Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

International Plant Protection Convention

REPORT

Technical Panel for the Glossary

Virtual Meeting
15–16 December 2020
and
18–22 January 2021

IPPC Secretariat

IPPC Secretariat. 2021. *Report of the Meeting of the Technical Panel on the Glossary, 15–16 December 2020 and 18–22 January 2021.* Rome. Published by FAO on behalf of the Secretariat of the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC). 73 pages. Licence: CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO.

CONTENTS

1. Opening of the meeting

1.1 Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat

[1] On behalf of the IPPC Standard Setting Unit lead, Mr Avetik NERSISYAN, the IPPC Secretariat (hereafter referred to as "the Secretariat") opened the meeting and welcomed all participants to the annual meeting of the Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG). The members of the Secretariat were introduced.

[2] In the January session of the meeting, the Secretariat welcomed Ms Olga LAVRENTJEVA (Estonia) as an observer. Ms LAVRENTJEVA had been selected by the Standards Committee (SC) to be the new TPG member for the Russian language, once Mr Andrei ORLINSKI (EPPO) steps down from this role in July.

2. Meeting arrangements

2.1 Selection of the Chairperson

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

2.2 Election of the Rapporteur

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

2.3 Adoption of the agenda

[5] The TPG adopted the Agenda (Appendix 1).

2.4 Current specification: TP 5 (TPG, 2016 – for information)

[6] The Secretariat confirmed that the specification for the TPG (TP 5)[1] had not changed since the last TPG meeting.

3. Administrative matters

[7] The documents list and the participants list are appended to this report as Appendix 2 and Appendix 3, respectively.

4. Addressing TPG-related comments on draft ISPMs submitted to the first consultation (1 July–30 September 2020)

[8] The TPG reviewed the consultation comments on the draft ISPMs for consistency in the use of terms. Recommendations from the TPG will be transmitted to stewards and the Standards Committee Working Group (SC-7) (May 2021), and a summary of major issues are presented in this report.

[9] Each TPG member had been assigned one of the draft ISPMs and tasked with drafting suggested TPG responses that had then been submitted to the Online Comment System for review and written commenting by the TPG members. Based upon this, TPG responses were finalized in this virtual meeting.

4.1 Commodity-based standards for phytosanitary measures (2019-008), Priority 1

[10] Mr Andrei ORLINSKI (EPPO) presented the draft TPG responses.[2]

[11] **Translation issues.** The TPG supported a general comment that "facilitation of safe trade" in the context of this draft ISPM means to facilitate trade that minimizes pest risk rather than referring to food safety, and the Spanish translation should be adjusted accordingly throughout the draft.

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

[2] 04_TPG_2020_Dec.

[12] The TPG also considered some other consultation comments suggesting corrections to translations and agreed to forward its recommendations to the FAO translation group. The TPG recalled that Glossary terms should be translated according to the language versions of ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*).

[13] **Outline of requirements.** The TPG noted that this section did not include any requirements. The TPG Steward, Ms Laurence BOUHOT-DELDUC, clarified, however, that this was a generic issue that had already been recognized by the SC; the matter was now due to be discussed at the 2021 SC-7 meeting.

[14] **Background.** A few consultation comments suggested that "safeguarding of agriculture" be changed to "protection of agriculture … from pests", but the TPG noted that "protection of agriculture" would also encompass e.g. production of animal products and therefore proposed the following text: "The IPPC aims at protecting plants and plant products against pests without causing unjustified impediments to trade".

[15] **Principles.** The TPG noted that the draft ISPM referred to commodity standards not imposing additional obligations on importing countries over and above those already identified in the IPPC, and considered whether to propose that this text be deleted as such a statement goes further than other ISPMs and could cause confusion as it only refers to importing countries. The TPG recalled, however, that the particular need for commodity standards to impose no additional obligations on contracting parties was a fundamental principle agreed by the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM). The TPG therefore decided not to comment on this text.

[16] The TPG considered two consultation comments on the phrase "the regulation of any pest remains subject to technical justification" – one indicating that is outside the scope of the standard because "any" would include contaminating pests and these are outside the scope, and the other suggesting that the phrase refer only to pests "associated with the specific commodity". The TPG concluded that the sentence in question is very general and is conveying the fact that even for pests covered by commodity standards a technical justification is needed, and recommended the text be retained as it is.

[17] The TPG discussed consultation comments proposing that "measures" be changed to "phytosanitary measures". They noted that a measure only becomes a phytosanitary measure in a particular country when it is technically justified for a regulated pest, and that the measures presented in commodity standards are therefore options for phytosanitary measures. These may include not only measures that in some countries have been specified as phytosanitary import requirements, but also measures that in some countries have been applied for domestic use but could have potential as a phytosanitary measure. The TPG therefore agreed that the use of the word "measure" in the final bullet point of the Principles section and other similar places in the draft standard was appropriate.

[18] **Purpose and use of commodity standards.** One consultation comment suggested that commodity standards *may* be considered rather than *should* be considered. Noting that the obligation is only "to consider", which is the general obligation of countries towards any adopted ISPM, and noting that commodity standards are to become annexes, not appendixes, the TPG did not support this suggestion.

[19] The TPG noted that phytosanitary import requirements are an importing country's materialization of its own sovereign rights, so it does not make sense to refer to phytosanitary import requirements as "respecting sovereign rights". Furthermore, in the IPPC there is no obligation to respect or even enter into market-access discussions. The TPG therefore proposed that the sentence on phytosanitary import requirements respecting sovereign rights be amended to read "While establishing phytosanitary import requirements, importing countries should respect international obligations and may consider market-access discussions", and also supported a consultation comment that this paragraph be moved up one paragraph.

[20] The TPG noted that ISPMs are developed to benefit all countries, regardless of their geographical location, income, vegetation cover or any other characteristics. They also considered that suggesting that a particular ISPM may be particularly beneficial to developing countries is a gross (and possibly offensive) generalization and is not used in other ISPMs. The TPG therefore proposed that the reference

to developing countries be deleted, and the first bullet point in this section be modified to read: "supporting and assisting countries to develop their phytosanitary import requirements".

[21] The TPG considered that the meaning of the final bullet point, "when a commodity should not be regulated within the scope of the IPPC", was unclear and proposed it be modified to read: "when a commodity should not be considered a regulated article".

[22] **Content of commodity standards.** The TPG agreed that a clear distinction should be made between the titles of sections of future commodity standards (as Annexes) and the titles of sections of this concept standard, to avoid confusion (e.g. to avoid section 2.1 of the concept standard, "2.1 Scope", being confused for the scope of the concept standard itself), for example by these subheadings be presented in italics and not numbered.

[23] The TPG proposed that in commodity standards the section on pests be named "List of pests" rather than "Pests", to more precisely reflect the content of the section.

[24] **Scope section in commodity standards.** The TPG found the phrase "a discrete set of pests" unclear and proposed it be replaced by either "a list of pests" or "the most relevant associated pests".

[25] **Criteria for inclusion of measures in commodity standards.** With regard to the list of examples of domestic use of measures, the TPG considered a consultation comment suggesting an amendment to the bullet point "the measure has been used successfully in outbreak management and suppression". The TPG considered whether to change it to "the measure has been used successfully in eradication or containment programmes" or "the measure has been used successfully in pest control", but concluded that the current wording was not incorrect.

[26] **Headings in the draft ISPM.** The TPG recommended that a review of all the headings in the draft ISPM was needed, to ensure consistency.

[27] **"Commodity standard" vs "commodity-based standard" vs "commodity-specific standard".** The TPG noted that there was inconsistency in the term used to refer to the future Annexes, with "commodity standard", "commodity-based standard" and "commodity-specific standard" all being used. The TPG thought that "commodity-based standards" should not be used, because it sounds as though the standard is drawn from the commodity, and noted that the term "commodity-specific standards" is used in the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030. However, the TPG recommended the use of "commodity standard" throughout the standard, for simplicity.

[28] The TPG:

(1) *Noted* that its recommendations on consistency would be transmitted to the Steward and SC-7 for consideration;

(2) *requested* that the Secretariat send the Spanish translation issues to the FAO translation group so that the Spanish version of the draft ISPM on *Commodity-based standards for phytosanitary measures* (2019-008) is amended.

4.2 Focused revision of ISPM 12 (*Phytosanitary certificates*) in relation to re-export (2015-011), Priority 2

[29] Ms Laurence BOUHOT-DELDUC (France) presented the draft TPG responses.[3]

[30] **Definition of "phytosanitary certificate for re-export".** One consultation comment suggested that "phytosanitary certificate for re-export" be defined in ISPM 5. The TPG noted that "phytosanitary certificate" is defined in ISPM 5 with reference to the "model certificates" in the plural, which means that this simple and clear definition covers both types of certificates. Furthermore, the draft revision of ISPM 12 gives a good explanation of a phytosanitary certificate for re-export, including for which

[3] 05_TPG_2020_Dec.

situations it may be used and the requirements that should be met for issuing one. The TPG concluded, therefore, that the definition of "phytosanitary certificate" in the Glossary was sufficient.

[31] **Change in nature of commodity.** A few consultation comments sought clarification on the meaning of "change their nature" in relation to the processing of commodities in the country of re-export. One comment suggested that "characteristics" would be preferable to "nature". The TPG acknowledged that it can be very difficult to say whether or at which 'intensity' or what point in time a process changes the nature of a commodity. For example, if potted plants are imported by a country, kept for a few months during which time they inevitably continue to grow, and are then re-exported, can the country of re-export issue a phytosanitary certificate for re-export or are the plants deemed to have changed their nature? Similarly, if seeds are imported by a country which subjects them to a process (such as treatment, manufacturing, commercial packaging) before re-exporting them, can the country of re-export issue a phytosanitary certificate for re-export? Ultimately, the judgement would depend on the phytosanitary import requirements of the importing country and whether they distinguished the commodity after the process from the commodity before it. The TPG noted that the word "nature" (in the English sense of essence, character, kind...) is used in the current ISPM 12, and that it probably originated from the Glossary definition of "plant products", the word "nature" also being used in the same "plant product" context in ISPM 32 (*Categorization of commodities according to their pest risk*). The TPG considered whether to recommend insertion of a footnote to clarify this issue, but in the end concluded that it was not a matter for the TPG, and should be left for the Steward and SC-7 to consider.

[32] **"Phytosanitary status".** A few consultation comments queried the rationale for changing "phytosanitary status" to "pest risk". The TPG noted that ink amendments to generally replace the term "phytosanitary status" had been adopted by the SC in May 2014 and noted by the CPM in March 2015, because it had previously been used inconsistently and with several different meanings. In the subsection on Place of origin, the SC had asked the TPG to consider a possible definition of "phytosanitary status (of a consignment)", but following further analysis the TPG had proposed not to define the term but to amend the text in ISPM 12 instead, avoiding the use of "phytosanitary status", and that was agreed by the SC in May 2015.

[33] **Outline of requirements.** The TPG noted that the phrase "when the consignment has not been subjected to the risk of infestation or contamination" is derived from the wording used in the model phytosanitary certificate in the Annex to the IPPC, but that elsewhere the draft revision of ISPM 12 refers to "taking into account the likelihood of a consignment becoming infested or contaminated" and "where it was possibly exposed to infestation or contamination by pests". The TPG therefore proposed that it would be much clearer to say "the consignment has not been infested or contaminated".

[34] The TPG considered several consultation comments relating to the paragraph on special consideration being given to situations of re-export:

- A few comments suggested that "commodity" be changed to "consignment" in relation to the phytosanitary certificate. The TPG concluded that although any individual phytosanitary certificate is issued for one particular consignment, this particular paragraph is *not* about a situation where the country of re-export does not require a phytosanitary certificate for one particular consignment, but about a situation where the country of re-export does not require phytosanitary certificates for *any* consignments of that type of plant, plant product or other article; that is, there are no requirements for the *commodity* as such. The TPG did not, therefore, support the comment.
- A few comments suggested that the verb "implemented" in relation to phytosanitary measures be changed to "carried out". The TPG supported this verb be substituted, but instead proposed that "applied" be used, as "to apply" is the verb usually used for "measures", the sentence thus to read "requires that specific phytosanitary measures have been applied".
- A few comments suggested that "the country of re-export … *and* … the country of destination" be changed to "the country of re-export … *or* … the country of destination". The TPG noted, however, that the situation referred to in this paragraph is the particular combination where the country of destination has certain phytosanitary import requirements towards the country of

origin, but the intermediate country of re-export does not have those phytosanitary import requirements and thus does not require a phytosanitary certificate for importing the commodity. To make this combination of differing requirements clearer, the TPG proposed that "and when" be replaced by "but", the resulting text to read: "… but the country of destination requires specific phytosanitary measures ….".

- One comment suggested that the text should be referring to phytosanitary measures being implemented in the country of re-export, not the country of origin. The TPG noted, however, that the country of destination may have phytosanitary import requirements (e.g. growing season inspection, soil testing) that cannot be met by the country of re-export, because such specific phytosanitary measures can be applied only by the country of origin. The TPG did not, therefore, support the comment.

[35] **Types and forms of phytosanitary certificates**. Regarding the sentence about the phytosanitary certificate for re-export providing a link to a phytosanitary certificate issued in a country of export, the TPG considered the following consultation comments:

- A few comments suggested that "country of export" should be changed to "country of origin". The TPG concluded, however, that the sentence is clearer by referring to the "country of export" and that this wording also works in the case of multiple re-export because re-export is a specific case of export. They did not, therefore, support the comment.
- A few comments suggested that it be made clear that the pest risk is in relation to a consignment. The TPG agreed and proposed the following wording: "The phytosanitary certificate for re-export provides the link to a phytosanitary certificate issued in a country of export and takes into account any changes in the pest risk associated with the consignment." This would be consistent with ISPM 32, where a similar wording is used for commodities.

[36] The discussion around the use of "pest risk" also prompted the TPG to consider the general question of consistency in ISPMs regarding the pest risk "posed by", "presented by" or "associated with" a consignment, commodity or pathway. Mr Ebbe NORDBO (Denmark) offered to prepare a recommendation on this for a future TPG meeting, with a view to guidance being included in the "General recommendations on use of terms in ISPMs". The TPG noted that the guidance may need to allow for some editorial flexibility.

[37] **Duration of validity.** Regarding the sentence "A phytosanitary certificate for export may still be used after this period for issuing a phytosanitary certificate for re-export, provided that all the requirements set out in section 6.1 are met", the TPG considered three consultation comments:

- The TPG supported the comment that "the consignment" be added, but proposed the following wording for greater clarity: "provided that the consignment meets all the requirements set out in section 6.1".
- The TPG did not support the comment suggesting that "all the" be deleted. The rationale given in the comment was that it contradicts one part of section 6.1.1 where two possible ways of meeting the phytosanitary import requirements of the country of destination are provided. The TPG, however, agreed that "all the" is not contradictory to the chapeau of section 6.1 that lists all the requirements that have to be met to issue a phytosanitary certificate for re-export.
- The TPG did not support the suggested change to "… after the period for issuing a phytosanitary certificate for re-export has expired …", as this would modify the meaning of the sentence, which is about the period of validity of the phytosanitary certificate for export and not about the period of validity of the phytosanitary certificate for re-export. To clarify the sentence while keeping its intended meaning, the TPG proposed the following wording: "A phytosanitary certificate for export whose duration of validity has expired …".

[38] **Certified copies of phytosanitary certificates.** One consultation comment suggested some amendments to make it clear who does the certifying and that certified copies include copies of phytosanitary certificates for export and for re-export. The TPG supported this suggestion, but with slightly modified wording using the singular for clarity: "A certified copy is a copy of the original of

the phytosanitary certificate for export or re-export that is validated (stamped, dated and countersigned) by the national plant protection organization (NPPO) of the exporting or re-exporting country, indicating it is a true representative copy of the original phytosanitary certificate". As certified copies are used primarily for re-export purposes, the TPG concluded that the proposed changes were not outside the scope of the focused revision of ISPM 12 in relation to re-export and could help improve the understanding of ISPM 12.

[39] **Specific considerations for the preparation and issuance of phytosanitary certificates.** A few consultation comments suggested that phytosanitary certificates should only be issued if the NPPO *is confident* that the phytosanitary import requirements are met, rather than if the NPPO *confirms* that the requirements are met. The TPG supported this suggestion, for consistency with elsewhere in the draft ISPM. Responding to another comment that preferred the passive voice of the original ISPM 12 ("… issued if it is confirmed that …"), the TPG pointed out that part of the revision exercise has been to make the text very explicit in terms of who is the active entity. This is consistent with the line taken by the SC and CPM over many years. Finally, regarding the same sentence, the TPG did not support one consultation comment suggesting that "the NPPO" be replaced with "the NPPO of the country of origin or re-exporting country", taking the view that this was not necessary and it was better to keep the sentence simple.

[40] **Guidelines and requirements for completing sections of a phytosanitary certificate for export:**

[41] • ***TO: Plant Protection Organization(s) of _____.*** The TPG considered several consultation comments regarding the guidance on what to put in this section of the phytosanitary certificate:

- A few comments suggested that in re-export situations the names of both the country of re-export and the country of destination "*should* be inserted" on the phytosanitary certificate, not "*may* be inserted". The TPG concluded that this was outside the scope of a TPG response, but noted that the NPPO of the exporting country does not always know if a consignment is going to be re-exported and to which country, so it does not always know the name of the country of final destination and if the phytosanitary import requirements of this country have been met. Even if the country of origin expects that the consignment shall be re-exported to a known country of destination, the NPPO cannot know whether that will actually happen, or when it will happen (the phytosanitary import requirements may theoretically have changed in the meantime), or how the consignment will be handled in the country of re-export. Thus, to insert the name of the country of destination cannot be an obligation ("should"), but only an action at the discretion of the NPPO of country of origin ("may").
- One consultation comment suggested that reference to both the country of re-export and the country of destination be deleted as only one country name can be entered in the "TO:" field of a phytosanitary certificate and more than one name would not work with an electronic phytosanitary certificate (ePhyto). The TPG did not support this, however, recalling that the current, adopted version of ISPM 12 already includes the possibility that the names of the country of re-export and the country of destination be inserted. According to the second sentence of the paragraph, it is even required in some cases for the names of the transit country and the importing country to be given on the certificate. The TPG noted that if the current ePhyto software does not allow the names of two countries to be entered for technical reasons, efforts should be made to solve this because, according to section 1.2 of ISPM 12, electronic phytosanitary certificates are supposed to be the electronic equivalent of the wording and data of phytosanitary certificates in paper form.

[42] • ***Place of origin.*** A few consultation comments suggested that the draft ISPM distinguish between "place of origin" and "place of provenance". The TPG did not support this suggestion, as the model phytosanitary certificate only has "place of origin".

[43] In response to a few consultation comments about the guidance on how each country and place are presented on the certificate, the TPG recommended the following text:

> … for example declared as "name of country of export (name of country of origin)".

[44] Regarding the paragraph about plants being imported to or moved within a country and subsequently grown, one consultation comment suggested that the reference to pest risk being *determined* only by that country or place of further growth should be amended to pest risk being *affected* only by it. The TPG supported this. The TPG also considered whether the text here should refer to "place of origin" rather than "country of origin", but concluded that the latter is appropriate as the paragraph is talking about a country and the country name is the minimum information needed for the place of origin section on the phytosanitary certificate.

[45] **Additional declaration.** One consultation comment queried why some of the amendments in the draft revision had been made as they did not relate to re-export, which was the focus of the revision. The TPG noted that these were ink amendments already agreed by the SC to correct terminology and improve consistency within the standard.

[46] **Name of authorized officer, date and signature.** One consultation comment suggested that the date being referred to in the first paragraph is the date of authorization. The TPG noted, however, that it is clear from the first sentence of the following paragraph that it is the date of issuance of the phytosanitary certificate, and therefore did not support this comment.

[47] Another consultation comment suggested that "public officer" be changed to "authorized officer". Recalling Article V.2(a) of the IPPC, which refers to phytosanitary certificates being issued only by "public officers who are technically qualified and duly authorized", the TPG disagreed to the proposed substitution but proposed that "authorized public officers" be used instead.

[48] **Considerations for issuing a phytosanitary certificate for re-export.** The TPG considered several consultation comments regarding the chapeau to the bulleted list of requirements:

- The TPG did not support the few consultation comments suggesting that "only" be deleted from the phrase "only if all of the following requirements are met", as if one of the four requirements described is not met, the NPPO should not issue a phytosanitary certificate for re-export.
- The TPG did not support the suggestion that a cross-reference to the section on transit be added for those situations when a consignment is not imported into a country. The TPG felt that this was not necessary and would detract from the clarity of the text.
- The TPG supported suggestions that "may" should be replaced by "should", for better clarity and for consistency with elsewhere in the draft revision of ISPM 12.

[49] Regarding the bulleted list itself:

- The TPG supported suggestions that "for export" be deleted after "original phytosanitary certificate (or phytosanitary certificates)" in the second bullet, for consistency with text added later in the draft ISPM explaining that in the case of multiple re-export, all phytosanitary certificates for re-export should also accompany the consignment. In response to another consultation comment, the TPG recalled that, in accordance with the *IPPC style guide*, the optional plural should not be presented as "phytosanitary certificates(s)".
- The TPG supported suggestions in the third bullet that two commas should be deleted to make it clear that "to change their nature" relates to both plants being grown and plant products being processed; that is, the plants or plant products have not been grown to change their nature (e.g. seeds planted to produce vegetables) or processed to change their nature (e.g. round wood sawn to produce sawn wood) in the country of re-export. The text would then also be consistent with elsewhere in the draft ISPM. The TPG also supported the expansion of this bullet point to include other regulated articles as suggested by one comment.
- The TPG considered a consultation comment suggesting that the final bullet point ("the consignment has not been subjected to the risk of infestation or contamination") be deleted because of the perceived contradiction with section 6.1.1 of the draft ISPM. The TPG noted that there is no contradiction because the text in question in section 6.1.1 is about what happens when the country of destination has phytosanitary import requirements (e.g. growing season inspection, soil testing) that cannot be met by the country of re-export, and the alternative phytosanitary

actions that the country of re-export may perform if considered equivalent and if in accordance with the phytosanitary import requirements of the country of destination. However, for clarity the TPG recommended the following alternative wording: "the consignment has not been infested or contaminated".

[50] One consultation comment suggested that the paragraph after the bulleted list should be part of this list, but the TPG did not support this. They noted that the paragraph had been intentionally separated from the bulleted list to emphasize that, in addition to the requirements listed in the bulleted list, the phytosanitary import requirements also have to be met. The need for this emphasis also led the TPG to decide that the opening phrase of the paragraph ("In addition to the above requirements") should be retained, contrary to a consultation comment calling for its deletion. The TPG noted that although the statement about compliance with phytosanitary import requirements is made in other sections of the draft ISPM, the text in this section refers specifically to situations of re-export – hence its inclusion here.

