain (as a commodity class)” to the LOT.</li> <li>- TPG 2017-12 proposed a revision of the term in the 2018 Amendments.</li> <li>- SC 2018-05 agreed with TPG proposal (no change) and approved it for the first consultation.</li> <li>- TPG 2018-12 discussed first consultation comments and left their proposal unchanged.</li> </ul>
10. growing period / growing season (2016-004)	To CPM 14 (2019)	Laurence Bouhot-Delduc	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- TPG 2015-12 proposed to add to the LOT (proposal to be submitted to the SC May 2016).</li> <li>- SC 2016-05 added to LOT.</li> <li>- TPG 2016-12 discussed the terms and recommended the revision of “growing period” and the deletion of “growing season” in the draft 2017 Amendments.</li> <li>- 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.</li> <li>- TPG 2017-12 considered first consultation comments and left their proposals unchanged.</li> <li>- SC-7 2017-05 reviewed consultation comments, agreed with TPG proposals (no change) and approved the revision of “growing period” and the deletion of “growing season” for the second consultation.</li> <li>- SC Nov 2018 reviewed second consultation comments and approved the revised definition for adoption without changes.</li> </ul>
11. identity (2011-001)	Pending Focused revision of ISPM 12	Ebbe Nordbo	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 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.</li> <li>- TPG 2012 suggested an approach, but asked SC to validate before further work.</li> <li>- SC 2013-05 agreed (see TPG 2012-10 report and SC 2013-05 report).</li> <li>- TPG 2014 discussed and incorporated into Amendments (2014).</li> <li>- SC 2014-05 withdrew from Amendments (2014) for TPG to reconsider <i>identity</i>, <i>integrity (of a consignment)</i>, <i>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.</li> <li>- 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).</li> </ul>

Term	Status	Lead	Comments & next steps
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 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.</li> <li>- 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.</li> <li>- 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).</li> <li>- Secretariat suggesting to wait with further work pending revision of ISPM 12 (SC not made pending).</li> <li>- CPM-11 (2016) approved the addition of the <i>Revision of ISPM 12 on Phytosanitary certificates (2015-011)</i>, with priority 2. The draft specification will be submitted to consultation in July 2017.</li> <li>- SC 2017-11 agreed to review the comments and consider the draft specification by SC e-decision.</li> <li>- SC approved Specification 67: <i>Focused revision of ISPM 12 (Phytosanitary certificates) in relation to re-export by e-decision (2018_eSC_May_03)</i>.</li> </ul>
12.	incidence (2018-010)	To TPG 2019-11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Topic submitted during 2018 joint call for topics: standards and implementation to revise the definition of the term "incidence" and define the term "prevalence" as their meaning can be confused in epidemiological and phytosanitary context.</li> <li>- SC 2018-11 discussed TFT recommendation and noted that these terms had been discussed in depth previously. SC agreed to include the term "incidence" in TPG work programme and requested the TPG consider deleting it from the Glossary and using the dictionary definition of incidence and prevalence in ISPMs.</li> </ul>
13.	inspection (2017-005)	To TPG 2019-11	<p>Rajesh Ramarathnam</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- TPG 2016-12 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.</li> <li>- SC 2017-05 added "inspection" to the LOT.</li> <li>- TPG 2017-12 proposed a revision of the term in the 2018 Amendments.</li> <li>- SC 2018-05 discussed TPG proposal and agreed to further consider this term in an SC e-forum.</li> <li>- 2018_eSC_Nov_01: SC decided that the term requires further discussion during SC November 2018 and TPG 2018-12.</li> <li>- TPG 2018-12 discussed the term and agreed to continue discussion during TPG 2019 based on current TPG working definition to potentially include meaning as in ISPM23.</li> </ul>
14.	integrity (of a consignment) consequential	Pending Focused revision of ISPM 12 (consequential)	<p>Ebbe Nordbo (see identity)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- See <i>identity</i>.</li> <li>- SC 2014-05 withdrew from Amendments (2014).</li> <li>- TPG to reconsider.</li> <li>- 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).</li> <li>- 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.</li> <li>- 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.</li> </ul>

