



**Report of the Glossary Working Group
3-7 October 2005
FAO, Rome, Italy**

1. OPENING OF THE SESSION

The Secretariat welcomed the Glossary Working Group to Rome, and the group elected Ms Bast-Tjeerde as Chairperson of the meeting. All members of the GWG attended the meeting (Reinouw Bast-Tjeerde-Chairperson, Ian Smith-steward, Felipe Canale, John Hedley, Mohammad Katbeh Bader, Xu Yan).

2. REPORT OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING (4-6 OCTOBER 2004)

The GWG did not have comments on the report of the previous meeting.

3. PUBLICATION OF ISPMs IN A BOOK FORMAT/REVIEW OF STANDARDS

3.1 Review of the sections definitions, to maintain only some of the definitions in the framework of the preparation of the book of standards

ICPM-7 agreed to the publication of ISPMs in a book format and made recommendations in relation to the definition section in ISPMs within the book (Report of ICPM-7, Appendix II, sections A.c and A.d). The GWG was presented with a document showing a comparison of the definitions in the published versions of standards, against the most recent terms/definitions [as in the consolidated Glossary of Phytosanitary Terms (2005)]. The GWG examined the comparisons and decided whether the new definition would conform, or not, to the use of the term in the old ISPM. Only one term/definition (outbreak) was found to not be compatible with the use of the term in ISPM No. 8 and ISPM No. 9, and it was proposed that the old definition should remain in these ISPMs in the book. All other terms/definitions were found either to be unchanged, or to have undergone only minor changes which would not change the meaning of the ISPM. The GWG also finalized a text which would be incorporated in the *definitions* sections of each standard in the book to explain the deletion of terms and definitions.

A paper summarizing decisions will be distributed to the Standards Committee.

3.2 Review of ISPMs

At its meeting in April 2005, the Standards Committee asked the GWG to consider the need for revision of ISPMs, and to provide advice to the next SC meeting. The GWG discussed this issue at length. Although a review was necessary, it could not be carried out during the present meeting.

In relation to a future complete review, the GWG thought that it should address both corrections in relation to inconsistencies/terminology, and identification of standards requiring an extensive revision. It agreed that the GWG would be well placed to undertake such a review, especially since it had seen and studied all standards over the years. It could also be used to ensure consistency in the standard setting system, and regular meetings could be convened for that purpose. However, due to the amount of work involved, the GWG would need to have special meetings separate from its normal meetings. During its discussions, the GWG also identified that combining ISPMs No. 7 and 12 should be considered for addition to the work programme this year.

The GWG discussed a detailed proposal on the possible review process. A paper will be presented to the SC in November.

The combination of ISPMs No. 7 and 12 should be considered for addition to the work programme this year.

4. REVIEW OF COUNTRY COMMENTS ON NEW AND REVISED TERMS IN DRAFT STANDARDS

The GWG reviewed comments received up to 3 October in relation to draft new/revise definitions in draft standards, and requests for definitions of new terms. The response and suggestion of the GWG are presented in Appendix 1.

All comments in Appendix 1 will be incorporated in the compilation of country comments, and transmitted to stewards/SC for consideration during redrafting of the texts.

5. REVIEW OF PROPOSED TERMS AS REQUESTED BY VARIOUS MEETINGS

The GWG reviewed several terms sent back by various meetings.

The recommendations in sections 5.1 to 5.6 below will be submitted to the SC in April 2006 in the form of amendments to the Glossary to be sent for country consultation.

5.1 Security, integrity

The terms/definitions were part of the amendments to the Glossary presented to the SC in November 2004. The SC had discussed whether *phytosanitary integrity* covered the phytosanitary state of the consignment, in addition to the physical state. This issue had not been resolved and the term sent back to the GWG. The definition for *security* had been presented to ICPM-7, but the ICPM had requested the GWG to review it in light of comments provided at the ICPM.

The GWG studied the comments made on both terms. It first discussed the relationship between security and integrity. It thought that integrity related to what is written on the PC, and envisaged several possibilities to link the terms with each other. In the end, the GWG recommended that *integrity* would cover the physical state of the consignment as declared on the PC, and *security*, as in the sense of article IV.2g of the IPPC would cover composition, substitution and reinfestation, i.e. both integrity and reinfestation. It also noted that the IPPC used the words "phytosanitary security", and that the term could be modified.

Proposed definition (compared to the latest version):

phytosanitary security	Maintenance of the integrity of a consignment, without loss or substitution, and prevention of its reinfestation by the appropriate phytosanitary measures
integrity (of a consignment)	Composition of a consignment as described by its Phytosanitary Certificate or other document

5.2 Prevalence

This term/definition was sent back by the SC in November 2004 on the basis that a definition of *low pest prevalence* had been proposed in the draft on ALPP. The GWG noted that the latter term had not been maintained in the approved standard on ALPP. It reviewed the proposed definition of *prevalence* and suggested the following redrafting:

Proposed definition (compared to the latest version):

prevalence (of a pest)	Proportion of units in a population that is affected by a given pest at a given time
------------------------	--

5.3 Tolerance

This term/definition was sent for country consultation in 2004, as part of the draft on inspection (now ISPM No. 23). The proposed definition for tolerance had attracted many comments at country consultation. The SC noted that the term would also be considered in the context of the draft on sampling, and would be discussed once the EWG on sampling has met. The draft ISPM on sampling (recently produced) did not contain a definition, but the GWG thought that it would be worth defining *tolerance* in relation to *prevalence*. It noted that the term *tolerance* was used in various contexts, and that it should be clarified that the definition applies to pests. It therefore proposed to rename the term as *tolerance (for a pest)*. There was a discussion on whether "phytosanitary action" or "phytosanitary measure" should be used, but the term action was maintained.

Proposed definition (compared to the latest version):

tolerance (for a pest)	Prevalence of a pest that is a threshold for phytosanitary action
---------------------------	---

5.4 Compliance procedure (for a consignment)

ICPM-7 requested the GWG to review the term in light of comments provided at the ICPM. The GWG noted that compliance procedures would check compliance with import requirements, for which the PC was issued.