[51] **Footnote about multiple re-export.** A few consultation comments suggested that this footnote, or a substantial part of it, be deleted. The TPG supported the deletion of the footnote here, recognizing that it is somewhat redundant given the two sentences added to the main text of the end of section 6.1.3 about multiple re-export situations. However, to introduce and explain the particular phrases used in ISPM 12 – "country of re-export" and "country of destination" – and the possible roles of countries in relation to re-export, the TPG recommended a simplified version of the footnote be moved to the end of the Outline of requirements: "In this standard, the requirements set out for issuing a phytosanitary certificate for re-export consider only a country of origin (issuing a phytosanitary certificate for export), a country of re-export (issuing a phytosanitary certificate for re-export) and a country of destination".

[52] **Examination of the phytosanitary import requirements of the country of destination.** One consultation comment suggested a text amendment to make it clear that, before issuing a phytosanitary certificate for re-export, the NPPO should not only examine the phytosanitary import requirements of the country of destination, but also determine if the requirements have been complied with. The TPG supported this but proposed a slightly modified wording using "met" rather than "complied" or "fulfilled" for consistency.

[53] Referring to the *IPPC style guide*, the TPG noted that the "or" separating the two indents means that either indent or both indents can apply at the same time, so there was no need to preface the indented list with "one or both…".

[54] For the second indent, one consultation comment suggested that reference to equivalence be deleted. The TPG did not support this, noting the Glossary definition of "equivalence (of phytosanitary measures)". However, they did propose a slight text modification to make it clear that "additional" refers only to "inspection" and not to "test" and "treatment".

[55] **Repacking, storing, splitting or combining consignments.** A few consultation comments suggested that the phrase "provided that it has not been exposed to infestation or contamination by pests" should be amended. The TPG did not support this suggestion, as the phrase is consistent with the wording used in the model phytosanitary certificate for re-export in the Annex to the IPPC. However, the TPG supported other consultation comments about the sentence that follows, and proposed that the text here be changed to "verify that the consignment has not been infested or contaminated by pests".

[56] **General considerations for issuing a phytosanitary certificate for re-export.** The TPG considered the following comments regarding the final paragraph of this subsection:

- One consultation comment suggested that "phytosanitary certificates for re-export" be changed to the singular instead of the plural. The TPG did not support this because if a consignment is re-exported multiple times, it will be accompanied by several phytosanitary certificates for re-export and by a phytosanitary certificate for export – hence the plural is correct.
- Another comment suggested adding a sentence to the end, to say that if a consignment is split and re-exported to multiple countries, then the original phytosanitary certificate or its certified copy should accompany the re-exported consignments. The TPG supported the comment, but proposed

that it be dealt with by inserting reference to "one or multiple countries" in the preceding subsection about what happens if a consignment is split up. The TPG also proposed that the final paragraph of the General considerations subsection be split into two – the first dealing with the classical situation and the second with consignments re-exported multiple times – and that the original phytosanitary certificates, as opposed to their certified copies, should be distinguished by inserting "the original" before "phytosanitary certificates".

- A few comments suggested adding seeds as an example of a consignment re-exported multiple times, but the TPG thought that the example was not necessary and did not fit well in the sentence.

[57] Regarding the second paragraph of this subsection, the TPG supported one suggestion making it clear that the phytosanitary import requirements are those of the country of destination, but thought that a second amendment, inserting "(issuing the phytosanitary certificate for export)" after "the country of origin" was not needed as the latter term is used all through the draft ISPM. The TPG did not support a further suggestion that "testing" be changed to "test" in the list of actions that a country of re-export may carry out, because the definition of phytosanitary action includes "testing" not "test", and because "testing" grammatically fits better than "test" in the sentence. The TPG also did not support a suggestion that the paragraph start with "without prejudice to the above" rather than "instead", because the paragraph is explaining that in the situation described the NPPO of the country of re-export should issue a phytosanitary certificate for export *instead* of the phytosanitary certificate for re-export that is mentioned in the previous paragraph.

[58] **General considerations for re-export situations.** The TPG supported a consultation comment suggesting that the heading be changed to "Other considerations for re-export situations", to avoid confusion with another heading earlier in the draft ISPM. The TPG did not support other comments, however, that suggested that this subsection be moved to the start of the section on Considerations for re-export situations, as they felt that the current order is more logical.

[59] **Translation issues.** The TPG also considered some consultation comments suggesting corrections to the Spanish translation, and agreed to forward these to the FAO translation group.

[60] The TPG:

(3) *noted* that recommendations on consistency would be transmitted to the Steward and SC-7 for consideration;

(4) *agreed* that Mr Ebbe NORDBO (Denmark) would draft a recommendation on the use of "pest risk posed by", "pest risk presented by" and "pest risk associated with" for consideration at a future TPG meeting, for possible inclusion in the "General recommendations on use of terms in ISPMs";

(5) *requested* that the Secretariat send the Spanish translation issues to the FAO translation group so that the Spanish version of the draft revision of ISPM 12 in relation to re-export (2015-011) is amended.

4.3 Audit in the phytosanitary context (2015-014), Priority 2

[61] Ms Shaza Roushdy OMAR (Egypt) presented the draft TPG responses.[4]

[62] **Definition of "audit".** In response to a consultation comment, the TPG considered whether a definition of "audit" is needed, but concluded that it would be better to describe the concept in the Scope section rather than to define the term in the Glossary.

[63] **"Verification audit" and "system audit".** The TPG considered some consultation comments that queried whether there is a need to differentiate between these two terms given that the draft ISPM does not give specific guidance for each of them. The TPG noted that the wording appears to indicate that a verification audit is just a subset of a system audit, but that the name "verification audit" is confusing as

[4] 06_TPG_2020_Dec.

it could imply that a "system audit" is not about verification. Also, the description of a verification audit includes reference to the timing of audits, but there is no equivalent in the description of a system audit. The TPG invited the Steward of the draft ISPM to reconsider whether the categorization needs international harmonization in an ISPM (as the categories are not used in the standard) and, if such harmonization is needed, to review the text for clarity.

[64] **"Purpose" vs "objectives", "findings" vs "observations", "conformity" vs "compliance".** In response to a consultation comment about the use of these terms in the draft ISPM, the TPG recalled that in the section "Guidelines for a consistent ISPM terminology" of the *IPPC procedure manual for standard setting*, drafters of ISPMs are requested to use only one term for each concept. The TPG noted that terms referring to different concepts should be explained if their respective meaning is not obvious. The TPG found it unclear how "purpose" is meant to differ from "objective", and how 'findings' should be understood as distinct from 'observations'. Regarding "conformity" and "compliance", the TPG recalled that the former should be used to refer to conformity with programme requirements, while the latter should be used to refer to compliance of consignments with phytosanitary import requirements (cf. the section "General recommendations on use of terms in ISPMs" in the *IPPC style guide*). The TPG noted that the meaning of the different terms used also needs to be clear in translations; for example, in the Spanish version of the draft ISPM "findings" is translated as "results" in some places, which in the context of an audit does not mean the same as "findings", and in Russian the translation of "observation" can be "finding" (meaning the result of the observation) or can refer to the process of observation. The TPG therefore invited the Steward to ensure consistency in the use of terms and to clarify their meaning where appropriate.

[65] **"Audit", "audits", "the audit", "auditing".** In response to a consultation comment, the TPG invited the Steward to check that the use of the plural "audits" and of "auditing" is justified, replacing with "audit" where it is not.

[66] **"Verification procedure" vs "audit".** The TPG concluded that a consultation comment on the relationships between these two terms – saying that "audit" is one method of verification procedure in the phytosanitary context – was not a matter for TPG response.

[67] **"Phytosanitary context".** In response to a consultation comment, the TPG concluded that this is a general concept that does not need to be defined in the Glossary.

[68] **Scope.** A few consultation comments suggested that the first sentence be deleted as it is a definition of "audit" and definitions should not be part of the Scope section. The TPG acknowledged that, in general, definitions should not be included in the Scope, but noted that there was precedence for explanatory text to be included, as in ISPM 43 (*Requirements for the use of fumigation as a phytosanitary treatment*). One option would therefore be to delete the first sentence, but then to add text to the second sentence as follows: "This standard covers audits in the phytosanitary context as a systematic examination of a process to determine whether it conforms with phytosanitary requirements, conducted…". The TPG recommended, however, to either switch the order of the first and second sentence, or to move the first sentence to become the opening sentence of the section "Purpose of audit".

[69] **Outline of requirements.** The TPG noted that this section did not include any requirements. However, they recalled that the SC-7 shall consider this issue in May 2021 and therefore decided not to make any comment.

[70] **Impacts on biodiversity and the environment.** The TPG considered a consultation comment suggesting that "quarantine pests" be replaced with "regulated pests" in the phrase "thereby reducing the risk of the introduction and spread of quarantine pests". The TPG concluded that the wording "thereby reducing the pest risk" would be most correct and recommended that wording be used instead.

[71] **Purpose of audit.** The TPG considered a few consultation comments regarding the final paragraph, which suggested that "system" should be "phytosanitary system" in the final indent, and the TPG supported this. In addition, the TPG noted that this indent was in conflict with the Scope, as it allowed

for authorized entities to conduct an audit in an exporting country, whereas the Scope referred to authorized entities only in relation to the authorizing NPPO's territory.

[72] **Types of audit: verification audit.** In response to consultation comments suggesting editorial changes to this paragraph, the TPG agreed that the purpose of a verification audit is to *assess* rather than to *indicate* the effectiveness and conformity of the system or procedure being audited, and that such audits assess conformity with phytosanitary *requirements* rather than phytosanitary *procedures*, because the audit assesses whether the system or procedure meets the requirements set for it. The TPG also supported suggestions to insert "phytosanitary" before "system or procedure" for clarification.

[73] **Roles.** The TPG considered a consultation comment suggesting that the second instance of "organization" be replaced with "entity" in the following sentence: "In the context of this standard, the term "auditor" may refer to an individual person, a group of people representing an organization, or an organization authorized to conduct an audit". The TPG noted, however, that the second sentence of this paragraph clearly identifies that an auditor may be an NPPO or its authorized entity, and that the draft ISPM on *Requirements for national plant protection organizations if authorizing entities to perform phytosanitary actions* (2014-002) makes it clear that an entity can be an individual or an organization, so there is no need to elaborate on it in this standard. The TPG therefore recommended that the sentence in question be deleted.

[74] **Responsibilities of the NPPO.** The TPG supported a consultation comment suggesting that it is corrective *actions* rather than corrective *measures* that are agreed with the NPPO of the exporting country when nonconformities are identified.

[75] **Responsibilities of the auditee.** A few consultation comments suggested text amendments to make it clear that the entities being audited are those "authorized by an NPPO to perform phytosanitary actions". The TPG supported this amendment as the wording would then be consistent with that used in the draft ISPM on *Requirements for national plant protection organizations if authorizing entities to perform phytosanitary actions* (2014-002).

[76] **Frequency of audit.** A few consultation comments suggested that "phytosanitary" be inserted before "system or procedure". The TPG supported this, for consistency with the rest of the standard. However, the TPG did not support a consultation comment suggesting that "pest risk" be changed to simply "risk" in the phrase "the pest risk associated with relevant pests or pathways", as "pest risk" is a Glossary term that perfectly fits the intended meaning here.

[77] **Reporting.** One consultation comment suggested that "providing [the audit report] to the auditee" be changed to "providing [the audit report] to the auditee and the NPPO", but the TPG did not support this amendment as the auditor could be the NPPO itself.

[78] **Translation issues.** The TPG also considered some consultation comments suggesting corrections to the Spanish translation, and agreed to forward these to the FAO translation group.

[79] The TPG:

(6) *noted* that recommendations on consistency would be transmitted to the Steward and SC-7 for consideration;

(7) *requested* that the Secretariat send the Spanish translation issues to the FAO translation group so that the Spanish version of the draft ISPM on *Audit in the phytosanitary context* (2015-014) is amended.

4.4 Draft PT: Irradiation treatment for *Tortricidae* on fruits (2017-011)

[80] Ms Beatriz MELCHO (Uruguay) presented the draft TPG responses.[5]

[5] 07_TPG_2020_Dec.

[81] There had been only one consultation comment, which had related to the Spanish translation of "consideration" in the following sentence that appears as part of the standard footnote in all phytosanitary treatments (PTs): "However, evaluation of any effects of a treatment on the quality of commodities may require additional consideration." The TPG did not support the consultation comment but suggested that it would be clearer to translate "consideration" as "consideración" instead of "examen". However, the TPG noted that the same issue would apply to all other PTs (both those adopted and those under consultation) and the issue had not been raised before. The TPG therefore concluded that it was best to leave the text of this draft PT unchanged for now, but to forward the matter to the FAO translation group for their consideration.

[82] The TPG:

(8) *requested* that the Secretariat send the Spanish translation issue to the FAO translation group for their consideration in future translations.

4.5 Draft 2019 and 2020 Amendments to ISPM 5 (1994-001)

Mr Ebbe NORDBO (Denmark) presented the draft TPG responses.[6]

Proposed deletion of "incidence" (2018-010)

[83] In response to a few consultation comments suggesting to revise the definition of "incidence" or define the term "prevalence", the TPG clarified the rationale behind the SC's decision to request that "incidence" and its definition be deleted from the Glossary. The SC had considered whether the usual meaning of "incidence" and "prevalence" in human and animal epidemiology should trigger a change in the Glossary to using "prevalence" for the concept that has been defined as "incidence" since 2009, but had thought it unlikely that global agreement would be reached on any revision of the terms and definitions, so had decided to request the deletion of "incidence" instead. With the term and definition of "incidence" deleted, countries may use "incidence" and "prevalence" as they individually interpret them. Also, in ISPMs, both terms may then be used, with no agreed CPM interpretation of neither of the terms.

[84] The TPG also clarified that the definition of "prevalence" used in the explanatory text for the deletion of "incidence" as an example of the use "prevalence" in human and animal epidemiology is a direct quotation from the terminology and linguistic databank *TERMIUM Plus* and so should not be changed.

[85] In response to a few consultation comments seeking "pointers" for the meaning of the terms "incidence" and "prevalence" if "incidence" is deleted, the TPG noted that it was not in a position to do this.

Proposed revision of "emergency action" (2018-044)

[86] **"Procedure" vs "operation".** A few consultation comments suggested that "procedure" be used instead of "operation" in the revised definition of "emergency action". The TPG clarified that the meaning of these two terms, as used in ISPMs, differs: a procedure is used to denote the *method* or *protocol* describing *how* to carry out certain activities (as in the definitions of "compliance procedure", "corrective action plan"', "devitalization", "phytosanitary measure", "phytosanitary procedure", "phytosanitary regulation", "provisional measure", "surveillance", "survey" and "treatment"). In contrast, "action" or "operation" (which are synonymous in the IPPC context) denote the *actual carrying out* of activities, which is the intended meaning with "emergency action". Therefore, the TPG did not support this suggestion.

[87] **"Action" vs "operation".** The TPG recalled that, when drafting the proposed definition at its meeting in November 2019, "operation" had been opted for rather than "action" for consistency with the definition of "phytosanitary action", which also uses "operation". The TPG discussed whether this

[6] 08_TPG_2020_Dec.

would make the two definitions too similar, which could cause confusion, but concluded that as "action" or "operation" are synonymous, it would be better to consistently use "operation" in the two definitions.

[88] **Giving examples.** The TPG considered a few consultation comments suggesting that inspection, testing and treatment be listed as examples in the definition of "emergency action", to align with the definition of "phytosanitary action" which lists those same examples plus surveillance. However, the TPG concluded that adding examples would detract from the main difference between the two terms "emergency action" and "phytosanitary action", which is that the trigger for the action is *not* covered by existing phytosanitary measures in the case of an emergency action but *is* covered by existing phytosanitary measures in the case of a phytosanitary action.

[89] **Phytosanitary nature of the action.** The TPG acknowledged that, by substituting the word "phytosanitary" with "official", the intuitive plant-health connotations may become less obvious. They therefore acknowledged the rationale behind a consultation comment that suggested that "for pests" be inserted after "official operation", although noted that "against pests" would be better. However, the TPG considered that this was too broad and could be misunderstood (e.g. would publishing a brochure be an operation against a pest?), and so proposed instead to use the more explicit wording "to prevent the introduction or spread of a pest". The TPG noted that although this wording was similar to that used in the definition of "phytosanitary measure", the latter was restricted to quarantine pests whereas the wording for "emergency action" it applied to all pests, either regulated or not.

[90] **Alternative definition proposed by one contracting party.** The TPG considered the following definition proposed in one consultation comment: "A prompt phytosanitary action or other official operation undertaken in a situation requiring immediate action, such as detection of a non-compliant regulated article or a pest with unknown regulatory status at the time of the action.". The TPG noted the following:

- "Phytosanitary action" and "emergency action" are disjunctive concepts (i.e. they are mutually exclusive), because the triggering situation is covered by existing phytosanitary measures for a phytosanitary action but not for an emergency action.
- The suggested wording "prompt action … in a situation requiring immediate action" is a tautology. The original wording "in a new or unexpected … situation" is more informative and supportive of the notion that the existing phytosanitary measures have, at this point in time, proven insufficient and therefore emergency action may be needed.
- The suggested example of a "non-compliant regulated article" is misleading, as emergency action is taken in situations where the necessary phytosanitary measures are *not* in place, whereas non-compliance is, by definition, always in regards to some *existing* phytosanitary measures.
- The proposed example of "a pest with *unknown* regulatory status" is unclear as the real issue is that the pest, at least in that particular situation, is not regulated at the time of the operation.
- Although the current and immediate lack of regulation is expressed by the suggested wording "… at the time of the action", that notion can be sufficiently well described simply referring to "*existing* phytosanitary measures".

[91] However, the TPG did accept the suggested omission of the word "phytosanitary" before "situation" to avoid any confusion with situations where a "phytosanitary action" may be undertaken. The TPG's proposed wording of "to prevent the introduction or spread of a pest" would make the phytosanitary context clear.

[92] **Type of situations triggering an emergency action.** The TPG noted that one crucial concept in understanding the meaning of "emergency action", and what distinguishes it from "phytosanitary action", is that it is triggered by a situation that is not covered by existing phytosanitary measures. However, as apparent from a consultation comment, this had not been fully understood. The TPG

discussed the merits of being explicit about this in the definition and considered three options proposed in the discussion paper 09_TPG_2020_Dec:[7]

> … in a new or unexpected situation not covered by existing **phytosanitary measures**
>
> … in a situation not covered by existing **phytosanitary measures**
>
> … in a new situation not covered by existing **phytosanitary measures**

[93] The TPG noted that in the first, more comprehensive option, the wording "new or unexpected situation" gives a "flavour" of the situation, whereas the wording "not covered by existing phytosanitary measures" is the legally significant part for contracting parties.

[94] The TPG considered whether "not specified", as used in ISPM 20 (*Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system*), would be more precise than "not covered", but noted that "covered" means that the situation is taken care of by phytosanitary measures, whereas "specified" has a different meaning and a phytosanitary measure cannot specify a situation. The term "covered" is also used in e.g. the model phytosanitary certificate for re-export in the Annex to the IPPC, in relation to the certificate covering the regulated articles that make up the consignment, so the term is already used in a phytosanitary context.

[95] The TPG considered whether "established" would be preferable to "existing", but decided that "existing" was preferable, as this makes it explicit that it is not referring to potential phytosanitary measures, but just existing ones, and avoids the possible ambiguity that "established" would bring. The use of "existing" also gives a hint that the situation may likely be covered by phytosanitary measures in future.

[96] The TPG noted that also "in a *new* situation" would convey a sense of the need to establish phytosanitary measures and that emergency actions cannot be continued in the long term, but decided to opt for the simpler "a situation" as it is sufficient to say "not covered by existing phytosanitary measures" because that is the most important criterion.

[97] The TPG therefore proposed that "in a new or unexpected phytosanitary situation" be replaced with "in a situation not covered by existing phytosanitary measures".

[98] **New composite definition proposed by TPG.** Bringing together its proposals for the various elements of this definition, the TPG's proposed definition was finally as follows:

> A prompt ~~**phytosanitary**~~ **official** ~~**action**~~ operation undertaken to prevent the **introduction** or **spread** of a **pest** in a ~~new or unexpected phytosanitary~~ situation not covered by existing **phytosanitary measures**

Proposed revision of "clearance (of a consignment)" (2018-045)

[99] One consultation comment disagreed with the need for any revision to the term "clearance (of a consignment)", but the TPG noted that the SC had recommended that the definition be revised to explicitly refer to the *process* of verifying a consignment's compliance with phytosanitary regulations, to prevent any confusion with the term "release (of a consignment)", which is defined as "authorization for entry after clearance".

[100] **"Clearance (of a consignment)" vs "compliance procedure (for a consignment)".** The TPG considered some consultation comments suggesting that the use of the terms "clearance (of a consignment)", as in the draft revision, and "compliance procedure (for a consignment)" be clarified or that the TPG considers deleting the term "clearance (of a consignment)" and always using instead the term "compliance procedure (for a consignment)". The TPG acknowledged the need to look at these two terms together and therefore recommended to the SC that the revision of the definition of the term "clearance (of a consignment)" is not sent for second consultation in 2021 and that the TPG be tasked

[7] 09_TPG_2020_Dec.

with reviewing "compliance procedure (for a consignment)" alongside their review of "clearance (of a consignment)".

Proposed revision of "detection survey" (consequential to 2015-013 "survey")

[101] **Repetition of "survey".** The TPG considered a consultation comment suggesting that "survey" be replaced with another word in the definition, to avoid repetition with "survey" in the term itself. The TPG recalled that in some Glossary definitions, such repetition is indeed avoided and another word used in the definition to provide a wider and more illustrative explanation (e.g. "operation" in the definition of "phytosanitary action", "purpose" in "intended use"), but there are also many examples of Glossary definitions where a word from the term itself is repeated in the corresponding definition (e.g. "area" in the definition of "area of low pest prevalence", "plants" in the definition of "plants"). In the case of "detection survey", the TPG concluded that the inclusion of "survey" in both the term and the definition of each of the three related terms "detection survey", "delimiting survey" and "monitoring survey" is needed to show that each of these three terms is a distinct subset of "survey".

[102] **Definite article.** The TPG accepted the consultation comments suggesting that the definite article "the" be inserted before "pest presence or absence".