Term	Status	Lead	Comments & next steps
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 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.</li> <li>- CPM-11 (2016) approved the addition of the <i>Revision of ISPM 12 on Phytosanitary certificates (2015-011)</i>, with priority 2. The draft specification will be submitted to consultation in July 2017.</li> <li>- SC 2017-11 agreed to review the comments and consider the draft specification by SC e-decision.</li> <li>- SC approved Specification 67: <i>Focused revision of ISPM 12 (Phytosanitary certificates) in relation to re-export by e-decision (2018_eSC_May_03)</i>.</li> </ul>
15.	mark (2013-007)	To CPM 14 (2019)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- TPG 2013 addition to the List of topics. To remove “phytosanitary status” in the definition. Proposal already exists. To be extracted from relevant document.</li> <li>- SC 2013-05 agreed.</li> <li>- TPG 2014-02 discussed and incorporated to Amendments to the Glossary (2014).</li> <li>- SC 2014-05 approved for MC.</li> <li>- Member consultation 1 July – 30 Nov. 2014.</li> <li>- TPG 2014-12 reviewed member comments; no changes to the proposed revision.</li> <li>- SC-7 2015 agreed with the proposal and approved for SCCP.</li> <li>- SC withdrew term from Amendments (2014) and asked TPG to consider deletion.</li> <li>- TPG 2016-12 recommended the deletion of “mark” from the Glossary.</li> <li>- SC 2017-05 agreed with the TPG proposal and approved the deletion of “mark” for the first consultation.</li> <li>- TPG 2017-12 considered first consultation comments and left their recommendation for deletion unchanged.</li> <li>- SC-7 2018-05 reviewed consultation comments, agreed with TPG proposal for deletion (no change) and approved it for the second consultation.</li> <li>- SC Nov 2018 reviewed second consultation comments and approved the deletion of the term for adoption.</li> </ul>
16.	phytosanitary security (of a consignment) (2013-008)	Pending Focused revision of ISPM 12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>See identity.</b></li> <li>- TPG 2012, added SC 2013-05. Details in TPG 2012-10 report.</li> <li>- SC 2013-05 added term to List of topics.</li> <li>- TPG 2014 incorporated to Amendments (2014).</li> <li>- SC 2014-05 withdrew from Amendments (2014).</li> <li>- TPG to reconsider.</li> <li>- 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).</li> <li>- 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.</li> <li>- 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.</li> <li>- 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.</li> </ul>