Proposed definition (compared to the latest version):

compliance procedure (for a consignment)	Official procedure used to verify that a consignment complies with phytosanitary import requirements
---	--

5.5 Buffer zone

A revised definition of buffer zone was approved at ICPM-7 as part of ISPM No. 22 (ALPP). The ICPM recommended that the GWG review it to consider some additional comments. The GWG noted that the maintenance of a buffer zone requires application of measures. However, these are not necessarily phytosanitary measures (since a country may want to maintain a buffer zone for a pest which is not a regulated pest for that country, i.e. for which only domestic measures are applied). The GWG also believed that there was no need to list all the different types of areas to which buffer zone would apply, but proposed to use a generic wording *area officially delimited for phytosanitary purposes*.

Proposed definition (compared to the latest version):

Buffer zone	An area surrounding or adjacent to an area officially delimited for phytosanitary purposes, subjected to control measures to minimize the risk of spread of a target pest in or out of the delimited area
-------------	---

5.6 ISPM No. 3

ICPM-7 adopted the revised ISPM No. 3 (2005) and decided that the GWG should review the new/revised definitions in the standard, taking account of comments submitted at ICPM (from Uruguay) on some of the terms.

5.6.1 biological control

The comment proposed that sterile insects should be added to the definition. The GWG agreed.

Proposed definition:

biological control	Pest control strategy making use of living natural enemies, antagonist, competitors, sterile insects or other biological control agents.
--------------------	--

5.6.2 beneficial organism

The comment proposed to delete "including biological control agents" in the definition, on the ground that the definition was clear enough without, and noting that sterile insects should also be covered. The GWG noted that this part of the definition was not wrong and could be maintained for extra clarity. In addition, it was proposed to add *sterile insects* to the definition of *biological control* (see above).

No change proposed.

5.6.3 biological control agent

The comment proposed the addition of the words "able to reproduce" at the end of the definition. The GWG noted that this proposal was contradictory to the one asking for inclusion of sterile insects in the definition of biological control, and proposed that the modification should not be made. It also noted that biological control agents used in inundative release are not expected to reproduce.

No change proposed

5.6.4 host range

The comment suggested deletion of the definition. The GWG thought that the definition was useful and should be maintained.

No change proposed.

5.6.5 natural enemy, sterile insect technique

The GWG reviewed the comments and proposed not to change these definitions.

No change proposed.

5.6.6 organism

The comment suggested deletion of the definition. The GWG thought that the definition of organism was needed and supported that it should be maintained.

In addition, one member noted that the current definitions of *organism* and *pest* were not related to each other (i.e. it would be logical that *pest* should be defined in relation to *organism*). The GWG noted that it would be worth noting the inconsistency, and noting that *pest* could be defined as *organism injurious to plants and plant products* (instead of *any species, strain or biotype of plant, animal or pathogenic agent injurious to plants or plant products*). However, *pest* is defined in the IPPC, and the change proposed was not substantial and would not justify an agreed interpretation.

No change proposed.

5.6.7 reference specimen(s)

The comment proposed deletion. The GWG believed that the definition was useful, but noted that it was restricted to biological control agents, since *culture collections* would apply to insects only in the context of biological control when they would be raised from a living collection, but not in general sense. Reference specimen could also be used in other contexts, such as diagnostics, for which it could be one dead specimen kept for reference purposes (and not a specific population conserved in a reference culture collection).

Proposed rewording:

The definition should not be changed, but that term should be modified to: reference specimen(s) (of a biological control agent).

6. COMMENTS FROM COUNTRY CONSULTATION REFERRED BACK BY THE SC IN NOVEMBER 2004

6.1 Threshold level (new term proposed at country consultation 2004)

The GWG noted that the term *threshold* is a normal English term without specific phytosanitary meaning. It has been used in standards in many contexts (e.g. damage threshold, infestation threshold). If definitions are needed, they should relate to these specific phytosanitary terms, and not to threshold in general.

The GWG recommended not to define *threshold*.

6.2 Refusal (new term proposed at country consultation 2004)

The GWG noted that there was already a definition of refusal, which was the normal IPPC term. The proposal for a new definition had been made in relation to the draft on *inspection*, which used rejection. It noted that the standard on inspection should use *refusal* and not *rejection*.

The GWG recommended that ISPM No. 22 is modified, in due course, to use *refusal* instead of *rejection*.

6.3 phytosanitary measures, official (modification of existing terms)

The GWG considered the comments, and in both cases decided that no changes proposed should be made.

No change proposed

7. ISSUES ARISING FROM THE LAST MEETING

7.1 Interpretations of CBD terms and definitions (as agreed by SC and as part of ICPM-5 discussions)

General discussion

Mr Smith recalled that several approaches had been suggested over the years in relation to how the IPPC could react to CBD definitions in the guiding principles: sending suggestions for modification to the CBD Secretariat (which had not led to reactions), incorporating some terms in the Glossary, but modifying them to fit the IPPC (this had been done in relation to two specific requests made by ICPM-5, for *habitat* and *ecosystem*), preparing agreed interpretations of CBD terms (which he felt would be difficult to agree upon). At the last meeting, it had been proposed that a supplement to the glossary could be prepared to explain how CBD terms could be understood in IPPC language.

The document he had produced was attempting to explain some CBD definitions. He thought that such an interpretation would be useful as a supplement, but noted that the CBD definitions had been developed some years ago and their status was uncertain. Rather than developing a supplement to be adopted at CPM, he suggested that the paper should be further developed as an explanatory document to the Glossary, and the GWG favoured that approach.

The GWG recommended to the SC that the paper should be developed as an explanatory document. Mr Smith will revise the paper and send it again to the GWG. If the approach is agreed by the SC, it will then be circulated to the SC as a draft explanatory document.