[103] **Absence.** One consultation comment had disagreed with the addition of reference to absence, arguing that it was sufficient to refer to pest presence. The TPG did not accept this suggestion, noting that the importance of explicitly mentioning that surveys could also be conducted to determine if pests are absent had been agreed at CPM-10 (2015) at the adoption of the revised definition of "survey (of a pest)", which reads "… to determine the presence or absence of pests …". The concept of "detection survey" is a subset of "survey" and if only "presence" were mentioned for "detection survey", that would constitute an undesirable restriction to the scope of "detection survey" in comparison to the scope of "survey".

[104] **What constitutes a place of production or production site.** A few consultation comments sought clarification as to whether greenhouses, nurseries, holding areas, endangered sites, packaging houses and cold storage are included in the terms "place of production" or "production site", and if not, suggesting that these be included in the definition. The TPG clarified that the definition of "place of production" does not specify the items that could be produced there, nor which production processes may be covered by the term, but the use of the term in several ISPMs (e.g. ISPM 10 (*Requirements for the establishment pest free places of production and pest free production sites*), ISPM 11 (*Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests*) and ISPM 36 (*Integrated measures for plants for planting*)) indicates that all entities where plants are grown are certainly included in the "place of production" concept.

[105] **In a country or an area within the country.** One consultation comment suggested that the proposed definition be revised to say that the survey was conducted "in a country or an area within the country", rather than "in an area". The TPG did not accept this suggestion, as "area" is defined as "an officially defined country, part of a country or all or parts of several countries", so the suggested addition would be redundant.

[106] **Area, place of production and production site.** A few consultation comments disagreed with the proposed addition of "place of production or production site" in the definition, as these are already included in the definition of "survey", but suggested that reference to an area be retained in the definition to emphasize that pest status is linked to an area, or because places of production and production sites are subsets of "area". The TPG considered the relative merits of referring to "an area, place of production or production site" in the definition, or referring just to an "area", or referring to none of these.

[107] The TPG acknowledged that referring to all three terms does result in some redundancy, as it is repeating a concept that is already included in the definition of "survey", but it also provides clarity. The TPG

recalled that one reason it had originally proposed the addition of "place of production or production site" had been to emphasize that the term is not referring to detection of a pest in a consignment.[8]

[108] Regarding the option of just referring to "area" in the definition, the TPG noted that "area" is needed in the definition of "delimiting survey" to qualify the meaning of the word "boundaries". Thus, the inclusion of "area" in the definition of "delimiting survey" does not justify including it in the definition of "detection survey". Finally, the TPG noted that "detection survey" is a subset of "survey", and only mentioning "area" in the definition of "detection survey" would constitute an undesirable restriction to the scope of "detection survey" in comparison to the scope of "survey".

[109] Regarding the final option – omitting any reference to an area, place of production or production site in the definition – the TPG noted that this provides simplicity and avoids redundancy. It would also be consistent with the definition of "monitoring survey", which does not mention an area, place of production or production site, and with the definition of delimiting survey (with the exception noted earlier about the need to refer to "area" to qualify "boundaries"). The TPG also noted that the starting point for this entire discussion about revising the definition of "detection survey" had been simply to include the concept of pest absence as well as pest presence, so the expansion of the definition to refer to places of production and production sites had not been the main intention for revision of the definition.

[110] The TPG finally agreed that, on balance, it was better to go for the simpler version, as any type of survey logically deals with an area, place of production or production site even this spatial scope is not explicitly mentioned in its definition. In analogy, the temporal scope specified in the "survey" definition (i.e. "over a defined period") holds for any type of survey, but is not repeated in the definition of "detection survey" or it sister terms. So, the resulting definition of "detection survey" was as follows:

Survey conducted ~~in an **area**~~ to determine ~~if **pests** are present~~ the presence or absence of **pests**

Language versions of 2019 and 2020 amendments to ISPM 5

[111] The TPG also considered some consultation comments suggesting corrections to the Spanish translation, and agreed to forward these to the FAO translation group. The TPG:

(9) *agreed* its responses to the first consultation comments on the draft 2019 and 2020 Amendments to the Glossary (1994-01);

(10) *recommended* to the SC that the revision of the definition of the term "clearance (of a consignment)" is not submitted for second consultation in 2021 and that the term "compliance procedure (for a consignment)" is added to the TPG work programme so that these two terms may be reviewed together;

(11) *noted* that the TPG comments, and the draft 2019 and 2020 Amendments to the Glossary (1994-01) as modified by this meeting, would be transmitted to the SC-7;

(12) *requested* that the Secretariat submit the proposals regarding language versions of terms and definitions to FAO translation group.

5. Reports

5.1 Previous meeting report of the TPG (December 2019), including the TPG work plan

[112] The TPG Steward informed that there were a few minor corrections to make to the report of the December 2019 meeting (e.g. regarding dates),[9] and suggested that she send these to the Secretariat for incorporation.

[113] There were no other comments.

[8] TPG 2018-12, agenda item 6.4.

[9] TPG meeting reports: https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/standards-setting/expert-drafting-groups/technical-panels/technical-panel-glossary-phytosanitary-terms-ispm-5/

[114] The TPG:

(13) *requested* that the Secretariat incorporate the Steward's amendments to the report of the December 2019 TPG meeting and replace the report version on the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP) accordingly.

5.2 Extracts from other meeting reports of relevance to the TPG

[115] The Secretariat presented extracts from the September and November 2020 virtual meetings of the SC,[10] including the associated e-forum outcomes that followed the meetings. The TPG made no comments.

6. Subjects on the TPG work programme

[116] The TPG discussed the working documents prepared by TPG members on individual terms on the *List of topics for IPPC standards*. Proposals agreed by the TPG for new or revised terms and definitions, as well as justifications, will be included in the 2021 *Amendments to the Glossary* and submitted to the SC meeting in May 2021 for approval for consultation.

6.1 "emergency measure" (2020-004), "provisional measure" (2020-008), "phytosanitary procedure" (2020-007) and "phytosanitary action" (2020-006)

[117] The TPG lead, Mr Rajesh RAMARATHNAM, introduced the paper,[11] explaining the background to the terms "emergency measure" and "provisional measure", their use in ISPMs, and the rationale for reviewing them. He informed the TPG that he had also gathered information on "phytosanitary procedure" and "phytosanitary action" but would present this at the next TPG meeting.

[118] At its meeting in 2019, the TPG had considered whether the definition of "emergency measure" needed amending, because it refers to "phytosanitary measure" and "provisional measure", both of which relate only to regulated pests (the latter because it refers to "phytosanitary regulation"). However, this contradicts the use of "emergency measure" and "emergency action" (emergency measures encompassing emergency actions) in the Convention text Article VII.6, ISPM 1 (*Phytosanitary principles for the protection of plants and the application of phytosanitary measures in international trade*), ISPM 13 (*Guidelines for the notification of non-compliance and emergency action*) and ISPM 20, where these terms can apply to situations where pests that are not yet regulated, but which pose a potential threat, are detected.

[119] There is a similar problem with the current definition of "provisional measure", being a "phytosanitary regulation … established without full technical justification". The definition for "phytosanitary regulation", however, relates to regulated pests, and regulation must be based on technical justification. So, there is a contradiction in the definition of "provisional measure", as the term "phytosanitary regulation" is actually only applicable to situations where there *is* technical justification.

[120] The TPG lead proposed revised definitions for "emergency measure" and "provisional measure", and the TPG then considered these in turn.

Emergency measure

[121] The TPG considered whether to retain the wording of the measure being *established* as a matter of urgency, but concluded to avoid this because the dictionary definition of "establish" is to set up on a firm or permanent basis, whereas according to its current definition an emergency measure may be provisional. The TPG therefore opted for "set up" instead.

[122] A TPG member commented on the sequence of actions that a country may take upon detecting a pest for which phytosanitary measures have not been established: the country may first take emergency action, but if there is good reason to think the pest may reoccur, then the country may set up emergency

[10] 09_TPG_2021_Jan_Rev1.

[11] 11_TPG_2021_Jan.

measures; if technical justification is lacking, then those emergency measures would be provisional measures.

[123] The TPG considered the proposed phrase "a prompt official rule or procedure", and whether it was necessary to refer to "rule" as well as "procedure", given that the definition of "phytosanitary measure" does not contain "rule". The TPG concluded to include "rule", however, as it is used in the definition of "phytosanitary regulation".

Provisional measure

[124] The TPG combined the two sentences of the proposed definition into one, added "temporary" to make clear the temporary nature of provisional measures, and used "set up" rather than "established" for consistency with the draft definition of "emergency measures".

[125] The TPG considered whether there are provisional measures that are not emergency measures, and noted that emergency measures relate to situations that are unusual or unexpected, whereas provisional measures relate to situations where there is insufficient information. As an example, if a pest is detected in a nearby country, this would not necessarily represent an emergency, but provisional measures could be taken without full technical justification.

[126] The TPG noted that Note 10 in the Annotated Glossary would need review to ensure clarity.

[127] The TPG:

(14) *proposed* the revision of "emergency measure" (2020-004) and "provisional measure" (2020-008) in the draft 2021 Amendments to the Glossary (1994-001) (Appendix 4) to be presented to SC May 2021;

(15) *asked* Mr Ebbe NORDBO (Denmark) to review Note 10 of the Annotated Glossary and forward any suggested amendments to the Secretariat for consideration by the TPG;

(16) *agreed* to defer consideration of "phytosanitary procedure" and "phytosanitary action" to the next TPG meeting.

6.2 "general surveillance" (2018-046), "specific surveillance" (2018-047) and "surveillance" (2020-009)

[128] The TPG lead, Ms Beatriz MELCHO, introduced the paper,[12] in which she proposed two options for definitions of these three terms. She highlighted that the term "specific surveys", used in the former version of ISPM 6 (*Guidelines for surveillance*) is not always used as a synonym of "specific surveillance" in adopted ISPMs, and proposed that, for consistency with the revised ISPM 6 (*Surveillance*), "specific surveys" should be replaced with "specific surveillance" whenever appropriate and that "specific surveys" should be used when referring to some type of survey as defined in the Glossary. She further noted that the Glossary term "survey (of pests)" could be equivalent to "specific surveillance" in some cases.

[129] **Consideration of the proposed definitions.** The TPG noted that in the first option, the details were in the definitions of "surveillance" and "general surveillance", with the definition of "specific surveillance" being very short. This could appear to be unbalanced. Furthermore, analysis of data was mentioned in the definition of "general surveillance", but not in the overarching definition of "surveillance".

[130] TPG members favoured the second option because the level of detail was more balanced; it made it clear that general surveillance and specific surveillance were subsets of surveillance; and it was explicit about the *official* nature of general surveillance and specific surveillance.

[131] **Surveys.** The TPG considered whether surveys were included within general surveillance as one of the "various sources" of data referred to, and whether the difference between general and specific

[12] 05_TPG_2021_Jan.

surveillance is the data sources or the need to analyse and verify data. The TPG agreed that the difference between them is the sources of data and that general surveillance should therefore not include surveys. This would make "general surveillance" and "specific surveillance" mutually exclusive concepts.

[132] The TPG clarified that "surveys" are always *official*, so data collected from comparable methods by non-NPPOs would be "general surveillance" not "specific surveillance".

[133] **Data and information.** In the definition of "general surveillance", the TPG noted that it was important to incorporate the concept of *collecting* data and that it was necessary to say that the data collection was "in an area", clearly not referring to consignments.

[134] The TPG concluded that it was appropriate to use "data" in the definition of "general surveillance", as this relates to the raw material collected, and that it is necessary to not only analyse data but also verify them because they come from various sources. In contrast, given that "information" is understood as being processed (i.e. analysed) data, for the definition of "specific surveillance" it was appropriate to refer to "information" and hence "obtain information" was a compressed way of saying "collect and analyse data". The data collected in specific surveillance would not need verifying as they are from surveys (i.e. an official process).

[135] The TPG opted for the definitions as per the second option presented in the paper, with some modifications to the definition of "general surveillance".

Amendments to other ISPMs

[136] As part of their considerations regarding the terms "surveillance", "general surveillance" and "specific surveillance", the TPG examined all instances of these terms, the related term "survey", and their derivatives in adopted ISPMs.[13]

[137] The TPG lead had identified instances in the following ISPMs that possibly needed amending to ensure consistency with ISPM 6 or to improve clarity: ISPM 2 (*Framework for pest risk analysis*), ISPM 4 (*Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas*), ISPM 7 (*Phytosanitary certification system*), ISPM 9 (*Guidelines for pest eradication programmes*), ISPM 10, ISPM 11, ISPM 17 (*Pest reporting*), ISPM 26 (*Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies*) and ISPM 35 (*Systems approach for pest risk management of fruit flies (Tephritidae)*). The TPG noted that although "specific surveys" could be replaced by "specific surveillance" in many instances, this is not always the case, so examined each instance one by one.

[138] **Surveys and monitoring or inspection.** The TPG agreed that when "survey" is being referred to in conjunction with "monitoring" or "inspection" (as in ISPM 7 section 2.2 or in ISPM 10 sections 1.1 and 3.1), "survey" is preferable to "surveillance" or "specific surveillance" as survey, monitoring and inspection are all distinct procedures at the same abstraction level.

[139] **"Survey" vs "specific surveillance".** The TPG discussed the difference between "survey" and "specific surveillance", recognizing that these two terms were almost synonymous. The TPG noted that it was necessary to use "specific surveillance" in ISPM 6, as a parallel concept to "general surveillance", but concluded that in other ISPMs where this parallelism does not occur it would be more direct to simply refer to "survey", especially as "survey" is defined in the Glossary, including the three subsets ("delimiting survey", "detection survey" and "monitoring survey").

[140] **Surveillance systems.** The TPG recognized that the term "surveillance systems" in ISPM 10 section 3.1 was undefined, but its meaning sufficiently clear. The TPG also recalled that in ISPM 6 a "surveillance system" refers to the highest conceptual level, and that surveillance programmes form part of surveillance systems

[141] **Consistency review.** The TPG considered whether to recommend to the SC that the TPG conduct a consistency review of the terms "surveillance", "survey" and their derivatives, taking into account the

[13] 05_TPG_2021_Jan (Annex 1 and Annex 2).

work already done by the TPG. However, although the TPG confirmed that none of these amendments altered the meaning of the text and so could be proposed as ink amendments, they were not urgent. The TPG therefore proposed the amendments be archived pending future revision of the relevant ISPMs.

[142] The TPG:

(17) *proposed* the revision of "surveillance" (2020-009) in the draft 2021 Amendments to the Glossary (1994-001) (Appendix 4) to be presented to the SC May 2021;

(18) *proposed* a draft definition for "general surveillance" (2018-046) and for "specific surveillance" (2018-047) in the draft 2021 Amendments to the Glossary (1994-001) (Appendix 4) to be presented to the SC May 2021;

(19) *requested* that the Secretariat archive the proposed amendments to ISPMs (Appendix 6), which aim to ensure a consistent use of "survey", "surveillance" and their derivatives in adopted ISPMs, for future revision of the relevant ISPMs.

6.3 "germplasm" (2020-005)

[143] The TPG lead, Ms Asenath Abigael KOECH, introduced the paper.[14] She explained that the intention was to make a small change to the definition of "germplasm" to explicitly reflect that the concept is completely included within the definition of "plants for planting". The proposal was therefore to change "plants" to "plants for planting" in the definition. The TPG lead provided some other definitions and descriptions of "germplasm", which made it clear that germplasm is living tissue from which new plants can be grown and contains the information for a species' genetic makeup. From the current Glossary definition of germplasm – "plants intended for use in breeding or conservation programmes" – it is implicit that germplasm is plants intended for planting (i.e. for subsequent growth, reproduction or propagation), but for a specified purpose: breeding or conservation programmes.

[144] The TPG considered and agreed to the proposed revision to the definition.

[145] The TPG noted that the recognition of "germplasm" as a subset of "plants for planting" would mean that germplasm, which is indeed recognized to pose a particularly high pest risk, would be implicitly covered in many other ISPMs, wherever reference is made to "plants for planting". This would be beneficial in terms of plant protection.

[146] The TPG lead had identified one occurrence of "germplasm" in an adopted ISPM: ISPM 38 (*International movement of seeds*). The term here is used according to the Glossary definition, but the TPG agreed that, irrespective of the proposed revision of the definition, the sentence "Examples include seeds for evaluation, germplasm and seeds as breeding material" in section 1.3.2 of ISPM 38 be amended to "Examples include seeds for evaluation and seeds as germplasm", because "seeds as breeding material" would be covered by "seeds as germplasm" that would exclude germplasm in forms other than seeds. As the proposed amendment was not urgent, the TPG proposed to archive it until ISPM 38 is revised.

[147] One TPG member queried why the definition of "germplasm" had been included in the Glossary if only occurring in one ISPM. The TPG recalled that any term and definition adopted with general applicability are now included in the Glossary, irrespective of how many ISPMs actually use the term. Only in the rare case where a term and definition has been adopted to explicitly apply only with a specific ISPM, will the definition appear only in that ISPM and not in the Glossary (cf. 'Guidelines for a consistent ISPM terminology', as produced by the TPG and endorsed by the SC). The Secretariat noted that "germplasm" does occur in one other standard: DP 26 (*Austropuccinia psidii*).

[148] The TPG:

[14] 10_TPG_2021_Jan.

(20) *proposed* the revision of "germplasm" (2020-005) in the draft 2021 Amendments to the Glossary (1994-001) (Appendix 4) to be presented to the SC May 2021;

(21) *requested* that the Secretariat archive the proposed amendment to ISPM 38 (*International movement of seeds*), for future revision of this ISPM (Appendix 6).

6.4 "inspection" (2017-005), including "clearance (of a consignment)" (2018-045), "compliance procedure (for a consignment)", "release (of a consignment)" and "test"

The TPG decided to deal with all the terms and definitions together, as indicated in the section title, as they are strongly interrelated and recommended for further processing as a package.

Definition of "inspection" (2017-005)

[149] The TPG lead, Mr Rajesh RAMARATHNAM, introduced the paper.[15] He summarized the various discussions by the SC and TPG from May 2018 until the TPG meeting in November 2019, and noted that subsequently the Expert Working Group (EWG) on the Focused revision of ISPM 12 (*Phytosanitary certificates*) in relation to re-Export (2015-011) had discussed the terms "identity" and "integrity", which the TPG had included in their provisional revised definition of "inspection". The expert working group had concluded that there is no urgent need for using "identity" and "integrity" in ISPM 12. The TPG lead had therefore continued to consider the provisional definition drafted by the TPG in November 2019. Further to these considerations, he proposed a modified definition to the TPG and explained the various components of it.

Definitions of "inspection", "clearance", "compliance procedure" and "release" (in relation to consignments)

[150] The TPG Assistant Steward Mr Ebbe NORBDO then introduced a paper that considered the related terms "clearance", "compliance procedure" and "release", as well as "inspection".[16] He explained that the main issue was the discrepancy between the "*sensu lato*" definition of "inspection" as used in parts of ISPM 23 (*Guidelines for inspection*), which is broad and includes the checking of documents, identity and integrity as well as the visual examination of plants (as also captured in the provisional definition drafted by the TPG in 2019), and the current "*sensu stricto*" Glossary definition of "inspection", which includes only the visual examination of plants. There were two ways to resolve this: either by revising the definition of "inspection" to become *sensu lato* or retaining the current, *sensu stricto* definition and adjusting the text in ISPM 23.

[151] Mr NORDBO highlighted several concerns with the broad, *sensu lato* definition:

- In all other ISPMs, the term "inspection" is used in the *sensu stricto* sense, and even in ISPM 23 the term is used in the broad, *sensu lato* sense in only 9 of the 67 instances of "inspection", with 37 appearing to be in the *sensu stricto* sense, and the rest indeterminate.
- Although the broad, *sensu lato* definition includes the narrower, *sensu stricto* sense of the term, this could give rise to confusion.
- In practice, the checking of documents is often separated physically and in time from the visual examination, and this will probably be even more the case with ePhyto, making the *sensu lato* definition less appealing.
- All elements of the current, *sensu stricto* definition can be used in import and export situations and in places of production, whereas in the *sensu lato* definition not all elements are relevant to production processes.

[152] He suggested that these concerns would not apply, however, if the current, *sensu stricto* definition of "inspection" was retained.

[15] 06_TPG_2021_Jan.

[16] 08_TPG_2021_Jan.

[153] Mr NORBDO also provided proposals for consequential revision of the definition of "compliance procedure" – one related to the *sensu lato* and the other to the *sensu stricto* definition of "inspection" – and recommended that "compliance procedure" should in any case be considered as part of the same package as "inspection".

[154] He finished by posing the question: in real-life situations, what does the phytosanitary community perceive "inspection" to include; that is, are document checks and verification of identity and integrity perceived to come under "inspection" or "under compliance procedure"?

Consideration of the proposed definitions of "inspection"

[155] The TPG considered the points made in the two papers and the different options presented.

[156] **"Phytosanitary regulations" vs "phytosanitary requirements".** Recognizing that the current definition of "inspection" refers to "phytosanitary regulations", which therefore restricts the definition to regulated pests, the TPG recalled previous discussions, where the TPG had concluded that "regulated pest" may refer to a pest that is regulated in the importing country or one that is regulated in the exporting country. A field inspection, therefore, may be for a pest that is not regulated in the country where the inspection is being carried out, but is regulated in the country to which the commodity is to be exported. However, the TPG noted that a phytosanitary regulation would only apply to the country in which it is enacted, so a phytosanitary regulation in an importing country would not apply to a field inspection in a country exporting to that importing country. The TPG lead confirmed that this was one of the reasons he had proposed that "phytosanitary regulations" be changed to "phytosanitary requirements" in the definition of "inspection". The change was supported by the TPG.

[157] **Situations not related to consignments.** The TPG noted that the definition of "compliance procedure", both currently and in the proposal by Mr NORDBO, related specifically to consignments. This would mean that document checks that were not related to consignments – for instance those carried out as part of an audit of a programme or system – would neither be covered by "compliance procedure" nor "inspection" if document checks were part of the "compliance procedure" definition rather than being part of the "inspection" definition (if revised according to the *sensu stricto* option). The TPG considered whether replacing "and" with "or" in the *sensu lato* definition of "inspection" would solve this issue; that is, for "inspection" to be an "official process of document checks, verification of consignment identity and integrity, ~~and~~ or the visual examination of …".

[158] The Russian language lead commented that in that language, "inspection" is used only in relation to consignments; for inspection in the field, the same term is used as for surveys, so field inspection is considered as a "survey". For this reason, he preferred the definition of "inspection" to relate to consignments only.