Term	Status	Lead	Comments & next steps
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- CPM-11 (2016) approved the addition of the <i>Revision of ISPM 12 on Phytosanitary certificates (2015-011)</i>, with priority 2. The draft specification will be submitted to consultation in July 2017.</li> <li>- SC 2017-11 agreed to review the comments and consider the draft specification by SC e-decision.</li> <li>- SC approved Specification 67: <i>Focused revision of ISPM 12 (Phytosanitary certificates) in relation to re-export by e-decision (2018_eSC_May_03)</i>.</li> </ul>
17.	plants <i>in vitro</i> (as a commodity class) (2017-006)	To SC-7 2019	Shaza Roshdy Omar <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 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.</li> <li>- SC 2017-05 added “plants <i>in vitro</i> (as a commodity class)” to the LOT.</li> <li>- TPG 2017-12 proposed deletion in the 2018 Amendments.</li> <li>- SC 2018-05 agreed with TPG proposal for deletion and approved it for the first consultation.</li> <li>- TPG 2018-12 discussed first consultation comments and left their proposal for deletion unchanged.</li> </ul>
18.	quarantine area (2012-006)	To SC May 2019	Laurence Bouhot-Delduc <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- TPF 2011.</li> <li>- SC 2012-04 added.</li> <li>- To be considered based on a draft revised definition proposed by the TPF.</li> <li>- TPG 2012-2013 considered definition, but proposed it should be postponed until ISPM 8 is revised. (details in TPG 2012 and 2013 reports).</li> <li>- SC 2013-05 changed the status to pending until after the revision of ISPM 8 (Determination of pest status in an area).</li> <li>- SC 2018-05 changed the status to active as the revision of ISPM8 was approved for first consultation.</li> <li>- TPG 2018-12 discussed, suggests no change but recommends retaining on LOT until revision of ISPM8 is adopted.</li> </ul>
19.	seeds (as a commodity class) (2017-007)	To SC-7 2019	Laurence Bouhot-Delduc <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 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.</li> <li>- SC 2017-05 added “seeds (as a commodity class)” to the LOT.</li> <li>- TPG 2017-12 proposed a revision of the term in the 2018 Amendments.</li> <li>- SC 2018-05 agreed with TPG proposal (no change) and approved it for the first consultation.</li> <li>- TPG 2018-12 discussed first consultation comments and left their proposal unchanged.</li> </ul>
20.	survey (2013-015)	To CPM 14 (2019)	Laurence Bouhot-Delduc <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- See SC May 2013.</li> <li>- TPG 2014 discussed. Proposed to SC 2014-05 to classify as “pending” until progress made with revision of ISPM 6.</li> <li>- SC 2014-05 reviewed TPG recommendation and made term pending till draft revised ISPM 6 is available.</li> <li>- TPG 2015-12 was informed that the EWG was held in 2015 and the draft ISPM will be reviewed by SC May 2016.</li> <li>- SC 2016-05 approved draft revision to ISPM 6 for 1<sup>st</sup> Cons. but term still pending.</li> </ul>

Term	Status	Lead	Comments & next steps
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 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.</li> <li>- SC 2017-05 agreed with the TPG proposal for revision (with no change) and approved the revision of “survey” for the first consultation.</li> <li>- TPG 2017-12 considered first consultation comments and revised their proposal for revision.</li> <li>- SC-7 2017-05 reviewed consultation comments, agreed with TPG proposal for revision (no change) and approved it for the second consultation.</li> <li>- SC 2018-11 discussed second consultation comments, slightly modified the proposed definition by adding a comma for clarity and approved the revised definition for adoption by CPM 14.</li> </ul>
21.	Treatment (2017-008)	To SC-7 2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 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.</li> <li>- SC 2017-05 added “treatment” to the LOT as proposed by TPG.</li> <li>- TPG 2017-12 proposed a revision of the term in the 2018 Amendments.</li> <li>- SC 2018-05 agreed with TPG proposal (no change) and approved it for the first consultation.</li> <li>- TPG 2018-12 discussed first consultation comments and left their proposal unchanged.</li> </ul>
22.	wood (as a commodity class) (2017-009)	To SC-7 2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 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.</li> <li>- SC 2017-05 added “wood (as a commodity class)” to the LOT.</li> <li>- TPG 2017-12 proposed a revision of the term in the 2018 Amendments.</li> <li>- SC 2018-05 agreed with TPG proposal (no change) and approved it for the first consultation.</li> <li>- TPG 2018-12 discussed first consultation comments and modified the definition to exclude “rattan”.</li> </ul>
<b>Related to consistency</b>			
23.	Review of the use of and/or in adopted ISPMs (2010-030)	Ongoing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Stays on the work programme to be implemented during the consistency review</li> <li>- TPG discussion 2009.</li> <li>- Modified SC November 2010.</li> <li>- Consistent with general recommendations on consistency, but require a review of every occurrence. Will be considered during consistency study.</li> </ul>