Invasive alien species

In relation to invasive alien species, ICPM-5 specifically requested that the GWG consider a definition. The GWG reviewed the CBD definition of invasive alien species in the framework of the above paper. It thought that, by addressing *biological diversity*, the meaning of the CBD definition was restricted to CBD purposes. It rather targeted species which are present and need to be controlled domestically, whereas the IPPC was more concerned about entry of pests. The notion of invasive alien species for the IPPC was much broader, and the GWG noted that it was appropriately covered by the definition of quarantine pests.

The GWG recommended that it would not be useful to try to define *invasive alien species* at this stage, nor to try to adapt the CBD definition to IPPC needs. It also noted that the explanatory document under development would contain some text in relation to the CBD definition of invasive alien species.

7.2 Country of origin (current definitions and proposed supplement)

The GWG had decided at its last meeting that the use of *country of origin* in ISPMs should be checked, in relation with the 3 definitions currently in the Glossary, and a proposal made on the basis of this analysis. Ms Bast-Tjeerde had reviewed ISPMs for the use of origin or country of origin and noted that the 3 definitions of *country of origin* in the glossary relate to the country where the plants are grown (or where the consignment originates in relation to regulated articles). However, in 3 standards (ISPMs No. 7, 11, 20), it is used to mean the country where the PC is issued, or country of export. There is therefore inconsistency between the definitions in the glossary and the use of the term in some of the standards. In addition, ISPM No. 12 used the term with both meanings. ISPM No. 12 also used the concept of *place of origin*, i.e. the place where the consignment gets its phytosanitary status, which is an obligatory field on the PC.

The GWG first envisaged that *country of origin* could be redefined/used as the country where the PC is issued, since this corresponded to the use of this term in some standards. However, it believed that the intuitive understanding of the term *country of origin* is the one in the glossary, i.e. the country where the plants were grown. In addition, it noted that *country of origin* and *place of origin* are not necessarily identical. The place of origin as written on the PC sometimes needs to be more precise than the country, i.e. a place in the country of origin.

The GWG concluded that there were 3 separate concepts: *country of origin* (country where the plants were grown/articles originate), *place of origin* (where the consignment gets its phytosanitary status, which might be a country or a place in a country) and *country of export/certification*.

The GWG recommended the following:

- 1- *Country of origin* is already defined (for plants, plant products and other regulate articles), and the three definitions could be maintained as such.
- 2- *Place of origin* could be defined as follows: "Place of origin (of a consignment) – the place(s) from which a consignment gains its phytosanitary status".
- 3- *Country of export/certification* is self-explanatory and does not need to be defined.
- 4- some simple corrections could be made to the standards in which country of origin was used to mean country of export/certification (ISPMs 7, 11, 20), and ISPM No. 12 would be reviewed. Mrs Bast-Tjeerde would present the issue to the SC in November, with a proposal that some changes could go through the fast-track process. If the SC agreed, then a paper would be then sent by email to the GWG for finalization, and would be further processed.

8. OTHER ISSUES ARISING FROM THE SC OR ICPM

8.1 For information: glossary proposals in the form for topics and priorities for standards, supplements to be prepared by Expert Working Groups

The Secretariat reported that the form for submission of topics for standards by countries now included a field in relation to terms to be defined or revised. It also reported that two supplements to the Glossary had been added to the work programme and would be developed by expert working groups, on *appropriate level of protection*, and on the meaning of *not widely distributed*.

8.2 Annotated glossary

The SC had agreed to the preparation of an annotated Glossary. The document would be prepared by Ian Smith in 2006. The GWG expressed its interest in taking part in the development of this document and would be consulted by email, and could also review the document at its next meeting.

8.3 Possible tasks in relation to entry into force of the IPPC (1997)

ICPM-7 had directed several tasks to the SC and GWG in relation to entry into force of the IPPC (linked to the Convention in authentic languages, and the review of existing ISPMs in languages). A discussion paper was presented by the IPPC Secretariat, and will be modified for the CPM.

In relation to the IPPC in authentic languages, the GWG agreed that it could be involved in reviewing the definitions in Article II. As a matter of practicality, these could be compared with the English version to identify possible inconsistencies. Individual members agreed to do that comparison before the end of November. It was noted that, in the case of Spanish, some "clarifications" of terms in the IPPC had already been agreed at ICPM-7, and these should also be considered during the review. In the case of Chinese, the Chinese authorities had recently submitted a corrected IPPC text. It was further noted that countries might not necessarily agree to modify the language by aligning them on the English version.

In relation to the translation of ISPMs, the GWG noted that a review of all ISPMs to ensure consistency and identify need for revision was proposed (see above in this report). It noted that it would be more logical to wait until this review has been done before reviewing languages. Any review of languages could start with ISPM No. 5 in order to decide on the proper terms to be used throughout the standards. The review of translations of ISPMs would be a huge task, and would not necessarily involve the GWG.

In addition, any review of translations would have to be based on a reference language. For practical reasons (i.e. because the standards were developed in English), it would be logical that the comparison would be made with the English versions. The GWG further thought that it would be useful if English, as the language in which standards are developed and worked on, could be declared as the reference language, but it recognized that it might be difficult for countries to agree to that. It wondered whether FAO had any general rules about reference languages for treaties or standards.

8.4 Use of regulated pests in relation to domestic measures

Mr Smith presented a document on the use of the term *regulated pest / phytosanitary measure* in relation to measures applied domestically. He thought that if measures are applied in a country to fulfil the import requirements of another country, then the pest is regulated in the country taking the measures, and these are phytosanitary measures. Some other members strongly disagreed with that and thought that the term *regulated pest / phytosanitary measures* are only for pests considered as *regulated pests* in the country,

otherwise it might lead to countries putting measures in place for pests regulated in other countries. However, it was noted that this would be a problem only if the country put in place import requirements for pests which are regulated by another country. The measures applied before export in the exporting country to fulfil import requirements would still be phytosanitary measures (e.g. pest free area, etc.), in so far as they did not affect other countries. It was noted that this interpretation did not align with that of the SPS Agreement.