[159] **"Inspection" vs "testing".** The Russian language lead commented that both inspection and testing involve a visual element. The TPG Steward recalled that the original philosophy for "inspection" was as an opposite concept to "testing"; the Glossary definition of "testing" makes this clear and several ISPMs use the two terms as disjunctive concepts. The Steward therefore expressed a preference for the current *sensu stricto* definition of "inspection", as being more aligned with the original intention.

[160] The TPG lead suggested that because the activity of inspection is used in multiple scenarios, not just in relation to consignments, any revision of the definition of "inspection" should apply to all scenarios. While agreeing that "inspection" should continue to apply also to e.g. in-field scenarios, the TPG Steward pointed out that if you try to put all procedural elements into the definition of "inspection", then this would equate to a "compliance procedure". Currently, there are the disjunctive terms "inspection" and "test", and the term "compliance procedure", but the disjunction is lost if the definition of inspection is broadened.

[161] **Revising the current definition of "inspection".** The TPG lead commented that, whatever option is decided, the current definition of "inspection" should not be left untouched, because, as currently written, the visual examination is not only to determine if pests are present, but also to determine

compliance with phytosanitary regulations. So, the concept of determining or verifying compliance is in both the definition of "inspection" and the definition of "compliance procedure", which could give rise to confusion.

[162] One TPG member commented that inspectors are not only looking for pests during the visual examination but also for other physical things such as soil or other contaminants, and that "to determine compliance with phytosanitary regulations" in the current definition of "inspection" was directed at such things. The TPG noted that the mark specified in ISPM 15 (*Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade*) is another example of something that an inspector could be looking for during a visual examination, so this is also "inspection".

[163] The TPG concluded that it would be better to use "conformity" rather than "compliance" in the definition of "inspection" because the latter term is used only in connection with consignments and phytosanitary import requirements only, and to also resolve any potential confusion caused by the concept of compliance being in the definition of both "inspection" and "compliance procedure".

[164] The TPG noted that "verify" would be a more appropriate verb to use with "conformity" than "determine", but concluded that "check" would be even better, as this does not imply completion of a final result. The French, Spanish and Russian language leads confirmed that in their languages the same word is used for "check" and "verify" anyway.

[165] The TPG considered whether the definition of "inspection" should refer to "regulated pests" rather than "pests", as phytosanitary requirements only apply to regulated pests. However, in some cases the presence of any pests (including non-regulated) could indicate that a treatment has been ineffective, and also the use "regulated pests" would raise the question discussed earlier of whether the pests were regulated by the importing country or the exporting country. The TPG concluded, therefore, that it was better to retain the reference to "pests".

[166] Taking account of these various considerations, the TPG agreed a revised definition of "inspection", derived from the current Glossary definition and retaining the *sensu stricto* sense if the term, i.e. including only visual examination, not the checking of documents or the verification of consignment identity and integrity.

[167] **Consequential changes to ISPM 20.** In his paper, the TPG lead had proposed some consequential changes to ISPM 20 in the event of the *sensu lato* definition of "inspection" being adopted. The TPG noted that if the current, *sensu stricto* definition is retained, where inspection is one of the three components of compliance checking, such changes may not be needed.

[168] **ISPM 23.** As noted before, nine uses of "inspection" in ISPM 23 do not conform to the Glossary definition of "inspection" or to the use of "inspection" in other ISPMs (which all conform to the Glossary definition). The TPG also noted that, in any case, the title of ISPM 23 does not match its actual content, as it only covers inspection of consignments, but not – for example – of places of production. Mr Ebbe NORDBO had informed[17] that the alternative title "Guidelines for checking compliance of consignments" had been envisaged by the SC in April 2004[18]. Omitting "Guidelines for...", as per general SC decision, other possible titles considered by the TPG were "Compliance procedures for consignments" or "Inspection of consignments", the latter being tentatively preferred by the TPG.

Revision of the definition of "compliance procedure"

[169] Further to the TPG recommending a draft definition of "inspection" and suggesting adjustments to the relevant parts of ISPM 23, the TPG noted it would be appropriate and the right timing to revise the related term "compliance procedure (for a consignment)", to expand on the possible procedural elements

[17] 08_TPG_2021_Jan.

[18] SC 2004-04, agenda item 7.8.

of the concept and link it to "inspection". The TPG therefore considered the proposed definition of that term in the paper by Mr Ebbe NORDBO[19], corresponding to the *sensu stricto* sense of "inspection".

[170] The TPG agreed that there was no need to explicitly refer to the compliance procedure being prior to export or import, even though the concept is applicable in both situations.

[171] After review of the terms "identity (of a consignment)" and "integrity (of a consignment)" (agenda item 6.5), the TPG agreed that as their new proposed definition of "integrity" referred to "identity", there was no need to refer to the verification of identity in the definition of "compliance procedure" – referring to integrity would suffice.

[172] **Transit.** The TPG agreed that it was important to include the objectives of the compliance procedure in the proposed definition, namely to check if a consignment complies with phytosanitary import requirements or phytosanitary measures related to transit. Given that transit is so seldom mentioned in ISPMs, the TPG considered whether to omit the objective relating to transit for simplification. However, recognizing that some contracting parties do require documents to be verified in relation to transit, the TPG agreed to retain reference to transit to avoid any potential difficulties with the implementation of ISPM 25 (*Consignments in transit*).

[173] The TPG considered whether to refer to *requirements* in relation to transit (e.g. "phytosanitary transit requirements" or "phytosanitary requirements for transit") and noted that ISPM 12 contained one mention of "phytosanitary requirements for transiting consignments". However, recognizing that countries tend not to have very specific requirements in relation to transit of consignments, but only for transit in general, the TPG agreed to refer instead to *phytosanitary measures* related to transit. Furthermore, as phytosanitary measures are not always required in transit situations, the TPG agreed that the definition should only refer to *relevant* phytosanitary measures related to transit.

[174] **"Check" vs "verify", "meet" vs "comply".** The TPG agreed that it was more appropriate to say that the compliance procedure was "to check if" a consignment meets phytosanitary import requirements rather than "to verify" this, as "check" does not imply completion of a final result and there may be additional steps or actions needed before completing the compliance procedure. They also agreed to use "meets" rather than "complies with" phytosanitary import requirements, for consistency with ISPM 12.

[175] **"If" vs "whether".** Taking account of these various considerations, the TPG agreed a revised definition of "compliance procedure (for a consignment)". The TPG noted that it was important to retain the two instances of "if" in the definition ("to check *if* a consignment meets phytosanitary import requirements or *if* relevant phytosanitary measures related to transit have been applied"), to avoid any misunderstanding that meeting the requirements and measures being applied would be alternative outcomes.

Consequential changes to "clearance (of a consignment)" and "release (of a consignment)"

[176] The TPG noted that if the proposed definition of "compliance procedure (for a consignment)" were to be adopted, this would have consequences for the related terms "clearance (of a consignment)" and "release (of a consignment)". Although the latter was not on the TPG work programme, the TPG were of the view that the proposals for all these related terms would need to be presented for consideration as a package rather than being considered in isolation, as they were all strongly inter-linked.

[177] **"Clearance (of a consignment)" (2018-045).** The TPG recalled its earlier response to the consultation comments on the draft 2019 and 2020 amendments to ISPM 5 (1994-001), including the recommendation that the SC task the TPG to clarify the use of the terms "clearance (of a consignment)" as tentatively revised and "compliance procedure (for a consignment)". The TPG noted that the current as well as the new, proposed definition of "compliance procedure (for a consignment)" was almost

[19] 08_TPG_2021_Jan.

synonymous with the current Glossary definition of "clearance (of a consignment)" and hence concluded that the latter term was redundant and should be deleted from the Glossary in any case.

[178] **"Release (of a consignment)".** The TPG noted that the definition of "release (of a consignment)", which contained reference to "clearance", would need slight amending as a consequence of the proposed deletion of "clearance (of a consignment)". The TPG agreed a draft revised definition, linking "release" to "compliance procedure" rather than to "clearance".

[179] **"Test".** The TPG considered whether the definition of "test" needed revision for consistency with the proposed revision of the definition of "inspection". The TPG recognized that testing can include tests of things other than consignments (e.g. whether a pest is present in a place of production), so agreed that it would be better to refer to "conformity" rather than "compliance", in accordance with the "General recommendations on use of terms in ISPMs". The TPG also agreed that "verify" would be more appropriate than "determine" or "check" in the context of testing, because the results of a test are more final and do not need further confirmation, whereas further confirmation may be required after a visual examination (i.e. inspection). The TPG acknowledged, however, that the subtleties of the distinction between "check" and "verify" may not be present in all FAO languages.

[180] The TPG agreed that the only change needed to the definition of "test" would be to replace "determine compliance" with "verify conformity", and emphasized that because the definitions of "inspection" and "test" were strongly linked – representing opposites (visual examination vs other than visual examination) – it was important that the two definitions be considered together.

Consequential changes to other ISPMs

[181] **ISPM 23.** The TPG recommended that some amendments would be needed to ISPM 23 as a consequence of retaining the current *sensu stricto* definition of "inspection" (albeit slightly amended) and the proposed revisions to definitions of the consignment-related terms "compliance procedure", "identity" and "integrity", and noted that it would be preferable if these could be done as ink amendments, so that the changes could be made relatively speedily after adoption of the revised definitions. The TPG tentatively identified possible new wording to instances in ISPM 23 where changes are needed (also see agenda item 7.2).

[182] **ISPM 20:** The TPG noted that there were two amendments to be made to ISPM 20 and recommended that these changes be made as ink amendments, once the definition of "clearance" has been deleted and the definition of "compliance procedure" revised.

[183] The TPG:

(22) *proposed* the revision of "inspection" (2017-005) and the deletion of "clearance (of a consignment)" (2018-045) in the draft 2021 Amendments to the Glossary (1994-001) (Appendix 4) to be presented to the SC May 2021;

(23) *invited* the SC to add "compliance procedure (for a consignment)", "release (of a consignment)" and "test" to the work programme of the TPG as a consequence of the proposed changes to "inspection" (2017-005) and "clearance (of a consignment)" (2018-045);

(24) *proposed* the revision of "compliance procedure (for a consignment)", "release (of a consignment)" and "test" in the draft 2021 Amendments to the Glossary (1994-001) (Appendix 4), to be presented to the SC May 2021 as part of the same package as "inspection" (2017-005) and "clearance (of a consignment)" (2018-045);

(25) *invited* the SC to task the TPG to conduct an early consistency review of ISPM 23 (*Guidelines for inspection*) to identify potential ink amendments arising as a consequence of the proposed revisions to "inspection" (2017-005) and "compliance procedure (for a consignment)";

(26) invited the SC to note the consequential changes that would arise from the proposed deletion of "clearance (of a consignment)" (2018-045) and revision of "compliance procedure (for a consignment)", as identified in this meeting, and to note the recommendation that these changes be made as ink amendments once these Glossary amendments have been adopted.

6.5 "identity" (2011-001), "integrity (of a consignment)" (consequential), "phytosanitary security (of a consignment)" (2013-008)

[184] The TPG lead, Mr Ebbe NORDBO, introduced the paper.[20] He explained that the term "identity (of a consignment)" had been under consideration since 2011, triggered by the adoption of the revised ISPM 12. The particularly problematic use of the term in ISPM 12 had now been resolved through the expert working group on the Focused revision of ISPM 12 in relation to re-export that met in 2019. However, the term is still used in many other ISPMs.

[185] The TPG lead proposed a new definition and provided an explanation. This made it clear that the identity of a consignment refers to the characteristics of a consignment that are of phytosanitary concern and which should never change from the time of certification to the time the consignment is received by the importer: the constituents of the consignment and the origin of the consignment. These elements are strongly linked with certain information on the phytosanitary certificate. *Additions* to a consignment would change the identity, but it cannot be generalized whether any (unintentional) *loss* or (intentional) *subtraction* of items from the consignment after phytosanitary certification would change the consignment's identity. The TPG lead explained that the word "quantity" cannot appear explicitly in the definition because, as already agreed by the SC in 2014, it would be too complicated to deal with it in a definition, but that the quantity is implicit in the word "constituents".

[186] The paper also offered two options for revision of "integrity" and two options for revision of "phytosanitary security".

Identity (of a consignment)

[187] **Constituents of a consignment.** The TPG considered whether the meaning of "constituent" would be clear, especially as this term was not used in ISPM 12, and agreed that "components" would be better. Although "articles" was another option, which would link with the definition of "consignment", it could be confusing as it is commonly used in the context of "plants, plant products or other articles", and so it would not necessarily be clear to everyone that it was referring to individual units of the commodity rather than the commodities.

[188] The TPG agreed that reference to the components could be made more explicit by referring also to the relevant sections on the phytosanitary certificate: "name of produce and quantity declared" and "botanical name of plants", the quotation marks making it clear that these were the names of sections of the phytosanitary certificate. By referring to these sections, the definition would also be aligned with ISPM 23, where it refers to identity checks verifying whether the type of plant or plant product or species, and the quantity and status, are as declared on the phytosanitary certificate. The TPG used "produce" in preference to "product" or "commodity" to align with the wording of the model phytosanitary certificate.

[189] **Packaging and distinguishing marks.** The TPG lead clarified that, in his understanding, the packaging and distinguishing marks of a consignment are not part of its identity, even though they are very helpful for inspectors to spot the actual consignment at the point of entry. Distinguishing marks may change or disappear, for instance if re-packaged, but that would not entail a change or loss of the identity.

[190] **Re-packaging, splitting and combining.** The TPG noted that in ISPM 12, re-packaging, splitting or combining consignments does not change the identity of the original consignment. So, for example, as long as the 500 apples from source X are the same (or a fraction of the same) apples that arrive in country Y, the *identity* is unchanged even if they are divided up into more boxes.

[191] **Origin.** In the draft definition, the TPG also included reference to the "place of origin" section of the model phytosanitary certificate. The producers are included in the concept of "place of origin", and the exporters are just intermediaries.

[20] 04_TPG_2021_Jan.

[192] The TPG noted that different lots in a consignment may have a different place of origin, but considered that it would be confusing in the definition to refer to multiple origins, and definitions generally refer to nouns in the singular.

[193] The TPG structured the draft definition so that the main message – that the components are covered by the phytosanitary certificate – came first, with the references to the relevant sections of the phytosanitary certificate given second as extra detail.

[194] **Grain.** The TPG considered whether, in the case of bulk commodities such as grain, the identity would be lost as the name of the producer may be lost, but noted that the name of the exporter and the exporting country would be on the phytosanitary certificate.

Integrity (of a consignment)

[195] The TPG considered the options for the definition of "integrity (of a consignment)" proposed in the TPG lead's paper: the first related only to the maintenance of identity and the second related also to the consignment remaining undamaged.

[196] **"Condition" vs "state".** The TPG noted that the *condition* of a consignment could refer to commodity quality, which is not the intended meaning, so preferred to use "state".

[197] **Damage to the consignment.** The TPG noted that it is damage to the packaging that needs to be captured in the definition, rather than damage to the commodity. The TPG also recognized that it is not a phytosanitary concern if the packaging has been changed, only if it has been damaged.

[198] The TPG considered whether to use the terminology from ISPM 23 (section 2.2) referring to inspection including checking for seals and for other relevant physical aspects. The TPG concluded that "other relevant physical aspects" was too vague and could, for example, refer to rotten apples.

[199] **Addition, substitution and loss.** The TPG considered whether the identity of a consignment changes if it suffers from loss and noted that if the quantity in the consignment changes, this might raise questions about the integrity of that consignment. The TPG therefore accepted that the concept of integrity would imply that identity had been maintained without addition, substitution or loss. The TPG noted, however, that if "identity" becomes a Glossary term as proposed and the definition of "integrity" says that the identity is maintained, then it would be redundant to also add in the definition "without addition, substitution or loss"

[200] The TPG agreed to refer to the identity being "unchanged" rather than "maintained" because the latter implies a process of maintenance over time rather than an assessment at the end of that process.

Phytosanitary security (of a consignment)

[201] The TPG considered the options for the definition of "phytosanitary security (of a consignment)" proposed in the TPG lead's paper: the first related to the identity being maintained and the second related to the integrity being secured. Given the definitions for "identity" and "integrity" already drafted by the TPG, the TPG focused on the second option.

[202] **State of a consignment.** The TPG noted that the phytosanitary security of a consignment is referring to the state of the consignment, not to an action.

[203] **Infestation and contamination.** The TPG agreed that phytosanitary measures are applied to prevent infestation *and* contamination, because measures to prevent both infestation and contamination are needed to reach the state of phytosanitary security.

[204] **Regulated pests.** The TPG considered whether to suggest deletion of "regulated pests" from the definition, as the definitions of "infestation" and "contamination" are not restricted to regulated pests alone, but apply to all pests, and non-regulated pests could infest or contaminate a consignment. The TPG noted, however, that the definition of "phytosanitary measure" applies only to regulated pests and hence it is clear that the intended scope of the current Glossary definition when referring to "infestation

and contamination by regulated pests, through the application of phytosanitary measures" is restricted to regulated pests, and that the real-world implications of expanding the definition to all pests would be huge. The TPG considered whether a consignment that is heavily infested with non-regulated pests could be said to have phytosanitary security, but noted that although an importing country could still take action in this event, it could not immediately refuse the entry of the consignment.

[205] **"Phytosanitary procedures" vs "phytosanitary measures".** Recalling that ISPM 1 referred to phytosanitary security being maintained "through appropriate procedures", the TPG considered whether it would be better to refer to "phytosanitary procedures" rather than "phytosanitary measures" in the definition of "phytosanitary security". The TPG noted that the wording in ISPM 1 is a quotation from Article IV.2(g) of the IPPC, but that the vocabulary in the IPPC is often not as precise as in ISPMs. The TPG concluded that "phytosanitary measures" was more appropriate, because this included not only procedures but also legislation, which may also be needed to prevent infestation and contamination.

[206] **Ink amendments.** The TPG noted that, if the revised definition of "phytosanitary security" is adopted, the TPG may need to consider ink amendments to ISPM 1 and ISPM 7.

[207] The TPG:

(27) *proposed* a draft definition for "identity (of a consignment)" (2011-001) in the draft 2021 Amendments to the Glossary (1994-001) (Appendix 4) to be presented to the SC May 2021;

(28) *proposed* the consequential revision of "integrity (of a consignment)" in the draft 2021 Amendments to the Glossary (1994-001) (Appendix 4) to be presented to the SC May 2021;

(29) *proposed* the revision of "phytosanitary security (of a consignment)" (2013-008) in the draft 2021 Amendments to the Glossary (1994-001) (Appendix 4) to be presented to the SC May 2021.

7. Review of ISPMs for consistency of terms and style

7.1 General recommendations on consistency

[208] The TPG noted that the "General recommendations on use of terms in ISPMs", as modified at the 2018 TPG meeting, had subsequently been published in the *IPPC style guide*[21]. As no amendments had been proposed prior to or during this meeting, the TPG made no changes.

7.2 Consistency of adopted ISPMs

[209] A hyperlink to the *List of proposed or approved ink amendments for ISPMs* had been included on the agenda for this meeting.[22]

[210] The Secretariat confirmed that no ink amendments had been applied since the TPG meeting in 2019.

[211] The TPG recalled their decision earlier in the meeting (agenda items 6.2 and 6.3) to request that the proposed amendments relating to "survey", "surveillance" and "germplasm" be archived until future revision of the ISPMs concerned.

[212] Looking ahead to future potential ink amendments, the TPG noted that ink amendments relating to "identity", "integrity", "clearance" and "compliance procedure" would be needed in ISPM 23 and ISPM 20 in the event of the new definitions proposed by the TPG being adopted. The TPG tentatively identified the necessary ink amendments to align ISPM 23 with the current *sensu stricto* definition (with proposed slight changes) of "inspection" and the proposed revised definition of "integrity (of a consignment)". The TPG concluded that the amendments were all straightforward, yet included a change to the title of ISPM 23 to better reflect its content, irrespective of other amendments to the ISPM or definitions. Only two ink amendments would be needed in ISPM 20.

[21] *IPPC style guide*: https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/132/

[22] List of ink amendments proposed or approved for ISPMs: https://www.ippc.int/en/work-area-pages/technical-panel-for-the-glossary-tpg/

[213] The TPG also recalled that ink amendments to ISPM 1 and ISPM 7 may be needed in the event of the new definition of "phytosanitary security" being adopted (see agenda item 6.5).

Annotated Glossary: 2020 intermediate version

[214] The Annotated Glossary, version 5, had been finalized by the TPG at their meeting in December 2018 and published in March 2019.[23] The next public version is due to be finalized in 2022.

[215] The TPG:

(30) *agreed* to review the intermediate version of the Annotated Glossary after CPM-15 (2021).

7.3 Explanation of Glossary terms

[216] This standing agenda item allows for TPG members to enquire about and discuss specific Glossary terms. Mr Ebbe NORDBO presented his paper in this regard.[24]

[217] The following terms were discussed.

[218] **Area of low pest prevalence.** The TPG noted that the last word in the definition, "measures", is redundant because "surveillance" and "control" are sufficient, and agreed that it would be better to delete it.

[219] **Delimiting survey.** As this term is a subset of the term "survey", and the definition of the latter term makes it clear that surveys are in areas, places of production or production sites, the TPG considered whether there is a need to retain the reference to "area" in the definition of "delimiting survey". Recognizing that "boundaries" did need a qualifier, the TPG considered whether a delimiting survey could be a "survey conducted to establish the boundaries of an infestation or freedom from a pest", but disregarded this as it would remove the link to an area, and "infestation" could relate to even a single specimen of a plant.

[220] **Entry (of a pest).** The TPG considered why the last four words of this definition – "and being officially controlled" – were included. The TPG noted that the first part of the definition ("movement of a pest into an area where it is not yet present") relates to any pest, and concluded that the intended, implicit meaning of the second part was "or of a quarantine pest, even if it is not widely distributed". The TPG concluded that no change to this definition was needed.

[221] **Import permit.** The TPG considered whether the use of the verb "authorizing" in the definition of this term could be confusing once the draft ISPM on *Requirements for national plant protection organizations if authorizing entities to perform phytosanitary actions* (2014-002) is adopted. The TPG recalled that an annex to ISPM 20 on the use of specific import authorizations (2008-006) was under development, which may use the verb "authorize" in the same sense as in the definition of "import permit". The TPG noted that "authorize" is a standard dictionary term and its use is already explained well in the "General recommendations on use of terms in ISPMs", and concluded that no action was needed.

