



Report of the First Meeting of the Technical Panel for the Glossary
9-13 October 2006
FAO, Rome (Italy)

1. Welcome

Mr Larson (Standards Officer, IPPC Secretariat) opened the meeting and welcomed the members of the Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG).

2. Background, terms of reference and rules of procedure for Technical Panels

The IPPC Secretariat gave a general overview of technical panels (TPs) and their functioning. It was noted that membership of TPs was a long term commitment since terms of TP members were not limited in time. In relation to standard setting processes, it was noted that not all material produced by TPs was processed under the fast-track standard setting process, and that TPs were making recommendations to the Standards Committee (SC) on the adoption process to be used. It was noted that rule 3 of the TOR for TPs may have to be adjusted to clarify that not all standards produced by TPs are intended for the fast track procedure.

3. Selection of Chair

The TP selected Reinouw Bast-Tjeerde as its chairperson.

4. Summary of the specification

John Hedley (steward of the TPG) presented the specification for the TPG.

5. Report of the last meeting of the Glossary Working Group (3-7 October 2005), notes from May 2006 SC relevant for TPG, extracts from CPM-1 report

Regarding the report of the last meeting of the Glossary working group (GWG), clarification was sought on the input of the TPG in the process of review of the IPPC in authentic languages. At the last meeting, GWG members had been invited to send their remarks on Article 2 (definitions). The Secretariat explained that the process had not been initiated for most languages. The input by TPG members, where provided, would be given to the translators carrying out the review.

The TPG noted the items of relevance for the TPG arising from CPM-1 and from the May 2006 SC meeting.

6. Review of country comments on new and revised terms in draft standards

The TPG reviewed the comments made during member consultation on terms and definitions. It made some recommendations for transmission to stewards and SC. In some cases, some inconsistencies were noted in the text of the drafts, and they would also be communicated to stewards and SC. Reactions of the TPG to comments on draft ISPMs are given in Appendix 1. Some action points arising from some of these definitions are included in the work programme for presentation to the SC in May 2007 (Appendix 2).

In addition, the following points were made during discussions on country comments:

- the draft definition for phytosanitary security mentioned the maintenance of integrity *by phytosanitary measures*. The TPG thought that this expression was vague and that the following wording would be more appropriate: *by the application of phytosanitary measures*. After a review of ISPMs, it thought that proper wording would be to have phytosanitary measures *established and applied* (but not *taken*, or *adopted*, or no verb as in the example above).
- relevant TPG members should review translation of new and revised definitions for their languages prior to finalizing the draft ISPMs for member consultation. This was included on the work programme (Appendix 2)
- glossary terms in draft definitions sent for country consultation should be bolded, to clearly identify which terms are already defined in the glossary. This would facilitate review by countries, and avoid requests for new definitions for terms which are already defined.

- a reference to supplement no. 2 would be included in definitions for which economic covers environmental aspects. This had been proposed in several draft revised definitions and would also be implemented in some other adopted definitions.

Some recommendations on country comments given in Appendix 1 led to creating or revising definitions, and proposing development of new definitions at the next meeting. Some of these proposals will be taken by the SC in November and be presented to approval at CPM-2. One revised definition (*beneficial organisms*) will be processed as part of the amendments to the glossary in 2007 (Appendix 3). TPG reaction to proposals to develop other new definitions are listed in the work programme, for the SC to decide (Appendix 2).

7. Review of adopted and draft ISPMs

The TPG reviewed and modified a document on the process proposed for the review of adopted and of draft ISPMs. A list of elements to be considered during the review of adopted ISPMs was examined and amended. It was noted that the preliminary review to be done by a consultant would be as extensive as possible. The TPG would hold an extra meeting to consider the outcome of the consultant's work, and would prepare recommendations for the SC on which modifications should be submitted through the standard setting process. It was suggested that holding the extra meeting back-to-back with the regular TPG meeting might not be efficient in practice. It was noted that some findings during the review would identify areas for which guidance could be given in the administrative guidelines for the structure of standard setting documentation. The TPG also recommended a process for the review of draft ISPMs. The document modified after the meeting with TPG comments is given as appendix 4 and will be presented to the SC at its meeting in November.

8. Review of draft terms and definitions as requested by various bodies

Further work on the definitions for *prevalence (of a pest)* and *tolerance (for a pest)* had been asked.