Mr Canale raised an issue related to the fact that the term *regulated pests* in the sense of the IPPC relates only to quarantine pests and regulated non-quarantine pests. In establishing their national structures and legislation, some countries separate regulated pests in the sense of the IPPC from others which need to be regulated but are not *regulated pests* in the sense of the IPPC (e.g. locusts/migratory pests etc.). This sometimes leads to separate legislations, separate services for plant quarantine and other plant health issues, and consequently frequently operational difficulties for plant quarantine since most of the resources and interest goes to plant health. In many countries, plant protection and plant quarantine have different laws and regulations, and would need to be integrated into one service for a better operation (in particular in areas such as surveillance and systems approaches). The pests which are not regulated pests in the sense of the IPPC, but which are still regulated by the country, could be brought back into the same framework by defining a category of “non-quarantine pests of national concern” on which countries could apply measures.

The GWG discussed this issue and recognized the difficulties linked to limiting the use of the term *regulated pests*, and the following points of discussion were expressed:

- many countries mention in their regulation some pests which are not *regulated pests* in the sense of the IPPC, but still tend to call them regulated pests.
- defining a new category of pests (*non-quarantine pests of national concern*, or *non-regulated pests*, or *domestically regulated pests*, or *nationally-regulated pests* etc.) although some members were not certain that it would be the best approach.
- it would be possible to explain the meaning of *regulated pests* in the sense of the IPPC. It could be clarified that locusts or such other pests may be regulated, but are not considered as *regulated pests* in the sense of the IPPC, and that measures against other pests are not considered as phytosanitary measures.
- it might be possible to avoid using *regulated pest*, and use quarantine pests and regulated non-quarantine pests.
- produce an agreed interpretation of *regulated pest* or expand the meaning of *regulated*.
- delete *regulated pests* from the IPPC, and use *quarantine pests and regulated non-quarantine pests*, while clarifying their linkage to phytosanitary measures. However, it was thought that regulated pests was a key component of the Convention and could not be modified.

The GWG recommended that the SC should consider this issue.

8.5 Biological control agents / regulated articles

At the SC in November 2004, there had been discussions on whether biological control agents were covered under regulated articles. At the time of the development of ISPM No. 20, the interpretation had been that only biological control agents “capable of harbouring or spreading pests” would be covered by the standard, and a footnote had been added to ensure that biological control agents per se would be covered. During discussions on ISPM No. 3, it had been envisaged that all biological control agents might in fact already be covered under the definition of regulated articles. The SC noted that suitable text had been added to ISPM No. 3 in this respect, but asked the GWG to review this issue and make recommendations to the SC.

As in previous discussions, there was no agreement between GWG members on whether BCAs are covered under current wording of the definition of regulated articles. Some members believe that the definition, by reading “organisms...capable of harbouring or spreading pests” covers only those BCAs capable of harbouring or spreading pests, while others thought that all BCAs could be covered. In any case, all agreed that BCAs are covered in the general sense both in the text of the IPPC and in ISPM No. 3. It could not propose any immediate adjustments, but suggested that it would make sense if the definition of regulated articles in the IPPC would include biological control agents explicitly in the list of potential regulated articles.

9. NEW OR REVISED TERMS IN OTHER DRAFT STANDARDS

The GWG considered the new or revised definitions in draft ISPMs not yet studied by the Standards Committee.

The recommendations on terms/definitions in 9.2 to 9.6 below will be addressed to the relevant EWG or to the SC, as appropriate.

9.1 Recommendations to expert working groups

The GWG remarked that many expert working groups attempted to define some common terms which have no specific phytosanitary meaning, and for which the GWG was suggesting deletion. It noted that the administrative guidelines distributed to EWGs do not give guidance on which terms should be defined. Mr Smith volunteered to write a small section to be presented to the SC for inclusion in the administrative guidelines.

An addition to the administrative guidelines will be proposed to the SC.

9.2 Draft ISPM on classification of commodities into phytosanitary risk categories

Nursery stock	A commodity class for living plants and parts thereof, excluding seeds, intended to be planted or replanted.
----------------------	---

The GWG made the following comments:

- The term is not used in the draft, and definition is therefore not needed.
- Even so, the term has defined was much broader than the group's understanding of nursery stock (i.e. whole plants moved for planting/replanting)

The GWG suggests deletion from the draft.

Phytosanitary risk categorization (for commodities)	Process for determining the phytosanitary risk associated with plants plant products or regulated articles based on their level of processing intended use and regulated associated pests.
--	---

The GWG made the following comments:

- *regulated associated pests* is not relevant. The level of processing will define which pests remain and some processing will eliminate all pests. The possible association with regulated pests is a matter to be considered in the PRA process.
- there might be categorizations of commodities other than those based on intended use and level of processing
- the term *phytosanitary risk categorization* has never been used in standards, and is also the whole topic of the draft standard. A definition is not needed.
- If it is nevertheless defined, it suggested that its content be changed, at least to read "process for determining the phytosanitary risk associated with plants, plant products or regulated articles, based on their level of processing and intended use", and possibly to consider other types of classification
- The GWG felt that the standard as written aimed at reducing the phytosanitary risk by processing or transformation, and did not really address the classification of commodities. The term might not correspond to the content of the standard. The GWG saw the purpose of identifying certain processes as not presenting phytosanitary risk, but the focus should then be on processing and not on commodity.

The GWG concluded that the term/definition is not necessary, but if they are maintained, they should be adjusted. It reserved judgement until the draft was further developed.

Verification	
---------------------	--

The term was in the table of definitions, without definition proposed. The GWG thought that it should not be defined. Verification is a very common English term, and defining it would limit its use in ISPMs if it was given a restricted phytosanitary meaning.