[222] **Monitoring.** The TPG considered whether it is necessary to retain the Glossary definition of "monitoring" and whether it is sufficiently clear, particularly as "monitoring" and "surveillance" are translated into the same word in some languages. The TPG agreed to defer any discussion until the outcome of considerations over "surveillance" was known.

[223] **Quarantine area.** The TPG recalled that revision of the definition of this term was dependent on the revision of ISPM 8 (*Determination of pest status in an area*) (2009-005), submitted for adoption at the

[23] 2019 Annotated Glossary: https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/87049/

[24] 07_TPG_2021_Jan.

forthcoming CPM-15 (2021).[25] The TPG agreed that, if the draft text submitted to CPM-15 were adopted, there would be no need for that revision.

[224] The TPG:

(31) *invited* the SC to consider deleting "measures" from the end of the definition of "area of low pest prevalence" as an ink amendment to ISPM 5, to remove redundancy;

(32) *requested* that the Secretariat remove the asterisk from the term "commodity" and set "established" in bold in the definition of "outbreak" in ISPM 5;

(33) *agreed* to defer consideration of the definition of "monitoring", in terms of the need for it and its clarity, pending a conclusion to review of the term "surveillance" (2020-009);

8. TPG work plan

[225] The TPG updated its work plan for 2021 (Appendix 5).

[226] The Secretariat clarified the role of the TPG members in translations. Members of the TPG help to translate the names of new subjects to go onto the *List of topics for IPPC standards* and consider translation issues when responding to first consultation comments on new or revised definitions, but it is FAO Language Service who translate the definitions for the first consultation. For the first consultation, the definitions are translated into French and Spanish; for the second consultation, the definitions are submitted only in English. For ink amendments resulting from the consistency review of standards, the SC had agreed via e-decision[26] that, where resources permit, initial translation is undertaken by TPG members following the SC May meeting each year, for subsequent checking by the FAO Language Service.

[227] The TPG:

(34) *invited* the SC to note the TPG work plan for 2021 (Appendix 5).

9. Any other business

[228] The TPG member for the Russian language, Andrei ORLINSKI, expressed his thanks to the TPG as he approached his retirement later in the year, and said what a great pleasure it had been to have been involved in the panel over the ten years of his membership. The TPG and the Secretariat joined in thanking Mr ORLINSKI for his many years of contribution, the enthusiasm which he brought to his work and the value of his interventions, and wished him well for his retirement.

10. Date and venue of the next meeting

[229] The next meeting of the TPG was tentatively scheduled for the second week in December 2021, probably in virtual mode.

11. Close of the meeting

[230] The Secretariat thanked the TPG members for their contributions to the work of the TPG and invited them to respond to the evaluation survey for the meetings.[27]

[231] The TPG Chairperson also expressed her gratitude to the TPG members, who in turn thanked the Secretariat.

[232] The Chairperson closed the meeting.

[25] TPG 2018-12, agenda item 6.1.

[26] 2020_eSC_Nov_03

[27] Surveys: https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/7MD68SL; https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/PYNL7L2.

Appendix 1: Combined agenda from the December 2020 – January 2021 TPG meetings

N	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER
1.	**Opening of the meeting**		
1.1.	Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat	-	Secretariat
2.	**Meeting arrangements**		
2.1.	Selection of the Chairperson	-	-
2.2.	Selection of the Rapporteur	-	Chairperson
2.3.	Adoption of the agenda	01_TPG_2020_Dec 01_TPG_2021_Jan	Chairperson
2.4.	Current specification: TP 5 (TPG) (2016) [Posted June 2016 in three languages]	Link to TP 5	Secretariat
3.	**Administrative Matters**		
3.1.	Documents list	02_TPG_2020_Dec 02_TPG_2021_Jan	Secretariat
3.2.	Participants list	03_TPG_2020_Dec 03_TPG_2021_Jan	Secretariat
4.	**Addressing TPG-related comments on draft ISPMs submitted to the first consultation** Draft answers proposed by the TPG members via OCS		
4.1.	Commodity-based standards for phytosanitary measures (2019-008), Priority 1	04_TPG_2020_Dec	ORLINSKI
4.2.	Focused revision of ISPM 12 (“re-export”) (2015-011), Priority 2	05_TPG_2020_Dec	BOUHOT-DELDUC
4.3.	Audit in the phytosanitary context (2015-014), Priority 2	06_TPG_2020_Dec	OMAR
4.4.	Draft PT: Irradiation treatment for *Tortricidae* on fruits (2017-011)	07_TPG_2020_Dec	NING / MELCHO
4.5.	Draft 2019 and 2020 Amendments to ISPM 5 (1994-001): - “emergency action” (2018-044) - “clearance (of a consignment)” (2018-045) - “detection survey” (consequential to 2015-013 “survey”) “incidence” (2018-010)	08_TPG_2020_Dec	NORDBO / KOECH
5.	**Reports**		
5.1.	Previous meeting report of the TPG (December 2019), including the TPG work plan	Link to TPG reports Link to the TPG work plan (work area; log on needed)	BOUHOT-DELDUC
5.2.	Extracts from other meeting reports of relevance to the TPG	09_TPG_2021_Jan_Rev 1	Secretariat
6.	**Subjects on the TPG work programme** Proposals for new or revised terms/definitions will be compiled into new draft Amendments to the Glossary, to be submitted to the SC in May 2021.		
6.1.	- "emergency measure", "provisional measure"	11_TPG_2021_Jan	RAMARATHNAM
6.2.	- "general surveillance", "specific surveillance" and "surveillance"	05_TPG_2021_Jan	MELCHO
6.3.	- "germplasm"	10_TPG_2021_Jan	KOECH
6.4.	- "inspection" - Definitions of “Inspection”, “Clearance”, “Compliance procedure” and “Release”	06_TPG_2021_Jan 08_TPG_2021_Jan	RAMARATHNAM NORDBO
6.5.	- "identity", integrity (of a consignment), phytosanitary security (of a consignment)"	04_TPG_2021_Jan	NORDBO
7.	**Review of ISPMs for consistency of terms and style**		

N	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER
7.1.	General recommendations on consistency (as modified following the TPG 2018 and noted by the SC. To be reviewed and completed as needed)	Link to IPPC Style Guide	Secretariat
7.2.	Consistency of adopted ISPMs (standard by standard): - List of standards that have gone through the consistency review	List of ink amendments proposed or approved for ISPMs (work area; log on needed)	Secretariat
	Annotated glossary: 2020 intermediate version	Web link to the 2018 Annotated Glossary Web link to the 2019 intermediate version (work area; log on needed)	MELCHO
7.3.	Explanation of Glossary terms Standing agenda item for TPG meetings. Members identify before the meeting some glossary terms/definitions requiring further explanations. These terms/definitions will be discussed during the TPG meeting and the need for additional explanations (e.g. in the annotated glossary) discussed.		Secretariat
	- Queries on some Glossary terms	07_TPG_2021_Jan	NORDBO
8.	**TPG work plan for 2021-2022** The TPG will update its work plan for the coming year, based on discussions at the meeting, to be presented to the SC May 2021 for noting.	To be prepared during the meeting	Secretariat
9.	**Any other business**		
10.	**Date and venue of the next meeting**		Secretariat
11.	**Close of the meeting** - Evaluation	December 2020: Link to survey January 2021: Link to survey	Chairperson

Appendix 2: Combined documents list

DOCUMENT NO.	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE
Administrative Documents		
01_TPG_2020_Dec 01_TPG_2021_Jan	2.3	Provisional agenda
02_TPG_2020_Dec 02_TPG_2021_Jan	3.1	Documents list
03_TPG_2020_Dec 03_TPG_2021_Jan	3.2	Participants list
Addressing TPG-related comments on draft ISPMs submitted to the first consultation (1 July–30 September 2020)		
04_TPG_2020_Dec	4.1	Commodity-based standards for phytosanitary measures (2019-008), Priority 1
05_TPG_2020_Dec	4.2	Focused revision of ISPM 12 (“re-export”) (2015-011), Priority 2
06_TPG_2020_Dec	4.3	Audit in the phytosanitary context (2015-014), Priority 2
07_TPG_2020_Dec	4.4	Draft PT: Irradiation treatment for *Tortricidae* on fruits (2017-011)
08_TPG_2020_Dec	4.5	Draft 2019 and 2020 Amendments to ISPM 5 (1994-001): - “emergency action” (2018-044) - “clearance (of a consignment)” (2018-045) - “detection survey” (consequential to 2015-013 “survey”) - “incidence” (2018-010)
Draft ISPMs		
Draft ISPM: Focused revision of ISPM 12 (Phytosanitary certificates) in relation to re-export (2015-011)		
Draft ISPM: Audit in the phytosanitary context (2015-014)		
Draft annex to ISPM 28: Irradiation treatment for *Tortricidae* on fruits (2017-011)		
Draft ISPM: Commodity-based standards for phytosanitary measures (2019-008)		
1994-001	-	Draft 2019 and 2020 Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms) (1994-001) *(for the TPG review)*
Subjects on the TPG work programme		
04_TPG_2021_Jan	5.5	"identity", integrity (of a consignment), phytosanitary security (of a consignment)"
05_TPG_2021_Jan	5.2	"general surveillance", "specific surveillance" and "surveillance"
06_TPG_2021_Jan	5.4	"inspection"
08_TPG_2021_Jan	5.4	Definitions of “Inspection”, “Clearance”, “Compliance procedure” and “Release”
10_TPG_2021_Jan	5.3	"germplasm"
11_TPG_2021_Jan	5.1	"emergency measure", "provisional measure"
Other documents		
07_TPG_2021_Jan	6.3	Queries on some Glossary terms
09_TPG_2021_Jan_Rev1	4.2	Extracts from other meeting reports of relevance to the TPG

DOCUMENT NO.	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE
IPP LINKS:		**Agenda item**
Current specification: TP 5 (TPG, 2016)		2.4
Link to TPG reports		4.1
Link to the TPG work plan		4.1
Link to IPPC Style Guide		6.1
List of ink amendments proposed or approved for ISPMs		6.2
Web link to the 2018 Annotated Glossary		6.2
Web link to the 2019 intermediate version		6.2
Link to survey, Link to survey		7, 11

Appendix 3: Participants list

	Participants details			TPG member's term	
	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Participant role	Email address	begins	ends
✓	**Ms Laurence BOUHOT-DELDUC** 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 **FRANCE** Tel: (+33) 149558437 Fax: (+33) 149555949	Steward / French	laurence.bouhot-delduc@agriculture.gouv.fr	Nov 2013	**2023** (1st term: 2013 - 2018)
✓	**Ms Asenath Abigael KOECH** Pest Risk Analysis expert/Plant health inspector Kenya Plant Health Inspectorate Service (KEPHIS) KEPHIS Headquarters OLOOLUA RIDGE , KAREN P.O. BOX 49592-00100, NAIROBI, **KENYA** Mobile: +254 -722973535 Office: +254 – 709891110 Fax: +254 -020 3536175	English	akoech@kephis.org; abigakoech@gmail.com	May 2017	**2022**
✓	**Ms Beatriz MELCHO** Ministry of Livestock, Agriculture and Fisheries, General Direction of Agricultural Services, Plant Protection Division Avda. Millan 4703 CP 12900 Montevideo, **URUGUAY** Tel: (+598) 2 309 8410 ext 267	Spanish	bmelcho@mgap.gub.uy; bemelcho@hotmail.com	Nov 2010	**2025** (1st term: 2010 - 2015) (2nd term: 2015 - 2020)
✓	**Mr Ebbe NORDBO** **DENMARK** Mobile: (+45) 28740095	English	ebbenordbo@outlook.com	Oct 2009	**2024** (1st term: 2009 - 2014) (2nd term: 2014 - 2019)
✓	**Ms Shaza Roushdy OMAR** 8 Kamal El-Din Salah street Garden City, Cairo **EGYPT** Mobile: (+20) 227972454 Fax: (+20) 227963989	Arabic	shaza.roshdy@gmail.com	May 2012	**2022** (1st term: 2012 - 2017)

	Participants details			TPG member's term	
	Name, mailing, address, telephone	**Participant role**	**Email address**	**begins**	**ends**
✓	**Mr Andrei ORLINSKI** European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization 21 bd. Richard Lenoir 75011 Paris, **FRANCE** Tel: (+33) 1 45 20 77 94 ; (+33) 1 84790743 Fax: (+33) 1 70 76 65 47	Russian	Orlinski@eppo.fr	November 2010	**2021** (1st term: 2010 - 2015) (2nd term: 2015 - 2020)
✓	**Mr Rajesh RAMARATHNAM** 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	English	rajesh.ramarathnam@canada.ca	January 2019	**2024**
✓	**Ms Olga LAVRENTJEVA** Adviser in Phytosanitary Affairs Ministry of Rural Affairs Lai tn 39 // Lai tn 41 15056 Tallinn **ESTONIA** Tel: +372 625 6101 Fax: +372 625 6200	Observer	Olga.Lavrentjeva@agri.ee	January 2021 (Overlap with a previous TPG member for Russian language)	**2026**

IPPC Secretariat	
Name	**Email address**
Ms Artur SHAMILOV Standard Setting Officer	Artur.Shamilov@fao.org
Mr Edgar MUSHEGYAN Standard Setting Associate	Edgar.Mushegyan@fao.org
Ms Aixa DELGRECO Standard Setting Associate	Aixa.DelGreco@fao.org
Ms Karen ROUEN IPPC Secretariat	Karen@karenrouen.com

Appendix 4: Draft 2021 Amendments to the Glossary (1994-001)

DRAFT 2021 AMENDMENTS TO ISPM 5: *GLOSSARY OF PHYTOSANITARY TERMS* (1994-001)

Publication history

(This is not an official part of the standard)

Date of this document	2020-06-08
Document category	Draft 2021 Amendments to ISPM 5 *(Glossary of phytosanitary terms)* (1994-001)
Current document stage	*To* first consultation
Major stages	CEPM (1994) added topic: 1994-001, Amendments to ISPM 5: Glossary of phytosanitary terms 2006-05 Standards Committee (SC) approved specification TP5 2012-10 Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG) revised specification 2012-11 SC revised and approved revised specification, revoking Specification 1 2021-01 TPG proposed 2021 amendments below 2021-05 SC revised the 2021 amendments via the Online Comment System and approved the 2021 amendments for the first consultation via e-decision (2021_eSC_MayXX)/virtual meeting.
Notes	Note to Secretariat formatting this paper: formatting in definitions and explanations (strikethrough, bold, italics) needs to remain.

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

[2] Guiding note: In the draft 2021 Amendments to the Glossary, certain terms and definitions are being proposed as a 'package' in the sense that the proposals are interlinked. Therefore, it is suggested that proposals within each 'package' be read in conjunction. 'Packages' are:

- The inter-linked definitions of the terms *identity (of a consignment), integrity (of a consignment) and phytosanitary security (of a consignment)*;
- The inter-linked definitions of the terms *inspection, test, compliance procedure (for a consignment), clearance (of a consignment) and release (of a consignment)*;
- The inter-linked definitions of the terms *general surveillance, specific surveillance and surveillance*;
- The inter-linked definitions of the terms *emergency measure and provisional measure.*

1. ADDITION

1.1. "identity (of a consignment)" (2011-001)

[3] The term '*identity* (*of a consignment*)' has been used frequently in ISPMs, notably in the context of the so-called '*identity check*' performed at export, import or transit. However, the use and meaning of this term and '*integrity (of a consignment)*', often used together, has been inconsistent, unclear and seemingly overlapping. At the request from the CPM-6 in 2011, the SC in 2012 had added the term to the List of topics for IPPC standards.

[4] An approach to defining the term had been submitted by the TPG and approved by the SC in 2013, implying that a consignment's identity is equivalent to information on the phytosanitary certificate. However, it remained unresolved which particular aspects of the phytosanitary certificate should be emphasized in a definition of 'identity'. The SC agreed to combine the work on definitions for the inter-related terms '*identity (of a consignment)*', '*integrity (of a consignment)*' and '*phytosanitary security (of a consignment)*'.

[5] A first TPG draft 'package' of those definitions had been discussed by the SC in 2014, but the further development process put on hold, awaiting the output from the Expert Drafting Group on "*Focused revision of ISPM 12 (Phytosanitary certificates) in relation to re-export*" that met in December 2019. Subsequently, the TPG in January 2021 had submitted a new proposal, reviewed by the SC in May 2021, and sent for consultation.

[6] The following explanatory points may be considered when reviewing the proposal:

(1) The identity of a consignment relates to certain consignment characteristics attested in its accompanying phytosanitary certificate, namely those characteristics that are not supposed to change from the time of phytosanitary certification in a country until import into another country. When considering whether simply the *number* of the phytosanitary certificate is the same as the consignment's identity, it had been concluded that not all elements of the phytosanitary certificate could reasonably be considered part of the consignment's identity. Then, to decide which elements are relevant for the identity and which not, the line of logic has been to reply to the question: what is the core phytosanitary concern of the importing NPPO when performing an 'identity check'? The reply is: to reassure that *exactly those specimens* of plants, plant products or other articles (i.e. *components from a particular place of origin*) that are about to be imported are *exclusively those that had been certified*;

(2) Thus, the *identity* of a consignment is: its components (being the core *material* content) and its origin (being the core *immaterial* characteristic);

(3) In broad terms, the '*components*' corresponds to the sections in phytosanitary certificates on *'Name of produce and quantity declared'* and '*Botanical name of plants*', as expressed in the definition;

(4) In contrast, descriptions provided in the phytosanitary certificate sections on 'Number and description of packages' and 'Distinguishing marks' may certainly be helpful for the practical spotting of one particular consignment among others, but are not considered part of the consignment's identity;

(5) The quantity of items in the consignment is referred to in the definition. Obviously, the identity would have changed if any item was *added* to a consignment after phytosanitary certification, corresponding to the fact that the certifying statement of the phytosanitary certificate would then no longer cover all components of the consignment. In contrast, it cannot be generalized whether any (unintentional) *loss* or (intentional) *subtraction* of items from the consignment after phytosanitary certification would change the consignment's identity. The SC, therefore, has concluded that the issue of quantity cannot possibly be explained to all detail in a definition. Referring to 'the components' is sufficient to indicate that any quantity *above* the declared quantity would certainly be deemed a change of identity;

(6) The consignment's origin is also an important part of consignment´s identity and it corresponds to the section in phytosanitary certificates on '*Place of origin*', as expressed in the definition and explained in ISPM 12 (*Phytosanitary certificates*);

(7) The number of the phytosanitary certificate is implicit and need not be mentioned in the definition, as the identity refers to a specific phytosanitary certificate;

(8) The sections of phytosanitary certificates on 'Name and address of exporter', 'Declared name and address of consignee', 'Declared means of conveyance' and 'Declared point of entry' are not considered part of the consignment's identity;

(9) The proposed definition of '*identity (of a consignment)*' does not conflict with current uses of the term 'identity' (in relation to a consignment) in adopted ISPMs. It is noted that in the draft revised ISPM 12 currently sent for second consultation, the use of the term 'identity' (in relation to a consignment) has been omitted;

(10) Defining '*identity (of a consignment)*' facilitates the revision of the definitions of '*integrity (of a consignment)*' and '*phytosanitary security (of a consignment)*'.

Proposed addition

identity (of a **consignment**)	The components of a **consignment** as covered by its **phytosanitary certificate** and described in the sections "name of produce and quantity declared", "botanical name of **plants**" and "place of origin"

1.2. "general surveillance" (2018-046)

[7] During their December 2018 meeting, the TPG noted that the revised ISPM 6 (*Surveillance*) had resulted in a slight change in the meaning of general and specific surveillance, with the previous version of ISPM 6 referring to "specific surveys" for what is now called "specific surveillance". The TPG had proposed that the terms "general surveillance" and "specific surveillance" be added to the TPG work programme for inclusion in the Glossary, to provide clarity without having to read ISPM 6, and the terms had been added to the work programme by the SC at its meeting in May 2019.

[8] During their November 2019 meeting, the TPG discussed the definitions of both terms "general surveillance" and "specific surveillance" together with an analysis of the use of these terms in adopted ISPMs. The TPG considered various options for a definition for "general surveillance".

[9] In their January 2021 meeting, the TPG had submitted a definition proposal, reviewed by the SC in May 2021, and sent for consultation.

[10] The following explanatory points may be considered when reviewing the proposal for the addition of the term:

- It is useful to add the term and definition in the Glossary to clarify its meaning in ISPM 6 and other adopted ISPMs;
- It is noted that in the current definition of *surveillance*, the "survey" and "monitoring" refer to specific surveillance and the "other procedures" to general surveillance;
- The proposed definition refers to "various sources" rather than "procedures" to allow for sources of data that are not procedures. These various sources of data can be official or unofficial, as explained in ISPM 6;
- "Pests" is used rather than "pest presence or absence" to allow for surveillance of other characteristics of pests;
- With reference to the "data" or "information" resulting from the surveillance, "data" refers to the raw collected material, which then becomes "information" once it has been analysed and verified. The word "data" is therefore appropriate in the context of *general surveillance*;

- Data are not official until they have been approved by the NPPO; therefore, the process does not stop with the collection of data, as analysis and verification are also key important parts of the process when non-official data-sources are being used.

Proposed addition

general surveillance	An **official** process whereby data on **pests** in an **area** are collected from various sources other than **surveys**, analysed and verified.

1.3. "specific surveillance" (2018-047)

[11] During their December 2018 meeting, the TPG noted that the revised ISPM 6 (*Surveillance*) had resulted in a slight change in the meaning of general and specific surveillance, with the previous version of ISPM 6 referring to "specific surveys" for what is now called "specific surveillance". The TPG had proposed that the terms "general surveillance" and "specific surveillance" be added to the TPG work programme for inclusion in the Glossary, to provide clarity without having to read ISPM 6, and the terms had been added to the work programme by the SC at its meeting in May 2019. The TPG in its January 2021 meeting had submitted a proposal, reviewed by the SC in May 2021, and sent for consultation.

[12] The following explanatory points may be considered when reviewing the proposal for the addition of the term:

- The only distinction between general and specific surveillance is the source of the data, as both types of surveillance can be directed to specific pests;
- Specific surveillance is achieved through surveys;
- With reference to the "data" or "information" resulting from the surveillance, "data" refers to the raw collected material, which then becomes "information" once it has been processed; data are not official until approved by the NPPO. The word "information" is therefore appropriate in the context of *specific surveillance*;
- Reference to "presence or absence" of a pest in the definition would be too restrictive as it would exclude seeking information on other characteristics of a pest population, such as pest biology or distribution, as allowed by the Glossary definitions of "survey (of pests)" and "monitoring survey";
- The TPG considered whether the definition should refer to surveys of specific pests because the Glossary term "survey" has the qualifier "(of pests)". In ISPM 6, the target of the specific surveillance may be a pest, a host, a commodity, a pathway or a combination of these, so plural is considered appropriate for "pests" because it allows, for example, a survey on potato pests.