8.1 Prevalence (of a pest)

Definition at the start

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

The SC wondered if the definition had to refer to a population, and if the term/definition were only meant to apply to field situations, or also to stored product pests or stored product situations. The TPG noted that *populations* was used here in its statistical sense, and would therefore cover all cases above.

The TPG thought that the concept of prevalence would be used in standards to express the following concepts:

1. Number of production units in which the pest is present related to the total area surveyed
2. Number of plants affected by pest at certain time
3. The level of occurrence of a pest in an area (independently from units) at a certain time

Cases 1 and 2 would be covered by the original proposal.

Case 3 was not covered in the original proposal and had to be included in the definition.

Regarding prevalence in *areas of low pest prevalence*, the TPG thought that, for the purpose of the IPPC, an ALPP refers to a low pest population level or a level of pest below a threshold level, without a time component. For that reason, this concept did not fit in the definition of "prevalence".

During its discussions, the TPG noted that although the word incidence is generally used in plant pathology to cover the same concept, the word prevalence has been used in standards and in the framework of the SPS, and this was therefore the term to be defined in the IPPC framework. However, as detailed in 8.2, the term *incidence* would be discussed at the next meeting.

Proposed definition

prevalence (of a pest)	Proportion of units in a population that is affected by a pest at a given time, or the level of occurrence of a pest in an area at a given time as expressed by a defined index.
------------------------	--

8.2 Tolerance

Definition at the start

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

The TPG discussed the start definition and SC comments, and noted in particular the following:

- the term *tolerance* has a very wide application and its definition should be kept broad so as not to restrict its meaning and use.
- the TPG had been asked by the SC to consider the draft ISPM on sampling in relation to development of this definition. In doing so, it noted that the use of the word *tolerance* in that standard might not be consistent: it was sometimes used with the meaning of tolerance, or with the meaning of level of detection. The draft standard might have to be reviewed in this respect.
- there was a disagreement on the fact that there could be tolerance for quarantine pests. One member supported that there could not be tolerance for quarantine pests, while other members noted that zero tolerance was a widely accepted term and concept. The TPG thought that modifying the term to tolerance level might solve the issue, even if the term used in ISPMs is *tolerance*.
- the relationship between tolerance, infestation level and incidence was discussed. It was mentioned that tolerance for sampling would be incidence of a pest below certain parameter. The TPG agreed to reconsider *infestation level* (e.g. included in the definition of prevalence) in relation to *incidence*.
- the SC had wondered whether the definition should use the term *phytosanitary action* or *phytosanitary measures*. The TPG noted that a *phytosanitary measure* is a procedure, written down, for example for fumigation of a consignment. If a consignment is fumigated, this is an action. In the case of the definition, action was therefore the correct word since finding of the pest above a certain level will trigger some action.

Proposed definition

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

Proposed definitions for tolerance level and prevalence of a pest and their rationale (new and as previously provided) will be included into the amendments to the glossary to be reviewed by the SC in May 2007 prior to country consultation (Appendix 3)

The TPG will rediscuss incidence, infestation level, at its next meeting (see work programme, Appendix 2)

9. Progress on annotated glossary

Mr. Smith presented the draft annotated glossary, which included a list of current terms, and many detailed notes on terms and definitions. The TPG welcomed the work done and the depth of the study.

It noted that the following adjustments were needed: bringing the list of terms and definitions in line with the 2006 version of the glossary; using bold in definitions for terms defined in the glossary; including acronyms and synonyms in the list of terms; including terms which cross-refer to others.

The SC confirmed its original suggestion that this document should be processed as an explanatory document, through the TPG and the SC.

A version modified to take account of TPG suggestions will be prepared by Mr. Smith and circulated by the Secretariat by email, with a two month comment period.

In discussing the annotated glossary, the TPG noted the following:

- The annotated glossary will be out-dated as the glossary changed. It supported that it should be updated regularly, and suggested that a three year update would be appropriate.

The TPG suggests to the SC that the annotated glossary is updated every three years.

- The annotated glossary relates only to the English version. Because of the way the glossary has evolved and translations have been adjusted, annotated glossaries for other languages might differ.
- Terms which have an acronym are always given in full with the acronym between bracket in the first occurrence of a term in a standard. This is not strictly necessary for acronyms which are defined in the glossary (e.g. IPPC, NPPO) provided that ISPM No. 5 was always available to readers. It noted that the number of acronyms in the Glossary was small (IPPC, ISPM, LMO, NPPO, PFA, PRA, RNQP, RPPO, SIT). It is noted that the Administrative guidelines for the structure of standard setting documentation currently recommends that "the use of new acronyms should be avoided as much as possible", and

The TPG proposed to the SC the addition to the Administrative guidelines that acronyms defined in the Glossary can be used in standards without a mention of the full term.