9.2 Draft ISPM on debarking

Bark	The outer layer of a woody plant, excluding the vascular cambium
-------------	---

The GWG made the following comments:

- bark is a common term, which has no specific phytosanitary meaning, and there was no need for a definition.
- a plant has also parts which do not have bark (leaves) so using *woody plant* is not correct. Bark is outside stems or roots.
- Are there other cambiums than the vascular cambium ? The GWG thought not, and therefore proposed deletion of *vascular*.
- bark is outer layer, and then there is cambium. So the bark is not the *outer layer excluding cambium*, but rather the *layer outside cambium*.

The GWG suggested that a definition for bark would not be necessary. If a definition is maintained, it suggested the following adjustments:

The layer of a woody stem or root, outside the cambium.

Bark-free wood	Wood from which all bark excluding the vascular cambium, ingrown bark around knots, and bark pockets between rings of annual growth has been removed.
-----------------------	--

The GWG made the following comment:

- vascular cambium is not part of the bark according to the definition of bark above, so it cannot be "all bark excluding vascular cambium"

The following adjustment is suggested:

Wood from which all bark exceptingrown bark around knots, and bark pockets between rings of annual growth has been removed

wood	a commodity class for round wood, sawn wood, wood chips and dunnage, with or without bark.
-------------	---

The GWG noted that the only difference with the definition in ISPM No. 5 was using *and dunnage* instead of *or dunnage*. It thought that it did not make a difference in the definition and advised it might not be substantial enough to resubmit the definition. Either way, the definition covered all the elements mentioned.

The GWG recommended keeping the currently approved definition.

debarking	Any process designed to remove bark from wood. Debarking does not necessarily make the wood bark-free and may have a limited effect as a phytosanitary measure
------------------	---

The GWG thought that the judgement on the effect of the treatment was not relevant for a definition.

The following adjustment is suggested:

Any process designed to remove bark from wood. Debarking does not necessarily make the wood bark-free.

9.3 Draft ISPM on systems approaches for citrus canker

citrus place of production	Consists of a number of defined citrus sites of production which are under official control
citrus site of production	Consists of a single production unit with a single production unit with a single cultivar under official control

The GWG noted that the general terms are defined, and the specific ones can be left to the specific standard to explain.

The GWG suggested that terms could be explained in the standard if needed, but did not need to be defined.

incidence survey (Asiatic citrus canker)	A survey conducted in a citrus production site at post bloom stage, based on a sampling protocol, to determine incidence on trees
qualification survey (Asiatic citrus canker)	A survey conducted in a citrus production site shortly before harvest, based on a sampling protocol, to determine incidence on trees.

The GWG thought that it would be preferable to explain the details in the text, and recommended that definitions were not needed.

infection	The act of an organism entering and establishing a pathogenic or potentially beneficial relationship with a host
------------------	---

The GWG was informed that this had been defined by the EWG to address an issue of scientific correctness, and the fact that latent infection/infection were especially important for that standard. The GWG noted that:

- the current definition of infestation covers infection
- the current definition allows for latent infestation
- the reason to define infestation was to give it a specific meaning (i.e. infection and infestation) for the IPPC. In its definition should be considered as a special phytosanitary term.
- having infestation and infection would force using infestation and/or infection each time the word pest was used.

The GWG recommended that infection should not be defined (see also appendix 1 point --).

traceability (of a commodity)	Ability to trace commodity records of observation, data and information (including origin and movement) which result from carrying out phytosanitary measures and which indicate whether specified process parameters are achieved in order to establish an audit trail.
--------------------------------------	---

The GWG thought that traceability was an ordinary term which was not given any specific phytosanitary meaning here. It suggested that it should not be defined.

9.4 Draft ISPM on guidelines for the production and maintenance of pest free potato micropropagation material and minitubers for international trade

A number of definitions were still in the *definitions* section of the draft. Mr Smith, who was also the Chairperson of the EWG which produced this draft, thought that the EWG had concluded that these definitions should be in the text, but not in the definitions section. The GWG recommended that this approach should be followed.

9.5 Draft ISPM on sampling

The GWG took note that the EWG on sampling had not included any definitions in the draft, but had defined the concepts of acceptance number, level of detection, tolerance, confidence level, efficacy and sample size in individual sections of the standard.

9.6 Draft revised ISPM No. 2

The GWG examined definitions in the draft revised ISPM No. 2, which will be further developed by an Expert Working Group on 31 October - 2 November 2005. A separate paper will be sent to the EWG and is in Appendix 2 of this report.

10. OTHER BUSINESS

The GWG was informed that the informal working group on strategic planning and technical assistance would be discussing how to transform the GWG in a Technical Panel. It was anticipated that the SPTA would define whether the GWG could fit into the general terms of reference and rules of procedure of technical panels, and would then draft or ask the SC to draft a specification for a Technical Panel.

The GWG reviewed the existing Specification for standard No. 1 on *review and updating of the glossary of phytosanitary terms* (last approved in 2001) and updated it. It was likely that the specification for Technical Panel could be based on the elements of that specification. The GWG noted that a call for nomination would be made, and that the current membership was open to change. To stay on the GWG, current members would have to be resubmitted and go through the selection process. The GWG insisted that some particularities of

the group went beyond the general terms of reference of Technical Panels. In particular, linguistic representation was more important than regional representation. The SC should also take into account that the GWG is an existing group which has a huge experience in working on terminology issues, and consider the need for continuity on the composition of the Technical Panel, in order not to lose valuable expertise which has built over years.

Appendix 1

Response to country comments on draft standards sent for country consultation in 2005

General comments

Replacing the title of the section "*definitions*" by "*terms*". The GWG supported that this section was meant to give definitions (i.e. of terms) and recommended to leave the title unchanged. Other changes proposed to introductory paragraphs. These paragraphs are for explanatory purposes only and will disappear in the approved standard

1- Draft ISPM on diagnostic protocols

Requests for new definition

- *diagnostic protocol*

The GWG recommended that "diagnostic protocols" should not be defined. The outline of requirements gives elements, and the whole standard explains what diagnostic protocols are. It would not be possible to summarize them in one sentence. If a definition is nevertheless thought necessary, it could be "internationally agreed procedure for pest diagnosis". However, the GWG strongly recommends not to define this term.