Proposed addition

specific surveillance	An **official** process whereby information on **pests** in an **area** is obtained through **surveys**.

2. REVISION

2.1. "surveillance" (2020-009)

[13] During their December 2018 meeting, the TPG noted that the revised ISPM 6 (*Surveillance*) had resulted in a slight change in the meaning of general and specific surveillance, with the previous version of ISPM 6 referring to "specific surveys" for what is now called "specific surveillance". The TPG had proposed that the terms "general surveillance" and "specific surveillance" be added to the TPG work programme for inclusion in the Glossary, to provide clarity without having to read ISPM 6, and the terms had been added to the work programme by the SC at its meeting in May 2019.

[14] During their November 2019 meeting, the TPG also discussed the definition of "surveillance" and invited the SC to add it to the TPG work programme. The SC in November 2020 reviewed the TPG work programme and agreed to add the term. The TPG in its January 2021 meeting had submitted a proposal, reviewed by the SC in May 2021, and sent for consultation.

[15] The following explanatory points may be considered when reviewing the proposal for the revision of the definition:

- The TPG considered various possible modifications of the current Glossary definition of "surveillance", but considering the proposed definitions of "general surveillance" (cf. section 1.2) and "specific surveillance" (cf. section 1.3), is finally proposing a definition that simply says that surveillance is "general surveillance and specific surveillance".

Current definition

Surveillance	An **official** process which collects and records data on **pest** presence or absence by **survey**, **monitoring** or other procedures [CEPM, 1996; revised CPM, 2015]

Proposed revision

Surveillance	**General surveillance** and **specific surveillance** ~~An **official** process which collects and records data on **pest** presence or absence by **survey**, **monitoring** or other procedures~~

2.2. "integrity (of a consignment)" (consequential)

[16] The SC in 2013 agreed to combine the work on definitions for the inter-related terms '*identity (of a consignment)*', '*integrity (of a consignment)*' and '*phytosanitary security (of a consignment)'*, and added *integrity (of a consignment)* to the TPG work programme.

[17] While the use and meaning of the terms '*identity*' and '*integrity*' in adopted ISPMs have been inconsistent, unclear and seemingly overlapping, the matter could be appropriately clarified by defining *identity (of a consignment)* and revising the definition of *integrity (of a consignment)*, relating it to the term *identity.*

[18] A first TPG draft 'package' of definitions including '*integrity (of a consignment)*' had been discussed by the SC in 2014, but the further development process put on hold, awaiting the output from the Expert Drafting Group on "*Focused revision of ISPM 12 (Phytosanitary certificates) in relation to re-export*" that met in December 2019. Subsequently, the TPG in January 2021 had submitted a new proposal, reviewed by the SC in May 2021, and sent for consultation.

[19] The following explanatory points may be considered when reviewing the proposal:

(1) By referring to the proposed definition of *identity (of a consignment)* (cf. section 1.1), the relationship between the two concepts is clarified and the definition of *integrity (of a consignment)* simplified;

(2) Consequently, the wording '*composition…as described by its phytosanitary certificate*' is deleted as redundant because that aspect is already included in the proposed definition of the term '*identity'*, which is inserted instead;

(3) The wording '*maintained without loss, addition or substitution*' is substituted by the wording '*is unchanged*', with the intent that such simplification more strongly emphasizes the core phytosanitary concern, namely: that the identity has remained unchanged, i.e. that exactly those specimens of plants, plant products or other articles (i.e. *components from a particular place of origin*) that are about to be imported are exclusively those that had been certified (cf. the

deliberation in section 1.1 regarding the proposed definition of *identity (of a consignment)*, in particular, the SC conclusion regarding *loss* or *subtraction*);

(4) While the unchanged *identity* is one major element of the consignment's integrity, also concerns of '*seals or packaging undamaged*' is considered an important element of integrity and is therefore added to the definition;

(5) The introductory wording '*State of*' is added to emphasize that integrity is a (desirable) state of a consignment, not an action to the consignment, and also added with the intent to provide a simple sentence;

(6) The wording '*or other officially accepted document*' is deleted because ISPMs deal with the harmonization of phytosanitary measures (in this case: as regards phytosanitary certification), whereas any other, bilateral arrangement is irrelevant for the definition;

(7) The proposed definition of *integrity (of a consignment)* does not conflict with current uses of the term in adopted ISPMs. It is noted that in the draft revised ISPM 12 currently sent for the second consultation, the use of the term '*integrity (of a consignment)*' has been avoided.

Current definition

Integrity (of a **consignment**)	Composition of a **consignment** as described by its **phytosanitary certificate** or other **officially** acceptable document, maintained without loss, addition or substitution [CPM, 2007]

Proposed revision

Integrity (of a **consignment**)	~~Composition~~ State of a **consignment** when its **identity** is unchanged and its seals or **packaging** undamaged ~~as described by its **phytosanitary certificate** or other **officially** acceptable document, maintained without loss, addition or substitution~~

2.3. "phytosanitary security (of a consignment)" (2013-008)

[20] The SC in 2013 agreed to combine the work on definitions for the inter-related terms 'identity (of a consignment)', 'integrity (of a consignment)' and 'phytosanitary security (of a consignment)', and added phytosanitary security (of a consignment) to the TPG work programme.

[21] A first TPG draft 'package' of definitions including *phytosanitary security (of a consignment)* had been discussed by the SC in 2014, but the further development process put on hold, awaiting the output from the Expert Drafting Group on "*Focused revision of ISPM 12 (Phytosanitary certificates) in relation to re-export*" that met in December 2019. Subsequently, the TPG in January 2021 had submitted a new proposal, reviewed by the SC in May 2021, and sent for consultation.

[22] *Phytosanitary security* is the term used for the (desirable) state of a consignment for which the *integrity* (cf. section 2.2) has been maintained and its infestation and contamination prevented.

[23] The proposed revision does not change the substantial meaning of the term but aims at providing correct grammar, simplification, and consistency with the proposed definitions of *identity (of a consignment)* and *integrity (of a consignment)*.

[24] The following explanatory points may be considered when reviewing the definitions:

(1) '*Maintenance of integrity*' has been substituted to '*State…when…integrity has been maintained*' to correctly reflect that phytosanitary security is a *state*, not an action (in analogy to the original and revised definition of '*integrity (of a consignment)*');

(2) Similarly, '*prevention of its infestation and contamination…*' has been substituted to '*infestation and contamination…prevented*';

(3) The word '*appropriate*' qualifying the 'phytosanitary measures' in the original definition is considered unnecessary and inappropriate for a definition and is therefore deleted;

(4) A comma has been inserted after *'…integrity has been maintained',* and the original comma after '*…infestation and contamination by regulated pests*' has been deleted in order to clarify that the text '*…through application of phytosanitary measures*' relates only to the latter element. It is considered that maintenance of integrity normally need not involve phytosanitary measures, as also supported by the fact that the current definition of 'integrity' does not refer to 'phytosanitary measures';

(5) It is noted that in the draft revised ISPM 12 currently sent for the second consultation, uses of the term '*phytosanitary security (of a consignment)*' have been retained with the expectation that the substantial meaning of the revised term would not change.

Current definition

Phytosanitary security (of a **consignment)**	Maintenance of the **integrity** of a **consignment** and prevention of its **infestation** and **contamination** by **regulated pests**, through the application of appropriate **phytosanitary measures** [CPM, 2009]

Proposed revision

Phytosanitary security (of a **consignment)**	~~Maintenance of the **integrity**~~ State of a **consignment** when its **integrity** has been maintained, and ~~prevention of~~ its **infestation** and **contamination** by **regulated pests**~~,~~ prevented through the application of ~~appropriate~~ **phytosanitary measures**

2.4. "germplasm" (2020-005)

[25] "Plants for planting" and "germplasm" are noted to have entered the Glossary independently. The distinction between the terms in practice has not been closely considered. "Germplasm" is considered to present a higher pest risk than other "plants for planting", since it may originate relatively recently from wild plants, and information on its possible infestation by pests may be limited and based on a relatively short period of observation.

[26] During their November 2019 meeting, the TPG recognized the definition of the term "germplasm" as being completely included within the definition of "plants for planting" and invited to add the term to the TPG work programme. In November 2020, the SC added "germplasm" to the list of topics for IPPC standards.

[27] The TPG in January 2021 proposed the revision of the definition of "germplasm" to refer to "plants for planting" and not just "plants". The proposal was reviewed by the SC in May 2021 and sent for consultation. The following revision is proposed.

Current definition

Germplasm	**Plants** intended for use in breeding or conservation programmes [FAO, 1990]

Proposed revision

Germplasm	**Plants <u>for planting</u>** intended for use in breeding or conservation programmes

2.5. "emergency measure" (2020-004)

[28] At its meeting in November 2019, the TPG had proposed the revision of "emergency action" in the draft 2020 Amendments to the Glossary and had invited the SC to add the terms "emergency measure" and

"provisional measure" to the TPG work programme. In November 2020, the SC added both terms to the List of topics for IPPC standards.

[29] At its January 2021 meeting, the TPG considered whether the definition of "emergency measure" needed amending because it refers to "phytosanitary measure" and "provisional measure", which in turn relates to "phytosanitary regulation", which relates to regulated pests.

[30] During the 2001 meeting of the Interim Commission on Phytosanitary Measures Working Group on the Glossary of Phytosanitary Terms (GWG), it was noted that Article VII.6 of the Convention referred to "emergency action", but no article referred to "emergency measure". It was suggested that no particular distinction between "emergency action" and "emergency measure" was being made at the time the revised text was adopted. However, if the terms were to be adopted now by the ICPM, Article VII.6 should most probably refer to "emergency measure" and not to "emergency action". It drew this point to the attention of the Interim Standards Committee. It noted further that the French text uses "mesures" and the Spanish text "medidas".

[31] The GWG, during its 2004 meeting, noted the difference which was made between emergency measure / phytosanitary measure, emergency action / phytosanitary action, mostly in relation to the notification provisions. Some participants believed that emergency action is a type of phytosanitary measure, but others noted that it was not covered under the definition of phytosanitary measure, which refers to regulated pests, and emergency action could be taken on pests not regulated at all or regulated but not for the commodity concerned. The GWG noted that emergency action /emergency measure and their relation to regulated pests should be considered further since it seemed that this left no place for action against pests which are not specifically regulated.

[32] The Expert Working Group for the revision of ISPM 1 (*Phytosanitary principles for the protection of plants and the application of phytosanitary measures in international trade*) in 2004 discussed that emergency action is done on a single occasion and that an emergency measure is an established procedure of what would be done if an emergency situation arose. Therefore, emergency measures encompass emergency actions. It was indicated that the term was being used in the standard in a way not consistent with the Convention, so an explanatory note was included to highlight this.

[33] The explanatory note in section 2.11 (Emergency measures) of ISPM 1 states that: "The term emergency actions in Article VII.6 of the IPPC is interpreted to include emergency measures as defined in ISPM 5."

[34] The TPG in its January 2021 meeting had submitted a proposal for a revised definition of "emergency measure", reviewed by the SC in May 2021, and sent for consultation.

[35] The following explanatory points may be considered when reviewing the proposal for the revision of the definition:

(1) The use of "emergency measure" in adopted ISPMs is in relation to a new or unexpected phytosanitary situation:

- A *new* phytosanitary situation results when a pest, not listed as a regulated pest, may require an emergency action because it has not been previously assessed. At the time of interception, it may be categorized as a regulated pest on a preliminary basis because the NPPO has a cause to believe it poses a pest risk.
- An *unexpected* phytosanitary situation may arise when a pest, although regulated, is detected and has not been listed or otherwise specified because it was not anticipated for the origin, commodity or circumstances for which the list or phytosanitary measure was developed;

(2) The use of "phytosanitary measure" in the current definition of "emergency measure" would imply that an emergency measure can only be used in relation to a regulated pest. However, this current definition contradicts the Convention text (Article VII.6), section 2.11 of ISPM 1, section 4.2 of ISPM 13 and section 5.1.6.2 of ISPM 20. In all these instances, emergency action/measure

can be taken/applied on the detection of a pest, not regulated yet but that could pose a potential threat;

(3) "Phytosanitary measure" is replaced with "official rule or procedure" as a rule encompasses legislation, regulation, statute, etc., and procedure indicates a method or process; furthermore, the rule or procedure is official as it is established, authorized or performed by the NPPO;

(4) The word "prompt" is inserted to emphasize the rapid or quick response to address the urgent situation;

(5) The text "to prevent the introduction or spread of a pest" is inserted to replace "phytosanitary" and thus allows the deletion of "phytosanitary measure"; it qualifies the phytosanitary nature of the situation and the intent of the rule or procedure;

(6) The text "not covered by existing phytosanitary measures" supports the deletion of "new or unexpected" and clarifies that the situation is critical from a phytosanitary standpoint and needs to be addressed.

Current definition

Emergency measure	A **phytosanitary measure** established as a matter of urgency in a new or unexpected phytosanitary situation. An **emergency measure** may or may not be a **provisional measure** [ICPM, 2001; revised ICPM, 2005]

Proposed revision

Emergency measure	A prompt **official** rule or procedure set up to prevent the **introduction** or **spread** of a **pest** in a situation not covered by existing **phytosanitary measures** ~~established as a matter of urgency in a new or unexpected phytosanitary situation~~. An **emergency measure** may or may not be a **provisional measure**

2.6. "provisional measure" (2020-008)

[36] At its meeting in November 2019, the TPG had proposed the revision of "emergency action" in the draft 2020 Amendments to the Glossary and had invited the SC to add the terms "emergency measure" and "provisional measure" to the TPG work programme. In November 2020, the SC added both terms to the List of topics for IPPC standards. At its January 2021 meeting, the TPG discussed the term "provisional measure".

[37] As per its current definition, a "provisional measure" is a phytosanitary regulation established without full technical justification. However, phytosanitary regulation is established to prevent the introduction or spread of quarantine pests or limit the economic impact of regulated non-quarantine pests.

[38] Pest risk analysis (PRA) provides the technical justification for the regulation of a pest. Therefore the current definition of "provisional measure" contradicts the principle of establishing a phytosanitary regulation, which should be based on technical justification.

[39] In reality, a provisional measure is applied following the detection of a new pest which, based on preliminary information, could be considered a potential quarantine pest. Further information in the form of completion of the PRA is required to determine the regulatory status of the pest and the appropriate phytosanitary measures. Provisional measures are established to prevent the introduction or spread of the pest for the duration it takes to complete the PRA. However, the inclusion of "phytosanitary regulation" in the current definition of "provisional measure" contradicts the use of provisional measures, which are established without full technical justification.

[40] In order to address the discrepancy, the TPG looked into amending the definition of "provisional measure". The TPG in its January 2021 meeting had submitted a proposal, reviewed by the SC in May 2021, and sent for consultation.

[41] The following explanatory points may be considered when reviewing the proposal for the revision of the definition:

(1) The term "phytosanitary regulation" is replaced by "temporary official rule" in order to emphasize that a provisional measure is temporary in nature; rule encompasses legislation, regulation, statute, etc.; furthermore, the rule or procedure is official as it is established, authorized or performed by the NPPO;

(2) The text "to prevent the introduction or spread of a pest" further enables the deletion of "phytosanitary regulation" and qualifies the phytosanitary nature and intent of the rule or procedure;

(3) The term "established" is replaced by "set up" in order to further support the temporary nature of the measure; "established" would indicate that a rule is set up on a permanent basis, which is not the case for the provisional measure.

Current definition

Provisional measure	A **phytosanitary regulation** or procedure established without full **technical justification** owing to current lack of adequate information. A **provisional measure** is subjected to periodic review and full **technical justification** as soon as possible [ICPM, 2001]

Proposed revision

Provisional measure	A ~~**phytosanitary regulation**~~ temporary **official** rule or procedure to prevent the **introduction** or **spread** of a **pest**, set up ~~established~~ without full **technical justification** owing to current lack of adequate information~~.~~ and ~~A **provisional measure** is~~ subjected to periodic review and full **technical justification** as soon as possible

2.7. "inspection" (2017-005)

[42] During the revision of the definitions for '*test*' and '*visual examination*', the TPG in 2015 recognized that the definition of '*inspection*' might be considered partly outdated due to technological advances. In 2017, the SC, therefore, added the term '*inspection*' to the List of topics for IPPC standards for a possible revision. Subsequently, the TPG considered possible modifications to the definition to take into account the use of olfactory, acoustic or other types of tools that may assist inspectors in performing inspections.

[43] A revised definition was presented to and considered by the SC in 2018. While confirming the need for retaining the distinction between the definitions of '*inspection*' and '*test*' (as often distinguished in ISPMs and phytosanitary legislation), the SC queried the need and feasibility of including other tools than 'visual examination' into '*inspection*'. Furthermore, noting that ISPM 23 (*Guidelines for inspection*) actually deals with the inspection of '*consignments*' only, the SC noted two different uses of '*inspection*' in ISPM 23: in some parts '*inspection*' is used congruent to its current definition, in other parts explicitly stating that inspection also includes the processes of examination of documents and verification of identity and integrity of the consignment.

[44] The SC did not reach consensus on the way forward and referred the term '*inspection*' back to the TPG, to particularly evaluate the term in relation to '*test*', the uses of '*inspection*' in ISPM 23 and the possible future revision of that standard.

[45] The TPG continued its discussion in its 2018, 2019 and 2021 meetings, also awaiting the parallel considerations of the consignment-related terms '*identity (of a consignment)*', '*integrity (of a consignment)*' and '*phytosanitary security (of a consignment)*'. In this process, the TPG concluded to dismiss proposed amendments to include other examination tools in the definition of inspection and

reconfirmed that the distinction between 'visual' versus 'other than visual' examination in *inspection* and *test*, respectively, remains to be most important.

[46] The TPG considered various ways to overcome the discrepancy between the current definition of '*inspection*' and the broader use of the term (in less than 10 of altogether approximately 70 cases) in certain parts of ISPM 23. Considerations included:

- creating a supplementary definition of '*phytosanitary inspection*' to include the processes of examination of documents and verification of the consignment's identity and integrity,
- broadening the definition of '*inspection*' to include those processes.

[47] However, the TPG finally concluded that, in particular given that:

- '*inspection*' in its current narrow sense, i.e., referring only to the visual examination of plants etc., is being used widely in many ISPMs, including in far the most of the cases within ISPM 23; and
- the Glossary term '*compliance procedure (for a consignment)*', already covering the verification of compliance with phytosanitary import requirements, would fit as the overarching term to be used in the particular parts of ISPM 23,

[48] it would be appropriate to:

- retain the current, narrow definition of '*inspection*'; and
- adjust the very limited number of cases in ISPM 23 where '*inspection*' had been used beyond its current definition by referring instead to '*compliance procedure (for a consignment)*', as proposed for revision (cf. section 2.9).

[49] Following that approach, the proposed revision of '*inspection*' only aims at improving the wording and consistency with other definitions. The SC reviewed the proposal at its meeting in May 2021 and sent it for consultation.

[50] The following explanatory points may be considered when reviewing the proposal for revision:

(1) Through Article VII.2f of the Convention and the definition of '*compliance procedure (for a consignment)*', the terms '*compliance*' and '*non-compliance*' are linked with consignments, and the 'General recommendations on use of terms in ISPMs' stipulates '*conformity*' be used in other cases. As *inspection* has a broader scope than only consignments, '*compliance*' is therefore substituted by '*conformity*';

(2) The word '*determine*' is substituted by '*check*' to reflect the change from '*compliance*' to '*conformity*'; also avoids redundancy as '*determine*' is used earlier in the sentence;

(3) The term '*regulations*' is substituted by '*requirements*', as phytosanitary regulations are at a higher level and refer to regulated pests. However, inspection can be carried out in scenarios other than at import, like at place of production or production site or at export, and inspection in such scenarios may not be always be related to regulated pests;

(4) The word '*other*' is inserted because requirements could also include other elements such as freedom from contaminants (e.g., leaves, soil), the growth stage of the plant, presence of ISPM 15 mark on wood packaging material, etc.;

(5) While the term '*inspection*' needs substitution by '*compliance procedure*' in a few cases in ISPM 23 (irrespective of the proposed revision), the use of the revised definition of '*inspection*' does not conflict with the current uses of the term in adopted ISPMs.

Current definition

Inspection	**Official visual examination** of **plants**, **plant products** or other **regulated articles** to determine if **pests** are present or to determine compliance with **phytosanitary regulations** [FAO, 1990; revised FAO, 1995; formerly "inspect"]

Proposed revision

Inspection	**Official visual examination** of **plants**, **plant products** or other **regulated articles** to determine if **pests** are present or to ~~determine compliance~~ check conformity with other phytosanitary requirements ~~**regulations**~~

2.8. "test" (2021-XXX)

[51] In January 2021, when concluding the proposed revision of 'inspection' (cf. section 2.7), the TPG recommended the consequential consistency revision of the definition of the related term 'test'. The SC reviewed the proposal at its meeting in May 2021 and sent it for consultation.

[52] The proposed revision does not change the substance but merely aims at the consistency of wording.

[53] The following explanatory points may be considered when reviewing the proposal for revision:

(1) Through Article VII.2f of the Convention and the definition of *compliance procedure (for a consignment),* the terms 'compliance' and non-compliance' are linked with consignments, and the 'General recommendations on use of terms in ISPMs' stipulates 'conformity' be used in other cases. As *test* has a broader scope than only consignments, the term 'compliance' is therefore substituted by 'conformity';

(2) The word 'determine' is substituted by 'verify' in order to highlight that in the case of testing, the use of appropriate methods and technology would ensure that the result of the test leads to a decision. In this case, test is a decisive action, and the use of the word 'verify' to describe the action would be more appropriate;

Current definition

Test	**Official** examination of **plants**, **plant products** or other **regulated articles**, other than visual, to determine if **pests** are present, identify **pests** or determine compliance with specific phytosanitary requirements [FAO, 1990; revised CPM, 2018]

Proposed revision

Test	**Official** examination of **plants**, **plant products** or other **regulated articles**, other than visual, to determine if **pests** are present, identify **pests** or ~~determine compliance~~ verify conformity with specific phytosanitary requirements

2.9. "compliance procedure (for a consignment)" (2021-XXX)

[54] In May 2019, the SC added '*clearance (of a consignment)*' to the List of topics for IPPC standards for a possible revision. Subsequently, a proposed revised definition to clarify that '*clearance (of a consignment)*' is a process rather than a result of such a process was sent for consultation in 2020. In response to comments received from several countries, the TPG recommended to the SC that the consignment-related terms '*clearance (of a consignment)*' (cf. section 3.1), '*compliance procedure (for a consignment)*' and '*release (of a consignment)*' (cf. section 2.10) be considered together.