- The definition of *occurrence* should be corrected to use "introduced and not officially..." The introduction of and/or was considered as a typo introduced in the glossary at an earlier stage, and should simply be corrected in the next version of the glossary. The TPG generally supported that the use of *and/or* introduced confusion. The several options implied by *A and/or B* were *both A and B*, *A and not B*, *not A and B*. In the case of *occurrence*, the option *not A and B* would not make sense (e.g. a pest considered present unless proved eradicated). The TPG also noted that the French and Spanish versions were correct, i.e. using *and*.

The definition of occurrence in English will be corrected in the next version of the glossary

10. New or revised terms in other recent draft standards

No new or revised terms in recent draft standards were available for review.

11. Issues arising from previous ICPM/CPM/SC meetings

11.1 CBD terms and definitions: interpretation and CBD anthology

CBD anthology

The TPG reviewed the anthology of invasive species terminology compiled by the CBD Secretariat and including terms and definitions from ISPM No. 5. The TPG made detailed comments on the document. In particular, the TPG noted that the anthology should use the latest definitions, and that restrictions i.e. indicated between brackets into the term should also be included after the term, and not in comments, and that the sources should quote the 2006 glossary. The IPPC Secretariat will transmit the TPG suggestions for modification to the CBD Secretariat.

IPPC interpretation of CBD terms

The document examined at previous meetings had been further developed by Mr. Smith. Although this paper had originally been envisaged as an explanatory document, the TPG felt that there might be a value in following an approval process, for example as a supplement to the Glossary. In that case, the content of the document may need to be adjusted. The SC would have to decide on the status of the document and the approval process to be followed. It was noted that this document was also considering the term *invasive alien species*, for which concerns had been raised at ICPM-5; it would explain what was meant and why it could not be defined under the IPPC.

The Secretariat noted that a CBD meeting on terminology had been foreseen but had never taken place. It believed that there would be benefits in having a common meeting between IPPC and CBD experts in the future. However, no such meeting was scheduled for the moment.

The TPG discussed the document in detail, especially the terms *indigenous*, *risk analysis*, *intentional and unintentional introductions*, and *indirect*. Comments from TPG members were incorporated by Mr. Smith, and the final document was re-examined. The TPG thought that the IPPC Secretariat should send this document to the CBD Secretariat as part of the collaboration between Secretariats, in order to verify informally with CBD experts whether their terms were interpreted correctly in the document, stating that the status of the document had not yet been decided. CBD comments would then be reviewed and incorporated by the author, and the document presented to the SC in May 2007. Whether to label interpretation,

clarification or explanation would depend on the status of the document wished by the Standards Committee. The revised document is in Appendix 5.

11.2 Regulated pests in relation to domestic measures

Discussion had started at a previous meeting on the use of *regulated* and the fact that current uses in ISPM No. 5, especially the term *regulated pest* restrict the use of the term to regulation in international trade (and not domestically). The SC had agreed to review a document on regulated, and this had been drafted by Mr. Smith. The document was reviewed and modified during the meeting and will be presented to the SC in November¹.

The TPG agreed that use of the term *regulated pests* should not stop the word *regulated* from having its normal meaning, i.e. either in domestic or international contexts. It is understood that a country can have pests which are regulated in the country and not internationally, and for which phytosanitary measures are not applied.

The TPG considered several options to solve the issue of use of regulated pests in relation to domestic measures. It agreed that a term and definition linked to pests regulated domestically should be added. In relation to pests regulated domestically, it preferred the expression *domestically-regulated* to *nationally-regulated*, since the word "domestic" was used in ISPMs, especially in the supplement on official control, and *nationally regulated* was not. However, the TPG thought that the term and definition should not be *domestically-regulated pest*, since a pest can be both a regulated pest and a domestically-regulated pest. It was therefore suggested that the new term defined could be *domestic regulation*.

In the document, the TPG proposed an agreed interpretation for *quarantine pest* and for *regulated non-quarantine pest*, and a new definition for *domestic regulation*. It also suggested that the expression "*quarantine pest and regulated non-quarantine pest*" should replace *regulated pests* where appropriate, and proposed revised definitions for *additional declaration*, *phytosanitary procedure* and *systems approach*.