- *infection (see also section ---)*

The GWG has made recommendations in this respect in relation to previous requests by the ICPM/SC. In rediscussing this issue in the framework of the current draft, it maintained its original recommendation and recommends not to define infection in the Glossary.

- terms which correspond to their general meaning do not have to be defined in the Glossary (whereas infestation corresponded to a specific use of the term, which justified a definition).
- considering infection as part of infestation is consistent with what is done for pests
- separating infection and infestation would oblige, most times "pest" is mentioned to refer to both infestation and infection, which would be heavier in the text (e.g. "plant infested/infected by a pest...")
- using infestation in its glossary meaning was a way to avoid such complications

- *latent infection, asymptomatic, symptomatic material, asymptomatic material*

The GWG recommends that definitions for these four terms are not needed. They are common terms with no specific phytosanitary meaning attached to them.

- *sensitivity, specificity*

The GWG noted that these are important concepts in the standard which might need to be explained in the standard. However, simply developing definitions would not give the guidance requested in the country comment. If further guidance is needed on this, it should be part of an annex (and the third important concept of reproducibility might be added to it). However, it was noted that the standard would be used to draft diagnostic protocols, by persons who are specialists of this field and would know what these concepts are.

Comments on new/revised terms in the draft

- *Pest detection.*

Several comments were made on the fact that this draft ISPM contains a definition of pest detection while the draft on pest free areas for fruit flies includes a definition for "detection".

The GWG reviewed the comments taking into account these two definitions and draft ISPMs. After consideration of the comments and discussion, the GWG recommended that there is no need for a new definition in either draft, for the following reasons:

- "detection" can be used with several meanings, i.e. the finding itself and the process for finding.
- both uses correspond to the normal English term as in a dictionary definition, and don't have a specific phytosanitary meaning attached to them in neither draft ISPM.
- it would be difficult to develop a definition which covered both concepts.
- in this draft, the word is used mostly in the sense of a finding, except in section 3.3 "detection" which could be modified to read "detection procedures", to clarify the differences between both uses.

However, if it was decided to maintain a definition, it would be better to amend it to "the process **for** finding a pest either in symptomatic or asymptomatic material". The process of finding would mean that you have found it, while the process for finding means what you are aiming at.

- *pest diagnosis*

The GWG strongly felt that pest diagnosis, as stated in the definition, is composed of both detection of the pest and its identification. It therefore did not support deleting "detection", as suggested by some comments.

One comment suggested to use regulated pest in the definition. The GWG noted that if one looks at a pest and find that it is not a regulated pest, one has still done diagnosis. It therefore recommended not to restrict the definition.

Some comments thought that diagnosis applied to diseases, and not pests. The GWG noted that the understanding in the IPPC concept could be wider, i.e. that in the same way as the concept of pests includes both diseases and others, the concept of diagnosis of pest was extended to cover more than diseases.

To address some comments on the French version, and to make languages more consistent, it proposed that the definition should be edited as follows: *The process of detection and identification of a pest.*

- *Pest identification*

The GWG recommended deletion of this new term and definition, for the following reasons:

- identification is a common term which is not given a special meaning in the draft ISPM
- identify/identification is used in many ways in existing ISPMs, with a meaning not related to diagnostics (including identification of a pathway etc.) and it would be better not to attach a specific definition to such a common term (which would limit its use in ISPMs to very specific circumstances)
- "identification" as used in the present draft seemed to refer to taxonomic identification of a pest. If that was the case, using the words "taxonomic identification" in the text (instead of "identification"), without defining the term, would be self-explanatory, would not need a definition and would remove possible ambiguities with other uses of the word "identification". It was thought that using "taxonomic identification" instead of "identification" in the first paragraph of section 3.4 might clarify the whole issue.
- Alternatively, if identification is meant "to define the scientific name of a pest", a formulation using these words could be used (similar wording has been used in some ISPMs).

2- Draft ISPM on phytosanitary treatments

Requests for new definition

- *Treatment elements*

The GWG recommended that this term should not be defined, since treatment was defined, and elements was not used with a special meaning in the draft standard.

- *Phytosanitary treatment*

The GWG did not think that a definition was necessary, for the following reason:

- Treatment is already defined for the IPPC.
- The meaning of the word in IPPC/ISPMs should not be restricted to quarantine pests and regulated non-quarantine pests.
- It is recognized that some countries differentiate between "quarantine treatment" and "phytosanitary treatment"(with a distinction on the efficacy required (e.g. probit 9 or other), but the GWG thought that it is an issue to be dealt with in regulation, and not in a definition.

Comments on new/revised terms in the draft

- *Treatment schedule*

The GWG reviewed the comments and made the following recommendations:

- it seemed from the content of the standard that the important element to be submitted are the critical elements of the treatment, i.e. the schedule. If treatment schedule was considered as an important concept for the standard, then it should have a more central position in the text. At the moment it did not appear in a very clear way and was used in an inconsistent manner. For example the outline of requirements could refer to the need to submit a treatment schedule. The title of the draft ISPM could also be changed to include "phytosanitary treatment schedule".
- it agreed with the many comments asking for deletion of the second sentence (see below), because this sentence is too restrictive. The elements which are critical will depend on the type of treatment and, in particular, not every treatment has a dose.

The GWG therefore proposed the following rewording:

The elements of a treatment that are critical to achieving the stated efficacy.

3- Draft ISPM on pest free area for fruit flies

Requests for new definitions

- *FF-PFA- acronym for fruit fly pest free area*

The GWG did not think that a definition was needed for every acronym used in standards. The acronym could be explained at the beginning of the text.

- *Geographical isolation*

The GWG thought that no definition was necessary since the term has no special phytosanitary meaning here.

Comments on new/revised terms in the draft

- *Pest detection*

The GWG proposed to delete this term, as explained under section 1.