[55] At the same time, in the continued TPG discussions on how to resolve the discrepancy between certain parts of ISPM 23 and the definition of '*inspection*' (cf. section 2.7), the TPG concluded that the Glossary term '*compliance procedure (for a consignment)*' would fit as the overarching term to be used in those parts of ISPM 23, whereby the discrepancy would be resolved through a very limited number of adjustments to ISPM 23. The SC reviewed the proposal at its meeting in May 2021 and sent it for consultation.

[56] The proposed revision in particular aims at expanding on the possible elements (as outlined in ISPM 23) of a compliance procedure by explicitly including and creating links to '*inspection*', '*test*', and the examination of documents and verification of the consignment's '*integrity*'.

[57] The following explanatory points may be considered when reviewing the proposal for revision:

(1) The addition of '*of document checks, verification of consignment integrity, and inspection or testing of plants, plant products or other regulated articles*' serves to more specifically explain which elements a compliance procedure may consist of, and thereby creating a clear link to those concepts and definitions. It is noted that the proposed revised definition of *integrity (of a consignment)* includes the 'identity is unchanged' so that verification of integrity includes verification of identity;

(2) '*Procedure*' is substituted by '*process*' in order to highlight that it is a series of steps or actions that are performed and, when completed, leads to the release of a consignment or transit through a country;

(3) The wording '*used to verify*' is substituted by 'to check' in order to highlight that there may be additional steps or actions needed prior to completing the compliance procedure; for example, an inspection may identify the need to test. Verification would be a decisive step, and in the case of compliance procedure, considering the potential for additional steps or actions, "*check*" is more appropriate than "*verify*";

(4) As the definition of '*phytosanitary measure*' includes '*any...official procedure*', the notion of a consignment complying with phytosanitary measures is inadequate. The wording '*…or phytosanitary measures related to transit' is therefore changed to 'or if relevant phytosanitary measures related to transit have been applied*';

(5) The proposed definition of '*compliance procedure (for a consignment)'* does not conflict with the current uses of the term in ISPMs.

Current definition

compliance procedure (for a **consignment**)	**Official** procedure used to verify that a **consignment** complies with **phytosanitary import requirements** or **phytosanitary measures** related to **transit** [CEPM, 1999; revised CPM, 2009]

Proposed revision

compliance procedure (for a **consignment**)	**Official** ~~procedure used to verify that~~ process of document checks, verification of **consignment integrity**, and **inspection** or **testing** of **plants**, **plant products** or other **regulated articles** to check if a **consignment** ~~complies with~~ meets **phytosanitary import requirements** or if relevant **phytosanitary measures** related to **transit** have been applied

2.10. "release (of a consignment)" (2021-XXX)

[58] In January 2021, when discussing the proposed deletion of 'clearance (of a consignment)', the TPG recommended the consequential revision of the definition of 'release (of a consignment)'. The SC reviewed the proposal at its meeting in May 2021 and sent it for consultation.

[59] The following explanatory points may be considered when reviewing the proposal for revision:

(1) The revision does not change the substance of the definition but merely links *release* to *compliance procedure* rather than to *clearance* (as proposed for deletion, cf. section 3.1);

(2) The revised definition of *release (of a consignment)* does not conflict with the current uses of the term in adopted ISPMs.

Current definition

release (of a **consignment)**	Authorization for **entry** after **clearance** [FAO, 1995]

Proposed revision

release (of a **consignment)**	Authorization for **entry** after completion of the **compliance procedure** ~~**clearance**~~

3. DELETIONS

3.1. "clearance (of a consignment)" (2018-045)

[60] In 2018, the TPG had noted that the definition of '*clearance (of a consignment)*' is unclear as to whether clearance is a particular *process* or the *result* of a process and recommended the definition be revised. In May 2019, the SC added '*clearance (of a consignment)*' to the List of topics for IPPC standards. Subsequently, a revised definition to clarify that clearance is a *process* rather than a result of such process and that such process is '*official'* was sent for the first consultation in 2020. In response to comments received from several countries, the TPG recommended to the SC that the consignment-related terms '*clearance (of a consignment)*', '*compliance procedure (for a consignment)*' (cf. section 2.9) and '*release (of a consignment)*' (cf. section 2.10) be considered together.

[61] Discussing the Glossary terms '*clearance (of a consignment)*' (in its prospective revised form) and '*compliance procedure (for a consignment)*' in its meeting in December 2020 / January 2021, the TPG concluded that the two terms, in essence, are almost synonymous, given the general agreement at the consultation that clearance is an 'official process'. The TPG concluded that the term is redundant, both in its current and revised version, and therefore recommended the term and definition be deleted from the Glossary. Consequential to the proposed deletion, the definition of '*release (of a consignment)*' would need a slight revision (as proposed, cf. section 2.10), and some very few ink amendments in adopted ISPMs are recommendable.

[62] The SC reviewed the proposal at its meeting in May 2021 and sent it for consultation.

Definition to be deleted

Clearance (of a **consignment)**	Verification of compliance with phytosanitary regulations [FAO, 1995]

Appendix 5: TPG Work Plan 2021-2022

TABLE 1 - REGULAR TASKS

Regular tasks		Detailed task	Responsible	Deadline	Comments
1. Meeting reports: preparation and update to SC	**February 2021**	Draft report to Steward, Chairperson and rapporteur	Secretariat	2021-02-15	
		Steward, Chairperson and rapporteur send back draft report	Steward, Chair & rapporteur	2021-02-25	
		Secretariat finalizes report and sends to TPG	Secretariat	2021-03-05	
		TPG reviews report and send comments	All	2021-03-15	
		Final report	Secretariat	2021-03-21	(To allow review in Secretariat)
	Update for SC May 2021	Prepare update (incl. decisions) from December 2020-January2021 meetings for SC May 2021	Secretariat with stewards	2021-03-25	Secretariat to draft; steward to respond by 25/03 tent.
2. Draft ISPMs in 1st consultation (except Amendments, see 3)	Going to SC-7 / 2nd consultation	Terms and consistency comments extracted. (tentative: Import Authorization, Revision of ISPM 4, Revision of ISPM 18, PTs)	Secretariat	2021-10-05	
		Review for possible inconsistencies and consideration of comments	All	at TPG meeting	
		Reactions to comments/consistency review integrated in tables: all drafts, and send to stewards via Secretariat	Secretariat with stewards	2021-12-05	Comments from TPG on these will not be solicited, documents will be finalized by Secretariat and Steward (15/02 deadline for stewards to send Sec. responses to comments and revised draft) DONE
		Check accuracy of translation of definitions in draft ISPMs and propose translations for Chinese, Arabic and Russian	French, Spanish Russian, Chinese, Arabic	2021-12-05	These will be submitted to translation-services when drafts go for translation before CPM

Regular tasks		Detailed task	Responsible	Deadline	Comments
3. Terms and definitions (incl. Amendments to the Glossary)	**2019 Amendments**	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		2020-07 to 09	1st consultation postponed to 2020
		Draft amendments and 1st Cons. comments reviewed		TPG 2020	
		Finalize amendments and responses	Secretariat and steward	2020-12-21	Back to Secretariat by 2020-01-09
		Amendments and responses for TPG comments	ALL	2021-01-28	Draft Amendments and responses to compiled comments to be posted by 1 March for SC-7 / 2nd Cons.
		Check accuracy of translation of definitions in draft ISPMs and propose translations for Chinese, Arabic and Russian	French, Spanish Russian, Chinese, Arabic	2021-01-28	These will be submitted to translation-services when drafts go for translation before CPM
		Draft amendments in 2nd Consultation		2021-07 to 09	
		Consultation by email on 2nd Cons. comments	ALL	TBD, in 2021-10	If Steward feels consultation is needed. The draft Amendments and responses to 2nd 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 2022-01	The translations will be ready for review around the beginning of January and must be posted by 1 March for CPM.
	2020 Amendments	Volunteers sends draft meeting papers to Secretariat	ALL, as allocated in Table 3	2019-10-01	TPG 2019
		Draft 2020 Amendments compiled based on discussions at TPG 2019-11	Secretariat and steward	2019-12-21	Back to Secretariat by 2020-01-10

Regular tasks		Detailed task	Responsible	Deadline	Comments
		TPG members' help to translate new terms proposed for the draft amendments in languages for the List of topics (LOT)	Secretariat	TPG meeting	
		Draft 2020 Amendments finalized	ALL	2020-01-26	
		Amendments processed for SC	Secretariat	2020-02-17	Posting deadline for SC May 2020 is 1 March
		Draft amendments to 1st Consultation		2020-07 to 09	
		Draft amendments and 1st Cons. comments reviewed		TPG 2020	DONE
		Finalize amendments and responses	Secretariat and steward	2020-12-21	Back to Secretariat by 2021-01-09 DONE
		Amendments and responses for TPG comments	ALL	2021-01-28	Draft Amendments and responses to compiled comments to be posted by 1 March for SC-7 / 2nd Cons. Done but need to check bold font in "emergency action".
		Check accuracy of translation of definitions in draft ISPMs and propose translations for Chinese, Arabic and Russian	French, Spanish Russian, Chinese, Arabic	2021-01-28	These will be submitted to translation-services when drafts go for translation before CPM DONE.
		Draft amendments in 2nd Consultation		2021-07 to 09	
		Consultation by email on 2nd Cons. comments	ALL	TBD, in 2021-10	If Steward feels consultation is needed. The draft Amendments and responses to 2nd 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 2022-01	The translations will be ready for review around the beginning of January and must be posted by 1 March for CPM.
	2021 Amendments	Volunteers sends draft meeting papers to Secretariat	ALL, as allocated in Table 3	2020-10-02	TPG 2020 (in fact January 2021)
		Draft 2021 Amendments compiled based on discussions at TPG 2021-01	Secretariat and steward	2021-01-21	Back to Secretariat by 2021-02-10
		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 2021 Amendments finalized	ALL	2021-02-26	

Regular tasks		Detailed task	Responsible	Deadline	Comments
		Amendments processed for SC	Secretariat	2021-02-26	Posting deadline for SC May 2021 is 1 March
		Draft amendments to 1st Consultation		2021-07 to 09	
		Draft amendments and 1st Cons. comments reviewed		TPG 2021-12	
		Finalize amendments and responses	Secretariat and steward	2021-12-21	Back to Secretariat by 2022-01-09
		Amendments and responses for TPG comments	ALL	2022-01-28	Draft Amendments and responses to compiled comments to be posted by 1 March for SC-7 / 2nd Cons.
		Check accuracy of translation of definitions in draft ISPMs and propose translations for Chinese, Arabic and Russian	French, Spanish Russian, Chinese, Arabic	2022-01-28	These will be submitted to translation-services when drafts go for translation before CPM
		Draft amendments in 2nd Consultation		2022-07 to 09	
		Consultation by email on 2nd Cons. comments	ALL	in 2022-10	If Steward feels consultation is needed. The draft Amendments and responses to 2nd 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 2023-01	The translations will be ready for review around the beginning of January and must be posted by 1 March for CPM.
	2022 Amendments	Volunteers sends draft meeting papers to Secretariat	ALL, as allocated in Table 3	2021-10-01	TPG Dec 2021
		Draft 2022 Amendments compiled based on discussions at TPG 2021-12	Secretariat and steward	2021-12-21	Back to Secretariat by 2022-01-10
		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 2022 Amendments finalized	ALL	2022-01-26	
		Amendments processed for SC	Secretariat	2022-02-17	Posting deadline for SC May 2022 is 1 March
		Draft amendments to 1st Consultation		2022-07 to 09	
		Draft amendments and 1st Cons. comments reviewed		TPG 2022	
		Finalize amendments and responses	Secretariat and steward	2022-12-21	Back to Secretariat by 2023-01-09

Regular tasks		Detailed task	Responsible	Deadline	Comments
		Amendments and responses for TPG comments	ALL	2022-01-28	Draft Amendments and responses to compiled comments to be posted by 1 March for SC-7 / 2nd Cons.
		Check accuracy of translation of definitions in draft ISPMs and propose translations for Chinese, Arabic and Russian	French, Spanish Russian, Chinese, Arabic	2022-01-28	These will be submitted to translation-services when drafts go for translation before CPM
		Draft amendments in 2nd Consultation		2022-07 to 09	
		Consultation by email on 2nd Cons. comments	ALL	in 2022-10	If Steward feels consultation is needed. The draft Amendments and responses to 2nd 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 2023-01	The translations will be ready for review around the beginning of January and must be posted by 1 March for CPM.
4. Annotated Glossary – (to be published every 3 years, last published in March 2019)	2019 (intermediate)	To prepare intermediate update based on TPG comments, outcomes of CPM 2019, SC May 2019	Beatriz Melcho	2019-06-15	
		To review intermediate update	All	2019-06-30	
	2020 (intermediate)	To prepare intermediate update based on TPG comments, outcomes of TPG 2019, including updates from SC Nov. 2019, CPM 2020, SC May 2020	Beatriz Melcho	After SC 2020-05	All to review / provide comments by end June 2020
	2021 (intermediate)	To prepare intermediate update based on TPG comments, outcomes of TPG 2020, including updates from SC Nov. 2020, CPM 2021, SC May 2021	Beatriz Melcho	After SC 2021-05	All to review / provide comments by end June 2021
	2022 (for publishing)	To prepare update based on TPG comments, outcomes of TPG 2021, including updates from SC Nov. 2021.	Beatriz Melcho	2022-02-15	All to review / provide comments during TPG 2021 meeting
		To review update	All	TPG meeting	To be approved by SC via e-decision asap in 2022.
5. Explanation of Glossary terms	Members to identify before the meeting some Glossary terms/definitions requiring further explanations (and not already explained in other places, such as the Annotated Glossary)		All	2021-10-01	
6. Review of membership	Annual review of membership to make recommendations to SC on new members needed			TPG meeting	

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

One-off tasks	Detailed task	Responsible	Deadline	Comments
7. Review of ISPMs for consistency and style (other than in draft ISPMs)	Ongoing consistency review	All during TPG meeting		TPG meeting
	Present all ink amendments / proposals for revision made so far	Secretariat	Ongoing	TPG meeting
8. Other tasks	General recommendations on consistency: yearly updates as needed	Secretariat with stewards	2021-01-07	
	General recommendations on consistency	ALL	2021-01-28	Appended to TPG report

TABLE 3 - TERMS AND SUBJECTS ON THE TPG WORK PROGRAMME

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

	Term	Status	Lead	Comments & next steps
1.	bulbs and tubers (as a commodity class) (2017-001)	To CPM-15 2021	Shaza Roshdy Omar	- TPG 2016-12 invited SC to add all commodity class terms to the LOT to consider whether any should be deleted or revised. This recommendation was prompted by the discussions on "commodity class" in the context of ePhyto. - SC 2017-05 added "bulbs and tubers (as a commodity class)" to the LOT. - TPG 2017-12 proposed deletion in the 2018 Amendments. - SC 2018-05 agreed with TPG proposal for deletion and approved it for the first consultation. - TPG 2018-12 discussed first consultation comments and left their proposal for deletion unchanged. - SC-7 2019-05 agreed with TPG proposal for deleting and approved for 2nd consultation - SC 2019-11 agreed with deletion and approved for CPM-15 for adoption as 2018 Amendments to ISPM 5
2.	clearance (of a consignment) (2018-045)	To SC-7 2021	Asenath Abigael Koech	- TPG 2018-12 proposed to add to the LOT following discussions on the definition of inspection. - SC 2019-05 added to LOT - TPG 2019-11 proposed the revision to be presented to SC May 2020 as a draft 2020 Amendments to ISPM 5 - SC 2020-05 approved via e-decision for the 1st consultation - TPG 2020-12 discussed first consultation comments and due to elaboration of "Compliance procedure" proposed to delete from glossary
3.	commodity class (2015-013)	To CPM-15 2021	Andrei Orlinski	- SC 2015-11 added the term to LOT following discussions on the 2014 Amendments, specifically for the terms grain and seeds, and asked the TPG to review this term in light of the recent discussions on the concept of a commodity standard (see section 5 of TPG 2015 report) and commodity classes within the context of ePhyto and consider deletion. - TPG 2016-12 discussed the term in the context of ePhyto and recommended further studies to determine if "commodity class" and specific commodity class terms should be deleted from ISPM 5. - SC 2017-05 noted that the TPG will consider further the term "commodity class" in combination with the review of the different commodity classes included in the Glossary. - TPG 2017-12 proposed deletion in the 2018 Amendments. - SC 2018-05 agreed with TPG proposal for deletion and approved it for the first consultation. - TPG 2018-12 discussed first consultation comments and left their proposal for deletion unchanged.

	Term	Status	Lead	Comments & next steps
				- SC-7 2019-05 agreed with TPG proposal and approved for 2nd consultation - SC 2019-11 agreed with deletion and approved for CPM-15 for adoption as 2018 Amendments to ISPM 5
4.	Compliance procedure (for a consignment)		Ebbe Nordbo	- TPG 2020-12 discussed first consultation comments clearance (of a consignment) and proposed to add to work programme "Compliance procedure (for a consignment) and presented revised definition to SC May 2021 as draft 2021 Amendments to ISPM 5 for 1st consultation
5.	Release (of a consignment)		Ebbe Nordbo	- TPG 2020-12 discussed first consultation comments clearance (of a consignment) and proposed to add to work programme **Release (of a consignment)** and presented revised definition to SC May 2021 as draft 2021 Amendments to ISPM 5 for 1st consultation
6.	Test (consequential to "inspection")		Ebbe Nordbo	- TPG 2020-12 discussed revision of "inspection" and agreed to proposed to add to work programme "test" consequential revision and presented revised definition to SC May 2021 as draft 2021 Amendments to ISPM 5 for 1st consultation
7.	cut flowers and branches (as a commodity class) (2012-007)	To CPM-15 2021	Laurence Bouhot-Delduc	- SC 2012-04 added to the List of topics. Discussed by the SC in relation to the specification for the topic of *International movement of cut flowers and branches*. The SC asked the TPG to review the current definition of *cut flowers and branches*. - TPG 2013 proposal submitted to SC May 2013 in Amendments (2013). - SC 2013-05 postponed the consideration of the revised definition of *cut flowers and branches* (2008-005), and requested the Secretariat to transmit the proposed revised definition (and associated explanations) to the EWG on International movement of cut flowers and branches (2008-005) for further consideration. One issue is whether the ISPM should be restricted to fresh material. - SC 2015-05 discussed the draft ISPM on cut flowers and agreed that the term be kept pending until the draft ISPM has advanced further. - TPG 2015-12 was given an update on the draft ISPM which had its scope modified to "cut flowers and foliage" in SC 2015-11 meeting. - TPG 2016-12 invited SC to add all commodity class terms to the LOT to consider whether any should be deleted or revised. This recommendation was prompted by the discussions on "commodity class" in the context of ePhyto. - SC 2017-05 removed the pending status of "cut flowers and branches (as a commodity class)". - TPG 2017-12 proposed deletion in the 2018 Amendments. - SC 2018-05 agreed with TPG proposal for deletion and approved it for the first consultation. - TPG 2018-12 discussed first consultation comments and left their proposal for deletion unchanged. - SC-7 2019-05 agreed with TPG proposal for deleting and approved for 2nd consultation - SC 2019-11 agreed with deletion and approved for CPM-15 for adoption as 2018 Amendments to ISPM 5
8.	detection survey (consequential to the revision of "survey" (2013-015))	To SC-7 2021	Laurence Bouhot-Delduc	- SC-7 2018-05 asked the TPG to consider whether the definition of "detection survey" should be amended to include "or absence". - TPG 2018-12 discussed the term and proposed revision in 2019 Amendments to ISPM5.