Term	Status	Lead	Comments & next steps
24. commodity class (consistency review; 2018-004)	To SC May 2019	Andrei Orliński	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- TPG 2017-12 discussed the term “commodity class” and proposed its deletion in the 2018 Amendments to ISPM 5. TPG 2017-12 also proposed to review adopted standards to avoid the use of the term “commodity class”, for instance by deleting it or replacing it with “commodity”.</li> <li>- SC 2018-05 agreed with TPG proposal and added this consistency review to the TPG work programme.</li> <li>- TPG 2018-12 proposed ink amendments to adopted ISPMs for approval by SC 2019-05.</li> </ul>
25. “contamination” (2017-002)	To CPM-14 (2019)	Beatriz Melcho	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 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.</li> <li>- SC 2017-05 agreed and added “contamination” (consistency review of its use in ISPMs) to the LOT.</li> <li>- TPG 2017-12 proposed ink amendments to adopted ISPMs for approval by the SC.</li> <li>- SC 2018-05 agreed with the proposed ink amendments (with no change) and noted that they will be processed for CPM noting and incorporated in relevant ISPMs as resources permit.</li> </ul>

**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
2018-12-03 to 06			TPG Meeting
2019-01-03	Emerging pest	Ebbe Nordbo	Draft definition and position paper with feedback from TPG (by 03/01/2019) to be sent to Secretariat and SC chair 2019-01-07 by 2019-01-07
2019-01-15	3. Terms and defs	Language leads	Check of translations of draft 2017 Amendments to ISPM5 going for adoption
2019-01-26	2. ISPMs from 1 <sup>st</sup> cons.	Language leads	Check accuracy of translations of draft ISPMs from first consultation, and for terms and definitions of draft 2018 Amendments to ISPM5 check translations in Fr and Es and propose translations in Ar, Ru and Zih (via email to Secretariat)
2019-01-26	3. Terms and defs	ALL	Review draft 2018 Amendments to ISPM5 following TPG 2018-12 meeting and provide comments in track changes
2019-01-26	3. Terms and defs	ALL	Review draft 2019 Amendments to ISPM5 following TPG 2018-12 meeting and provide comments in track changes
2019-02-05	1. Meeting reports	ALL	Review report of TPG 2018-12 meeting (including draft ink amendments on “commodity class”, and TPG considerations on the definition of “emerging pest” ) and provide comments in track changes

Deadline	Activity in tables	Resp.	Task
2019-06-30	4. Ann. Gloss.	ALL	Comment on 2019 intermediate version of Annotated Glossary
2019-06-30	8. Other tasks	ALL	Provide comments on the draft explanatory document on ISPM 16 (Regulated non-quarantine pests: concept and application) to Beatriz Melcho
2019-10-01	3. Terms and defs	Rajesh Ramarathnam ??? ??? Asenath Abigael Koech Laurence Bouhot-Delduc Shaza Omar Shaza Omar	Inspection (2017-005) Incidence (2018-010) Modified atmosphere treatment Clearance (of a consignment) Emergency actions General surveillance Specific surveillance
2019-10-01	8. Other tasks	Beatriz Melcho	Review the draft explanatory document on ISPM 16 (Regulated non-quarantine pests: concept and application)
2019-10-01	5. Explanation of glossary terms	ALL	Identify terms that need explanation (and which are not explained elsewhere) and provide a paper for TPG 2019 meeting.
<b>2019-11-18 to 21</b>			<b>TPG meeting</b>
2020-01-15	3. Terms and defs	Language leads	Check of translations of draft 2018 Amendments to ISPM5 going for adoption
2020-01-28	2. ISPMs from 1 <sup>st</sup> cons.	Language leads	Check accuracy of translations of draft ISPMs from first consultation, and for terms and definitions of draft 2019 Amendments to ISPM5 check translations in Fr and Es and propose translations in Ar, Ru and Zh (via email to Secretariat)
2020-01-28	3. Terms and defs	ALL	Review draft 2019 Amendments to ISPM5 following TPG 2019-11 meeting and provide comments in track changes
2020-01-28	3. Terms and defs	ALL	Review draft 2020 Amendments to ISPM5 following TPG 2019-11 meeting and provide comments in track changes
2020-01-29	1. Meeting reports	ALL	Review report of TPG 2019-11 meeting and provide comments in track changes
2020-01-29	8. Other tasks	ALL	Review general recommendations on consistency for inclusion in the 2020 version of the IPPC Style guide