4- Draft revision of ISPM No. 1

- *Acceptable level of risk*

In relation to a comment asking for the inclusion of the words "technically justified", the GWG noted that neither level of risk nor level of protection have to be technically justified.

It had been proposed that the term should be called acceptable level of phytosanitary risk. The GWG recommended not to change the term, also because it would then refer to the concept of "phytosanitary risk", which is still under discussion in ISPM No. 2. The term can be used as such (acceptable level of risk), and the text in the standards can specify that it applies to plant health.

- *Appropriate level of protection*

In relation to the country comments made, and in particular to restricting the term to the phytosanitary area, the GWG noted that the definition as transferred from the SPS Agreement is broader than just plant health. When it is used in standards, it would refer to plant health only, and not animal or human health. It recommended not to change the term (which is used elsewhere), but to modify the definition to make it specific to issues related to plant life and health. It also recommended that this should be checked by the Legal service.

It also discussed whether "members" in the original definition should be replaced by "contracting party" or "country". Member has no sense in IPPC terms, and the principle itself uses "contracting party".

The GWG proposed the following rewording of the definition:

The level of protection deemed appropriate by a contracting party establishing phytosanitary measures to protect plant life or health within its territory

- *"Regionalization"*

There were several proposals to define "regionalization". The GWG:

- noted that the term "regionalization" has not been used in the IPPC framework or plant health, nor in standards. The concept used is always referred to as linked to the recognitions of PFAs.

- thought that a definition was not needed at this stage, and that in any case it would be difficult to agree upon since the whole concept was currently under discussion. It was noted that the EWG had preferred not to use this and remain with "PFAs and ALPPs".

- noted that it would also be difficult to define because it is not defined or explicated in the framework of the SPS.

- proposed that it may be suggested that the term is defined in the SPS Committee if a definition is necessary

5- Draft ISPM on transit

Comments on new/revised definitions in the draft standard

- *Consignment in transit*

A comment proposed that the old definition should be maintained but it was noted that its content was not be consistent with the standard. The GWG noted that:

- noted that the necessary points to be picked up in the definition (and in accordance with comments), are 1- that consignments in transit are not imported, and 2 that official procedures are applied if needed (which the current "appropriate" apparently does not convey clearly enough).

- was in favour of maintaining "country" in the definition, and not replacing with "contracting party" on the ground that a consignment can be in transit even if the country is not a contracting party.

- thought that there was no need to maintain "territory" in the definition, and that deleting it would be less confusing.

- the key element that the entirety of the consignment leaves the country is implied in the current definition, but could be more explicit.

With regards to the proposed addition of the words "in proper packing condition", the GWG thought that this was partly addressed by the proposed rewording (through "in its entirety") and partly explained in the standard. It would therefore not be needed.

Rewording proposed: A consignment passing through but not intended for import into, a country, that leaves in its entirety, and that may be subject to official procedures

Requests for new definitions of terms

- *territory of a country*

The GWG had proposed that the word territory be deleted in the definition, and did not think that a definition was needed.

- *Country of transit*

The GWG thought that a definition was not needed. Once *consignment in transit* is defined, the meaning of country of transit is clear.

- *Transit system*

The GWG suggested not to define "transit system". The whole standard gives a description of the transit system, and a definition would not help.

- *trans-shipment*

The GWG noted that transshipment is not mentioned in the draft, and that there is therefore no need for a definition. However, some text might be needed in the standard to explain what transshipment is.

Appendix 2

Discussion on terms in the draft revised ISPM No. 2

(as transmitted to the expert working group on ISPM No. 2. October 2005)

Pest risk analysis

The GWG started by reviewing the agreed interpretation for pest risk analysis as proposed in the new draft standard: *The process of evaluating biological, economic, environmental or other scientific evidence to determine, for a specified area, whether an organism is a pest; if so, whether it poses an unacceptable risk; and, if so, options for phytosanitary measures to manage the risk. The analysis may be extended to cover a pathway potentially carrying a range of pests.*

The GWG made the following remarks:

- *for a specified area* relates to the unacceptable risk, and not to whether an organism is a pest.
- some members wondered whether *specified area* should be replaced by *endangered area*, or *PRA area*, but no recommendation was made.
- If the concept of *phytosanitary risk* is defined, then the term could be used (instead of *risk*), in order to link it to PRA. In addition, one member thought that it would be logical to establish a relation between PRA and both *phytosanitary risk* and *phytosanitary hazard*, but the others did not consider that these terms necessarily had to be used in the definition for *pest risk analysis*.
- The sentence on pathways should be slightly adjusted, i.e. the analysis is *applied* rather than *extended*, and a pathway carries a range of organisms (and then analysis determines which are pests and are to be evaluated). Further comments on the inclusion of pathways in the definition were also made below.
- One member favoured that the term *phytosanitary risk analysis* should be used instead of *pest risk analysis*, as proposed in the previous draft of the revised ISPM No. 2 (in particular not to talk about pests for an organism). The other members noted that countries had been carrying out *pest risk analysis* for years, and that introducing a new word would not facilitate things. It was noted that this discussion had taken place at several expert working group meetings, and at the Standards Committee, and that the latest option chosen, on which the GWG was invited to comment, was *pest risk analysis*.
- It noted that only some stages of PRA were mentioned in the definition, but did not propose any change in relation to this comment.

Based on the comments above, the GWG proposed the following rewording:

Pest risk analysis (agreed interpretation)	The process of evaluating biological, economic, environmental or other scientific evidence to determine, whether an organism is a pest; if so, whether it poses an unacceptable phytosanitary risk for a specified area; and, if so, options for phytosanitary measures to manage the risk. The analysis may also be applied to a pathway potentially carrying a range of organisms.
--	--

The GWG noted that this definition was intended to be an agreed interpretation. The group acknowledged that at its last meeting it had proposed an agreed interpretation which was quite far from the current definition in the IPPC, but it now thought that it might be easier to get the concept and the definition approved if it was closer to the current definition. The important concept to include in the definition was that the process starts with an organism and, if so, then defines whether it should be a regulated pest.