12. Proposals in relation to ISPM No. 3

When reviewing the annotated glossary, the TPG noted that a number of terms from ISPM No. 3 (1996) were still in the glossary, but were not used in the revised version of the ISPM No. 3 (2005) or in other ISPMs. The TPG reviewed these terms. The maintenances proposed are given below, and deletions and their reason are part of the proposed amendments to the Glossary (Appendix 3).

Terms proposed for maintenance in the Glossary

term	rationale for maintenance
parasites, parasitoids, pathogens, predator	These terms are used in ISPM No. 3 (2005). The TPG supported that they should remain in the Glossary, and that some words of their definitions would be "de-bolded" depending of the outcome of deletions proposed (e.g. micro-organisms)
release (into the environment)	This term is used in ISPMs, and the definition is appropriate.
hitch hicker pest	the definition is a reference to <i>contaminating pest</i> . Although there is no attempt to include synonyms in the glossary, this one is already there and the term <i>hitch hicker pest</i> is used in ISPMs.

Proposed deletions and their rationale are part of the amendments to the glossary to be reviewed by the SC in May 2007 prior to country consultation.

13. Update on various topics

13.1 Convention into authentic languages, translation of standards (including Glossary)

¹ Note: the SC in November 2006 did not have time to study the document. Due to further concerns expressed during the preparation of the report, a new document will be drafted for the SC in May 2007, and this subject will be rediscussed as appropriate at the TPG meeting in 2007.

The TPG discussed its involvement with languages other than English, based on its specification (TP No. 5), to ensure accuracy of languages. The TPG decided that its members should make recommendations with regard to translations. This would take the form of a list of proposed changes, accompanied by a rationale for the problem in translation and justifying the change and its nature. Even if other TPG members did not speak the language, they could review the validity of the rationale for change.

The TPG noted that changes should be limited to what is really necessary. Mr Smith (for the French), Mr Katbeh Bader (Arabic), Mr Wu Lifeng (Chinese), Ms Peralta (Spanish) could be involved. This task would be carried out by email between TPG meetings. TPG members would interact with individuals or groups involved in translations. The TPG understood that its specification gave the group the final word on translation of terms.

The TPG noted that there were some translation mistakes in the glossary. There is an intention to review the translation of ISPMs, once the English version has been reviewed for consistency. However, because of the importance of terminology for all ISPMs, it might be appropriate to review the glossary separately, even before review of the translations of other ISPMs. The Secretariat noted that the Arabic version of the glossary was under review, and that Mr. Katbeh Bader could be associated to it.

13.2 Information on the publication of a multilingual glossary

The IPPC Secretariat informed the TPG that although the multilingual table of terms was a useful feature of the glossary, a system needed to be developed to facilitate its updating and accuracy (especially in view of the need to include Chinese and Arabic characters and different text orientations). A trilingual glossary would be posted on the IPP, and solutions sought to ultimately publish complete multilingual tables in the book of ISPMs.

13.3 Information on expert working groups about appropriate level of protection and not widely distributed

The TPG was informed that two working groups had been scheduled to discuss appropriate level of protection and not widely distributed. The outcome of these meetings might become supplements to the glossary.

14. Work programme for the TPG

The TPG reviewed and adopted its work programme (Appendix 3), which will be presented to the Standards Committee in May 2007. Some points of immediate relevance will be submitted to the SC in November 2006.

15. Other business

No additional point was raised.

RESPONSE TO COUNTRY COMMENTS ON DRAFT STANDARDS SENT FOR CONSULTATION IN 2006

General comments on the general sentence which is in all "definition" section

No need to change and also used throughout the book of standards.