	Term	Status	Lead	Comments & next steps
				- SC 2019-05 agreed with TPG proposal and approved it for first consultation, noting that the consultation would be postponed until 2020. - The term was sent for first consultation in 2020 -TPG 2020-12 - discussed first consultation comments and provided revised proposed definition
9.	emergency action (2018-044)	To SC-7 2021	Laurence Bouhot-Delduc	-TPG 2018-12 proposed to add to the LOT following discussions on the definition of treatment. - SC 2019-05 added to LOT -TPG 2019-11 proposed the revision to be presented to SC May 2020 as a draft 2020 Amendments to ISPM 5 - SC 2020-05 approved via e-decision for the 1st consultation -TPG 2020-12 - discussed first consultation comments and provided revised proposed definition
10.	emergency measure (2020-004)	To 1st Consultation 2021	Rajesh Ramarathnam	- TPG 2019-11 invites the SC to add it to the work programme - SC 2020-11 via e-decision agreed to add it to the LOT - TPG 2021-01 revised definition and presented to SC May 2021 as draft 2021 Amendments to ISPM 5 for 1st consultation
11.	emerging pest (2018-003)	pending	Ebbe Nordbo	- SC 2018-05 considered proposal from TC-RPPOs and agreed to include the term in the TPG work programme - TPG 2018-12 TPG proposed a draft definition of "emerging pest" – for SC to consider future steps. - SC 2018-05 considered TPG proposal and agreed to not send the definition for consultation for inclusion in ISPM 5 at this time. Discussions on the topic were forwarded to CPM Bureau as input into the wider discussion on the concept of "emerging pests".
12.	fruits and vegetables (as a commodity class) (2017-003)	To CPM-15 2021	Andrei Orlinski	- TPG 2016-12 invited SC to add all commodity class terms to the LOT to consider whether any should be deleted or revised. This recommendation was prompted by the discussions on "commodity class" in the context of ePhyto. - SC 2017-05 added "fruits and vegetables (as a commodity class)" to the LOT. - TPG 2017-12 proposed deletion in the 2018 Amendments. - SC 2018-05 agreed with TPG proposal for deletion and approved it for the first consultation. - TPG 2018-12 discussed first consultation comments and left their proposal for deletion unchanged. - SC-7 2019-05 agreed with TPG proposal for deleting and approved it for 2nd consultation - SC 2019-11 agreed with deletion and approved for CPM-15 for adoption as 2018 Amendments to ISPM 5
13.	general surveillance (2018-046)	To 1st Consultation 2021	Beatriz Melcho	-TPG 2018-12 proposed to add to the LOT following discussions on the note on "surveillance" in the Annotated Glossary. - SC 2019-05 added to LOT - TPG 2019-11 agreed to continue working on term - TPG 2021-01 elaborated definition and presented to SC May 2021 as draft 2021 Amendments to ISPM 5 for 1st consultation
14.	Germplasm (2020-005)	To 1st Consultation 2021	Abigael Koech	- TPG 2019-11 invites the SC to add it to the work programme - SC 2020-11 via e-decision agreed to add it to the LOT

	Term	Status	Lead	Comments & next steps
				- TPG 2021-01 revised definition and presented to SC May 2021 as draft 2021 Amendments to ISPM 5 for 1st consultation
15.	grain (as a commodity class) (2017-004)	To CPM-15 2021	Laurence Bouhot-Delduc	- TPG 2016-12 invited SC to add all commodity class terms to the LOT to consider whether any should be deleted or revised. This recommendation was prompted by the discussions on "commodity class" in the context of ePhyto. - SC 2017-05 added "grain (as a commodity class)" to the LOT. - TPG 2017-12 proposed a revision of the term in the 2018 Amendments. - SC 2018-05 agreed with TPG proposal (no change) and approved it for the first consultation. - TPG 2018-12 discussed first consultation comments and left their proposal unchanged. - SC-7 2019-05 agreed with TPG proposal and approved it for 2nd consultation -SC 2019-11 agreed with proposed revision and approved for CPM-15 for adoption as 2018 Amendments to ISPM 5
16.	identity (2011-001)	To 1st Consultation 2021	Ebbe Nordbo	- SC 2011-05 added based on CPM-6 discussion. At CPM-6, in relation to the revised ISPM 12, some members suggested that the SC consider whether there is a need to define the term "identity", and the SC added the term to the work programme as TPG subject. - TPG 2012 suggested an approach, but asked SC to validate before further work. - SC 2013-05 agreed (see TPG 2012-10 report and SC 2013-05 report). - TPG 2014 discussed and incorporated into Amendments (2014). - SC 2014-05 withdrew from Amendments (2014) for TPG to reconsider identity, integrity (of a consignment), phytosanitary security (of a consignment) and section 6.1 of ISPM 12 be reviewed together, and possibly propose revised definitions of the terms and possible consistency changes to section 6.1 of ISPM 12. - TPG 2014-12 reviewed; deferred final decision to e-forum discussion but agreed that terms and ISPM 12 will be processed combined only (for SC May 2015). - SC 2015-05 reviewed but asked TPG to prepare draft specification for the review of ISPM 12 in combination with this term, as not consistency changes or ink amendments. - TPG 2015-06 prepared specification via TPG_2015-06_e-decision_03: Draft specification for the revision of ISPM 12 and submitted to 2015-08 Call for topics. - SC 2015-11 recommended addition of topic to LOT to be approved by CPM-11 (2016). If approved, focused revision of ISPM 12 will be prepared. (Consider if apply "phytosanitary status" revisions as well). - Secretariat suggesting to wait with further work pending revision of ISPM 12 (SC not made pending). - CPM-11 (2016) approved the addition of the Revision of ISPM 12 on Phytosanitary certificates (2015-011), with priority 2. The draft specification will be submitted to consultation in July 2017. - SC 2017-11 agreed to review the comments and consider the draft specification by SC e-decision. - SC approved Specification 67: Focused revision of ISPM 12 (Phytosanitary certificates) in relation to re-export by e-decision (2018_eSC_May_03). -TPG 2019-11 TPG Steward and TPG Assistant Steward prepared discussion paper for EWG on sections 4 and 6 of ISPM 12 and agreed to continue working on term - TPG 2021-01 revised definition and presented to SC May 2021 as draft 2021 Amendments to ISPM 5 for 1st consultation

	Term	Status	Lead	Comments & next steps
17.	incidence (2018-010)	To SC-7 2021	Laurence Bouhot-Delduc	- 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. - 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. TPG 2019-11 agreed to propose to SC May 2020 deletion as a draft 2020 Amendments to ISPM 5 - SC 2020-05 approved via e-decision for the 1st consultation - TPG 2020-12 - discussed first consultation comments and left their proposal for deletion unchanged
18.	inspection (2017-005)	To 1st Consultation 2021	Rajesh Ramarathnam	- 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. - SC 2017-05 added "inspection" to the LOT. - TPG 2017-12 proposed a revision of the term in the 2018 Amendments. - SC 2018-05 discussed TPG proposal and agreed to further consider this term in an SC e-forum. - 2018_eSC_Nov_01: SC decided that the term requires further discussion during SC November 2018 and TPG 2018-12. - 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. - TPG 2019-11 agreed to continue working on it - TPG 2021-01 revised definition and presented to SC May 2021 as draft 2021 Amendments to ISPM 5 for 1st consultation
19.	integrity (of a consignment) (consequential)	To 1st Consultation 2021	Ebbe Nordbo (see identity)	- See identity. - SC 2014-05 withdrew from Amendments (2014). - TPG to reconsider. - TPG 2014-12 reviewed; deferred final decision to e-forum discussion but agreed that terms and ISPM 12 will be processed combined only (for SC May 2015). - SC 2015-05 reviewed but asked TPG to prepare draft specification for the review of ISPM 12 in combination with this term, as not consistency changes or ink amendments. - TPG 2015-06 prepared specification via TPG_2015-06_e-decision_03: Draft specification for the revision of ISPM 12 and submitted to 2015-08 Call for topics. - SC 2015-11 recommended addition of topic to the LOT to be approved by CPM-11 (2016). If approved, focused revision of ISPM 12 will be prepared. - CPM-11 (2016) approved the addition of the Revision of ISPM 12 on Phytosanitary certificates (2015-011), with priority 2. The draft specification will be submitted to consultation in July 2017. - SC 2017-11 agreed to review the comments and consider the draft specification by SC e-decision. - SC approved Specification 67: Focused revision of ISPM 12 (Phytosanitary certificates) in relation to re-export by e-decision (2018_eSC_May_03).

	Term	Status	Lead	Comments & next steps
				-TPG 2019-11 TPG Steward and TPG Assistant Steward prepared discussion paper for EWG on sections 4 and 6 of ISPM 12 and agreed to continue working on term - TPG 2021-01 revised definition and presented to SC May 2021 as draft 2021 Amendments to ISPM 5 for 1st consultation
20.	phytosanitary action (2020-006)	To TPG 2021	Rajesh Ramarathnam	- TPG 2019-11 invites the SC to add it to the work programme - SC 2020-11 via e-decision agreed to add it to the LOT - TPG 2021-01 agreed to continue working on it
21.	phytosanitary procedure (2020-007)	To TPG 2021	Rajesh Ramarathnam	-TPG 2019-11 invites the SC to add it to the work programme - SC 2020-11 via e-decision agreed to add it to the LOT - TPG 2021-01 agreed to continue working on it
22.	phytosanitary security (of a consignment) (2013-008)	To 1st Consultation 2021	Ebbe Nordbo	See identity. - TPG 2012, added SC 2013-05. Details in TPG 2012-10 report. - SC 2013-05 added term to List of topics. - TPG 2014 incorporated to Amendments (2014). - SC 2014-05 withdrew from Amendments (2014). - TPG to reconsider. - TPG 2014-12 reviewed; deferred final decision to e-forum discussion but agreed that terms and ISPM 12 will be processed combined only (for SC May 2015). - SC 2015-05 reviewed but asked TPG to prepare draft specification for the review of ISPM 12 in combination with this term, as not consistency changes or ink amendments. - TPG 2015-06 prepared specification via TPG_2015-06_e-decision_03: Draft specification for the revision of ISPM 12 and submitted to 2015-08 Call for topics. - SC 2015-11 recommended addition of topic to LOT to be approved by CPM-11 (2016). If approved, a focused revision of ISPM 12 will be prepared. - CPM-11 (2016) approved the addition of the Revision of ISPM 12 on Phytosanitary certificates (2015-011), with priority 2. The draft specification will be submitted to consultation in July 2017. - SC 2017-11 agreed to review the comments and consider the draft specification by SC e-decision. - SC approved Specification 67: Focused revision of ISPM 12 (Phytosanitary certificates) in relation to re-export by e-decision (2018_eSC_May_03). -TPG 2019-11 TPG Assistant Steward and TPG Steward prepared discussion paper for EWG on sections 4 and 6 of ISPM 12 and agreed to continue working on term - TPG 2021-01 revised definition and presented to SC May 2021 as draft 2021 Amendments to ISPM 5 for 1st consultation
23.	plants *in vitro* (as a commodity class) (2017-006)	To CPM-15 2021	Shaza Roshdy Omar	- TPG 2016-12 invited SC to add all commodity class terms to the LOT to consider whether any should be deleted or revised. This recommendation was prompted by the discussions on “commodity class” in the context of ePhyto. - SC 2017-05 added “plants *in vitro* (as a commodity class)” to the LOT.

	Term	Status	Lead	Comments & next steps
				- TPG 2017-12 proposed deletion in the 2018 Amendments. - SC 2018-05 agreed with TPG proposal for deletion and approved it for the first consultation. - TPG 2018-12 discussed first consultation comments and left their proposal for deletion unchanged. - SC-7 2019-05 agreed with TPG proposal for deleting and approved it for 2nd consultation - SC 2019-11 agreed with deletion and approved for CPM-15 for adoption as 2018 Amendments to ISPM 5
24.	provisional measure (2020-008)	To 1st Consultation 2021	Rajesh Ramarathnam	- TPG 2019-11 invites the SC to add it to the work programme - SC 2020-11 via e-decision agreed to add it to the LOT - TPG 2021-01 revised definition and presented to SC May 2021 as draft 2021 Amendments to ISPM 5 for 1st consultation
25.	quarantine area (2012-006)	To TPG 2021	Laurence Bouhot-Delduc	- TPFF 2011. - SC 2012-04 added. - To be considered based on a draft revised definition proposed by the TPFF. - TPG 2012-2013 considered definition, but proposed it should be postponed until ISPM 8 is revised. (details in TPG 2012 and 2013 reports). - SC 2013-05 changed the status to pending until after the revision of ISPM 8 (Determination of pest status in an area). - SC 2018-05 changed the status to active as the revision of ISPM8 was approved for first consultation. - TPG 2018-12 discussed, suggests no change but recommends retaining on LOT until revision of ISPM8 is adopted. - SC 2019-05 agreed with TPG proposal
26.	seeds (as a commodity class) (2017-007)	To CPM-15 2021	Laurence Bouhot-Delduc	- TPG 2016-12 invited SC to add all commodity class terms to the LOT to consider whether any should be deleted or revised. This recommendation was prompted by the discussions on "commodity class" in the context of ePhyto. - SC 2017-05 added "seeds (as a commodity class)" to the LOT. - TPG 2017-12 proposed a revision of the term in the 2018 Amendments. - SC 2018-05 agreed with TPG proposal (no change) and approved it for the first consultation. - TPG 2018-12 discussed first consultation comments and left their proposal unchanged. - SC-7 2019-05 agreed with TPG proposal and approved it for 2nd consultation - SC 2019-11 agreed with proposed revision and approved for CPM-15 for adoption as 2018 Amendments to ISPM 5
27.	specific surveillance (2018-047)	To 1st Consultation 2021	Beatriz Melcho	-TPG 2018-12 proposed to add to the LOT following discussions on the note on "surveillance" in the Annotated Glossary. - SC 2019-05 added to LOT - TPG 2019-11 agreed to continue working on it - TPG 2021-01 elaborated definition and presented to SC May 2021 as draft 2021 Amendments to ISPM 5 for 1st consultation
28.	Surveillance (2020-009)	To 1st Consultation 2021	Beatriz Melcho	- TPG 2019-11 agreed to recommend to SC to add it to the work programme - SC 2020-11 via e-decision agreed to add it to the LOT

	Term	Status	Lead	Comments & next steps
				- TPG 2021-01 revised definition and presented to SC May 2021 as draft 2021 Amendments to ISPM 5 for 1st consultation
29.	treatment (2017-008)	To CPM-15 2021	Stephanie Bloem	- TPG 2016-12 invited SC to add the term to the LOT for possible revision to make the term usable in a non-official sense. - SC 2017-05 added "treatment" to the LOT as proposed by TPG. - TPG 2017-12 proposed a revision of the term in the 2018 Amendments. - SC 2018-05 agreed with TPG proposal (no change) and approved it for the first consultation. - TPG 2018-12 discussed first consultation comments and left their proposal unchanged. - SC-7 2019-05 agreed with TPG proposal and approved it for 2nd consultation - SC 2019-11 agreed with proposed revision and approved for CPM-15 for adoption as 2018 Amendments to ISPM 5
30.	wood (as a commodity class) (2017-009)	To CPM-15 2020	Andrei Orlinski	- TPG 2016-12 invited SC to add all commodity class terms to the LOT to consider whether any should be deleted or revised. This recommendation was prompted by the discussions on "commodity class" in the context of ePhyto. - SC 2017-05 added "wood (as a commodity class)" to the LOT. - TPG 2017-12 proposed a revision of the term in the 2018 Amendments. - SC 2018-05 agreed with TPG proposal (no change) and approved it for the first consultation. - TPG 2018-12 discussed first consultation comments and modified the definition to exclude "rattan". - SC-7 2019 agreed with TPG proposal and approved it for 2nd consultation - SC 2019-11 agreed with proposed revision and approved for CPM-15 for adoption as 2018 Amendments to ISPM 5
	Related to consistency			
31.	Review of the use of and/or in adopted ISPMs (2010-030)	Ongoing	Stays on the work programme to be implemented during the consistency review	- TPG discussion 2009. - Modified SC November 2010. - Consistent with general recommendations on consistency, but require a review of every occurrence. Will be considered during consistency study.
32.	commodity class (consistency review; 2018-004)	To CPM-15 2021	Andrei Orlinski	- TPG 2017-12 discussed the term "commodity class" and proposed its deletion in the 2018 Amendments. 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". - SC 2018-05 agreed with TPG proposal and added this consistency review to the TPG work programme. - TPG 2018-12 proposed ink amendments to adopted ISPMs for approval by SC. - SC 2019-05 approved the ink amendments that will be processed for CPM noting.

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
2019-11-18 to 20			**TPG meeting**
2020-01-15	3. Terms and defs	Language leads	Check of translations of draft 2018 Amendments to ISPM5 going for adoption
N/A	2. ISPMs from 1st 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)
2020-02-28	3. Terms and defs	ALL	Review draft 2021 Amendments to ISPM5 following TPG 2019-11 meeting and provide comments in track changes
2020-03-19	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
2020-06-30	4. Ann. Gloss.	ALL	Comment on 2020 intermediate version of Annotated Glossary
2021-10-01	3. Terms and defs		
2021-10-01	8. Other tasks		
2021-10-01	5. Explanation of glossary terms	ALL	Identify terms that need explanation (and which are not explained elsewhere) and provide a paper for TPG 2021 meeting.
2021-12 XX-			**TPG meeting**

Appendix 6: Proposed Amendments to ISPMs (for noting by the Standards Committee and archiving by the Secretariat for future revision of these ISPMs)

ISPM 2: Framework for pest risk analysis		
Section	**Proposed change**	**Rationale**
3.2 Information gathering	Throughout the process, information should be gathered and analysed as required to reach recommendations and conclusions. Scientific publications as well as technical information such as data from ~~surveys~~ surveillance and interceptions may be relevant…..	Technical information can be obtained from both types of surveillance.
ISPM 4: Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas (this proposal may be taken into account during the current Revision of ISPM 4)		
Section	**Proposed change**	**Rationale**
1.2 Establishment and Maintenance of a PFA	ISPM 6:1997 and ISPM 2:1995 provide further details on general surveillance and specific ~~survey~~ surveillance requirements.	For consistency with Revised ISPM 6
1.2.1 Systems to establish freedom	Two general types of systems to provide data are recognized, though variations on or combinations of the two can be used. These are: • general surveillance • specific ~~surveys~~ surveillance. **General surveillance** This involves utilizing all sources of data such as NPPOs, other national and local government agencies, research institutions, universities, scientific societies (including amateur specialists), producers, consultants, museums and the general public. Information may be obtained from: • scientific and trade journals • unpublished historical data • contemporary observations. **Specific ~~surveys~~ surveillance** ~~These~~ It may be carried out using detection or delimiting surveys. They are official surveys and should follow a plan which is approved by the NPPO concerned.	1 and 2) For consistency with Revised ISPM 6. 3) Consequential change
1.3 Documentation and Review	Whatever the type of PFA, documentation should be available, as appropriate, on the: - data assembled to establish the PFA - various administrative measures taken in support of the PFA - delimitation of the PFA - phytosanitary regulations applied technical details of surveillance~~, or survey~~ and monitoring systems used.	Surveys are subset of specific surveillance, delete to avoid confusion.

2.1.1 Systems to establish freedom	Both data from general surveillance and from specific ~~surveys~~ surveillance are acceptable. They are different in that they may provide for different kinds or degrees of phytosanitary security.	For consistency with Revised ISPM 6
2.2.4 Documentation and review	Documentation may include supporting evidence describing official controls such as ~~survey~~ surveillance results, phytosanitary regulations and information on the NPPO as noted in section 1.3.	Both types of surveillance can result in documentation supporting evidence.
2.3 Uninfested Part of a Country Situated Within a Generally Infested Area	In certain cases, a PFA may be established within an area whose infestation status has not been based on specific ~~surveys~~ surveillance.	Consistency with Revised ISPM 6
ISPM 7: Phytosanitary certification system		
Section	**Proposed change**	**Rationale**
2.2 Operational responsibilities	The NPPO should have the capability to undertake the following functions: - document and maintain the information regarding the phytosanitary import requirements where needed for phytosanitary certification and provide appropriate work instructions to personnel – ……. - perform ~~surveys~~ surveillance and monitoring and control activities to confirm compliance with the phytosanitary import requirements to be attested in phytosanitary certificates ……	For consistency
ISPM 9: Guidelines for pest eradication programmes		
Section	**Proposed change**	**Rationale**
2.1 Initiation	The eradication programme may be initiated by detection of a pest new to an area arising from general surveillance or specific ~~surveys~~ surveillance (see ISPM 6 (Guidelines for surveillance)). ….	For consistency with revised ISPM 6
ISPM 10: Requirements for the establishment of pest free places of production and pest free production sites		
Section	**Proposed change**	**Rationale**
1.1 Application of a Pest Free Place of Production and Pest Free Production Site	….. Pest freedom is established by ~~surveys~~ surveillance and/or growing-season inspections and maintained as necessary by other systems to prevent the entry of the pest into the place of production. The operations are supported by appropriate documentation. Depending on the pest concerned, local circumstances and the acceptable level of risk for the importing country, an adequate level of security may be achieved by different intensities of measures, ranging from a simple growing-season inspection in the year of export to a complex system	Both types of surveillance are relevant Specific surveillance involves surveys

	of ~~surveys~~ specific surveillance and supporting procedures maintained over several years.	
3.1 General Records	Documentation should be available, as appropriate, on the administrative system applied by the NPPO for the establishment of pest free places of production or pest free production sites in general, and in relation to the particular pest(s) concerned. This includes details of the surveillance systems used (including inspection, ~~survey~~ and monitoring), of the procedures for reaction to pest presence (corrective action plans), and of the procedures to ensure product identity and phytosanitary security of the consignment. Documentation should also be available, as appropriate, on the specific actions taken at a place of production or a production site and any associated buffer zone in relation to the approval of pest free status for a particular growing season, including the results of surveys and the pest management records (e.g. types and dates of treatments, use of resistant cultivars).	Deleted to avoid redundancy
ISPM 11: Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests		
Section	**Proposed change**	**Rationale**
Annex 4 Presence or absence in the PRA area (refer to section 2.1.1.2)	Determination of presence or absence in the PRA area is a particular challenge for NPPOs when plants are proposed for import because the plants may already be growing in locations (e.g. botanical gardens, home gardens) that may not be reported. Sources of information may include horticultural, agricultural, forestry and aquaculture publications and databases. The NPPO may need to carry out ~~particular surveys~~ specific surveillance to obtain information on presence and distribution.	Suggest to replace particular surveys by “specific surveillance”
ISPM 17: Pest reporting		
Section	**Proposed change**	**Rationale**
3.1 Surveillance	Pest reporting depends on the establishment, within countries, of national systems for surveillance, as required by the Article IV.2(b) of the IPPC. Information for pest reporting may be derived from either of the two types of pest surveillance systems defined in ISPM 6 (~~Guidelines for~~ surveillance), general surveillance or specific ~~surveys~~ surveillance. Systems should be put in place to ensure that such information is sent to and collected by the NPPO. The surveillance and collection systems should operate on an ongoing and timely basis. Surveillance should be conducted in accordance with ISPM 6.	For consistency with revised ISPM 6
ISPM 26: Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)		

Section	Proposed change	Rationale
2.2.4 Additional technical information for the establishment of an FF-PFA	Additional information that may be useful during the establishment phase of FF-PFAs includes: - historical records of detection, biology and population dynamics of the target pest(s), and ~~survey~~ surveillance activities for the designated target pest(s) in the FF-PFA	For consistency
Instances of these terms in Annexes to ISPM 26 are OK, any amendment is proposed.		
ISPM 35: Systems approach for pest risk management of fruit flies (Tephritidae)		
Section	**Proposed change**	**Rationale**
2. Development of an FF-SA	Growing period: - flowering control and timing of fruit production ….. - monitoring and ~~survey~~ surveillance of the target fruit fly species (e.g. trapping or fruit sampling) Harvest: - harvest at a specific stage of fruit development or time of the year - surveillance, including fruit cutting	For consistency
ISPM 38: International movement of seeds		
Section	**Proposed change**	**Rationale**
1.3.2 Seeds for planting under restricted conditions	Such seeds are imported for research and are grown in protected environments (e.g. glasshouses, growth chambers) or in isolated fields. These seeds should be planted under conditions that prevent the introduction of quarantine pests into the PRA area. Examples include seeds for evaluation, and seeds as germplasm. ~~and seeds as breeding material.~~	At TPG January 2021 virtual meeting, the TPG agreed that the term here is used according to the Glossary definition (**Plants** intended for use in breeding or conservation programmes [FAO, 1990]), but the TPG agreed that, irrespective of the proposed revision of the definition, the sentence "Examples include seeds for evaluation, germplasm and seeds as breeding material" in section 1.3.2 of ISPM 38 be amended to "Examples include seeds for evaluation and seeds as germplasm", because "seeds as breeding material" would be covered by "seeds as germplasm" that would exclude germplasm in forms other than seeds. As the proposed amendment was not urgent, the TPG proposed to archive it until ISPM 38 is revised.