The GWG remarked that the proposed agreed interpretation talked about "biological, economic, environmental or other scientific evidence". It noted that there was overlap between some of these, e.g. environmental/biological, biological/scientific, economic/scientific. It also noted that the supplement to ISPM No. 5 included all these concepts under "economic". One member however supported that "environmental" should be mentioned to strengthen this area in the definition, and show explicitly that it was covered (rather on relying on the reader's knowledge of the supplement on economic importance). The group generally agree that a natural tendency was to talk from environmental and economic separately, and that including environmental under economic was somehow artificial. However, the IPPC itself was constructed the other way, and since a supplement had been developed, it would not be a problem to be as close to the current definition as possible. It also noted that environmental aspects were clearly covered in the text of the standard. With the idea of changing the current definition as little as possible, the GWG generally supported that the original phrasing be maintained in the definition. It was suggested that "environmental" would belong better in the definition of pest risk management anyway.

The GWG had a discussion about the sentence on pathway analysis in the agreed interpretation. It noted that there are several initiation points to a PRA, an organism, a pathway or a policy. In all these cases, the analysis was then focused on individual organisms. In addition, all initiation points were clarified in the standard, and a definition could not detail the whole standard. The GWG did not see the need for a sentence on pathway.

One member wondered whether, if LMOs were to be regulated, they could be only quarantine pests or regulated non quarantine pests. It was noted that LMOs would not be RNQPs because of the definition of these, but could be

quarantine pests under plant health regulations, if they were found to be pests of plants and posing an unacceptable risk. In any case, pest risk analysis under the IPPC was not competent to assess animal or human health.

As a result of comments above, the following simpler agreed interpretation was proposed.

Pest Risk Analysis (agreed interpretation)	The process of evaluating biological or other scientific and economic evidence to determine whether an organism should be a regulated pest, and the strength of any phytosanitary measures to be taken against it
--	---

A member noted that the definitions of *organisms* and *pests* were not aligned on each other, and that the simple replacement proposed would not be appropriate.

In conclusion, the GWG identified a number of issues, but could not agree on what would be the best option among the two agreed interpretations above. It identified the danger of making too many changes in the IPPC, and thought that proposing an agreed interpretation substantially different from the current definition might make it more difficult to approve. It thought that it would be possible to make an agreed interpretation closer to the current definition, i.e. to correct it while making it easier to adopt.

However, the GWG recognized that it may not be the way that the EWG thought the most appropriate. If the EWG intended to describe the steps of PRA in the definition, then the simpler agreed interpretation would not be adequate. The GWG suggested that, if the simpler interpretation is chosen, the definitions of pest risk assessment and pest risk management could be modified to incorporate the different steps in the process. This might prove easier to adopt later.

Phytosanitary hazard and phytosanitary risk

Phytosanitary hazard*	The potential of an organism to cause harm directly or indirectly to plants or plant products.
Phytosanitary risk*	The likelihood of occurrence of a phytosanitary hazard and magnitude of its consequences.

The GWG thought that the definitions as proposed would be appropriate if the EWG wished to introduce definitions of these terms. The GWG nevertheless wanted to highlight that there is currently no link between the two terms proposed and the definition of pest risk analysis/pest risk assessment/pest risk management. If these terms are to be generally used in the ISPMs, they should be fully integrated into the definitions.

It also noted that the term *phytosanitary risk* had already been used in other ISPMs. The term *phytosanitary hazard* was not used in other ISPMs, but many expressions using *hazard* (such as potential pest hazard, health hazard, biological hazards or fire hazards) had been used.

Appendix 3 List of participants

Members

<p>Reinouw Bast-Tjeerde (Chairperson) Manager of International Plant Protection Issues Plant Health Division Canadian Food Inspection Agency 59 Camelot Drive Ottawa, ON Canada</p> <p>Phone: +1 613 2252342 Fax: +1 613 2286615 E-mail: rbast@inspection.gc.ca</p>	<p>Felipe Canale Ministerio de Ganadería, Agricultura y Pesca Meliton Gonzalez 1169/501 Montevideo Uruguay</p> <p>Phone: +598 2 6289471/99134716 Fax: +598 2 6289473 E-mail: fcanale@celersys.com</p>
<p>John Hedley Principal Adviser International Coordination Policy and Business Biosecurity New Zealand Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry PO Box 2526 Wellington New Zealand</p> <p>Phone: +64 4 4744170 Fax: +64 4 4744257 E-mail: john.hedley@maf.govt.nz</p>	<p>Mohammad Katbeh Bader Head of Phytosanitary Department Ministry of Agriculture Amman Jordan</p> <p>Phone: +962 6 5686151/260 Fax: +962 6 5686310 E-mail: katehbader@moa.gov.jo</p>
<p>Ian Smith (steward) Director General EPPO 1 rue Le Nôtre 75016 Paris France</p> <p>Phone: +33 1 45207794 Fax: +33 1 42248943 E-mail: hq@epo.fr</p>	<p>Xu Yan Institute of Animal and Plant Quarantine Chinese Academy of Inspection and Quarantine 241 Hui Xin Li, Hui Xin Xi Jie Chaoyang District, 100029 Beijing, China</p> <p>Phone: 86-10-64972606 Fax: 86-10-64934645 Email: xuyan98@vip.sina.com; xu_yan98@hotmail.com</p>

IPPC Secretariat

<p>Fabienne Grousset Information Officer IPPC Secretariat - FAO Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00100 Roma Italy</p> <p>Phone : +39 0657055696 Fax : +39 0657054819 E-mail : fabienne.grousset@fao.org</p>	<p>Brent Larson Standards Officer IPPC Secretariat - FAO Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00100 Roma Italy</p> <p>Phone : +39 0657054915 Fax : +39 0657054819 E-mail : brent.larson@fao.org</p>
--	--