1. Amendments to the Glossary

1.1 phytosanitary security

Proposed rewording based on country comments

phytosanitary security (of a consignment) : Maintenance of the integrity of a consignment and prevention of its **infestation** and contamination, by the application of appropriate phytosanitary measures

Alternative rewording (see reason 3 below)

phytosanitary security (of a consignment) Maintenance of the integrity of a consignment and prevention of its **infestation, reinfestation** and contamination, by the application of appropriate phytosanitary measures

Reasons

1. agree to specify (*of a consignment*). Phytosanitary security may be used in other contexts, e.g. in relation to areas, and the definition relates to consignments.
2. Agree to transfer *without loss and substitution* to the definition of *Integrity*, and make some modifications to it
3. Several comments proposed to replace infestation with reinfestation, or to mention both terms. The TPG preferred option is that only *infestation* be mentioned because:
 - * the glossary definition of *infestation* covers *reinfestation*
 - * replacing *infestation* by *reinfestation* would give the wrong idea that the consignment was previously infested and was reinfested between certification and import.
 However, if the SC considers necessary to mention *reinfestation*, then both terms should be kept (alternative option).
4. agree to mentioning *contamination*
5. agree to mentioning *application*
6. Some countries suggested to introduce a timing in the definition, i.e. *after certification* or *prior to export*. The TPG recommended that the definition should not be restricted, since it could be used in other situations, i.e. there might be a need to maintain security at different times, e.g. before certification.

1.2 integrity (of a consignment)

Proposed rewording based on country comments

integrity (of a consignment): Composition of a consignment as described by its Phytosanitary Certificate or other agreed document, maintained without loss, addition or substitution

Reasons

1. proposed to maintain *other documents* to cover the case that countries may accept that the composition is adequately described on these. IPPC does not oblige to the use of PCs
2. added *agreed* to cover concerns that not any kind of documents could be used, and that they should be agreed for phytosanitary purposes
3. agreed to transfer *without loss and substitution* from the definition of security. The important point is that composition is *maintained*
4. agreed that there are other cases than loss or removal, and proposes to include *addition*. It thought mentioning removal was not needed, since there is only a slight difference in meaning between *loss* and *removal*

1.3 buffer zone

Proposed rewording based on country comments

buffer zone: An area surrounding or adjacent to an area officially delimited for phytosanitary purposes, subjected to phytosanitary or other control measures to minimize the risk of spread of the target pest into or out of the delimited area

Reasons

1. control measures might give understanding that buffer zones are limited to domestic measures. This is not the case. It would be clearer to specify *phytosanitary measures or other control measures*
2. agree to use *the*. Buffer zone applies to a specific target pest.
3. French and Spanish definitions not in line with English.

4. For Spanish translation. Noted that common translation problem that *minimize* translated by *decrease*, which does not have the same meaning.

1.4 compliance procedure (for a consignment)

Proposed rewording based on country comments

compliance procedure (for a consignment) : Official procedure used to verify that a consignment complies with phytosanitary import requirements or phytosanitary measures related to transit

Reasons

1. agreed that more correct to mention transit, and in line with ISPM No. 25.
2. however, noted that might introduce inconsistencies with some other definitions, which might have to be adjusted in a similar way
3. Spanish term has to be modified. *procedimiento de verificación* or *procedimiento de cumplimiento* would not be correct. Proposed: **procedimiento de verificación de cumplimiento (para un envío)**. *de verificación* is too short and not specific enough to *compilarse*

1.5 biological control

1. the only change between the proposal and the current definition in ISPM no. 5 was to propose addition of *sterile insects*. However, it is noted that the adopted definition of *biological control agent* implies an *organism*, i.e. capable of replication/reproduction, i.e. would not cover sterile insects. The phrase *sterile insects or other biological control agents* in the proposed definition for *biological control* is therefore not correct. Since *sterile insects* are in the scope of ISPM No. 3, they could be mentioned under the definition of *beneficial organisms*, but not under *biological control* (nor *biological control agents*).
2. It further suggested that the definition of *biological control* should be deleted from ISPM No. 5 for the following reasons:
 - * it is well-known internationally
 - * it is not used in a different sense in ISPM no. 3, and is therefore not needed
 - * *biological control agents* is defined (and is needed because of ISPM No. 3 and trade), but there is no need for both definitions.

Proposal:

1. deletion of the adopted definition of *biological control*. 2 alternatives in terms of timing:
 - * either make the proposal at CPM-2 as part of the Amendments to the glossary (but deletion was not proposed to countries)
 - * or remove any proposal from the current Amendments to the glossary (i.e. term and definition remain as in ISPM no. 5 for now), but propose deletion as part of Glossary amendments in the next consultation after the SC May 2007
2. propose a revised definition of *beneficial organisms* for consultation in 2007 as part of the amendments to the Glossary (beneficial organism: Any organism directly or indirectly advantageous to plants or plant products, including biological control agents and sterile insects)

1.6 reference specimen(s) (of a biological control agent)

It was originally believed that reference specimen for biological control were live specimen, which introduced a difference with reference specimen for other purposes. Since this does not seem to be the case, the TPG suggested that there is no need of a specific definition for reference specimens, nor for reference specimens of a biological control agent. Alternatively the definition has to be widened to cover other uses, such as for diagnostic etc.

Alternatives

- propose deletion of the current definition of reference specimen
 - * either in proposals going for CPM
 - * or at consultation after SC May 2007
- or widen the existing definition of reference specimens (no wording developed).

2. Revision of ISPM No. 2

2.1 recommendations with regard to inconsistencies in the text of the standard

1. *living modified organisms* in section 1.2.5 are defined in a way which does not correspond to the adopted definition. Defining them in two different ways introduces confusion.
2. the text uses the expression *organisms of no phytosanitary concern* and *of phytosanitary concern*. The term *phytosanitary concern* is not defined, and phytosanitary can be understood to have two meanings, a limited meaning in relation to regulated pests, or a wider meaning. There is an ambiguity here to what it relates. One possibility would be to use *plant quarantine concern* instead, and restrict the meaning.

2.2 Recommendations with regard to term and definitions in draft ISPM

2.2.1 pest risk analysis

Proposed rewording based on country comments

pest risk analysis (agreed interpretation): The process of evaluating biological or other scientific and economic evidence to determine whether an organism is a pest, whether it should be a quarantine pest or regulated non quarantine pest , and the strength of any phytosanitary measures to be taken against it

Reasons

1. IPPC (1997) definition, and recommended to keep changes to the part of the definition which needs an agreed interpretation, i.e. the middle part. (Therefore it recommends not to change "*The process of evaluating biological or other scientific and economic evidence*" nor "*and the strength of any phytosanitary measures to be taken against it*".). Further details under individual comments below.
2. agree with comments saying that *unacceptable* is not clear, but instead of using *regulated* as suggested, it recommends to use *quarantine pest* and *RNQP*, with the same intention but in order to make a link to *pest risk assessment* and *pest risk management* whose definitions are different for quarantine pests and RNQPs.
3. No need to reinterpretate the beginning of the definition and add *environmental*. "Biological" is the key evidence, and was the original reason to have it there when the definition was included in the IPPC 1997.

2.2.2 pest risk assessment (for quarantine pest)

Proposed rewording based on country comments

pest risk assessment (for quarantine pest): Evaluation of the probability of the introduction and spread of a pest and the magnitude of the associated potential economic consequences (see Glossary Supplement No. 2)

Reasons

1. the TPG recommends not to change the definition with detailed proposals below (see justification in individual comments).
2. some comments ask for inclusion of environmental consequences. TPG notes that environmental concerns are covered under economic, as detailed in Supplement no. 2 to ISPM no. 5. Suggests not to modify the definition, but to make a reference to supplement no. 2 at the end of it, and also in other relevant definitions in ISPM no. 5 (as done for supplement no. 1 in the definition of official control)

2.2.3 pest risk

Proposed rewording based on country comments

- pest risk (for quarantine pests). The probability of introduction and spread of a pest [through a pathway] and the magnitude of the associated potential economic consequences (see Glossary Supplement No. 2)
- and
- pest risk (for regulated non-quarantine pests). The probability that a pest in plants for planting affects the intended use of those plants with an economically unacceptable impact (see Glossary Supplement No. 2)

Reasons

1. TPG agrees that the definition proposed applies only to quarantine pests, and consequently agrees to proposals to specify that in the term
2. there was strong disagreement on whether *through a pathway* should be mentioned. Two points of view:
 - * include: the probability is always linked to a particular pathway, and so is the pest risk. Associating risk to pathway is important in relation to the magnitude of economic consequences.
 - * don't include. There are various possible initiation points. The analysis is carried out on one or several pathways, but this is clear in the text and no need to put it in definition
3. suggests to make a reference to supplement no. 2, as for pest risk assessment (see details under pest risk assessment)
4. agrees that a definition of *pest risk (for regulated non-quarantine pests)* is needed, and recommends that it should be as close as possible to the definition of *pest risk assessment (for RNQP)*.
5. Notes that this definition has not been sent for consultation. If it is not included in the draft now, it could be added to amendments to ISPM no. 5 for consultation in 2007

2.3 Reaction to proposals made in comments for definition of new terms

- *hazard* : No agreement in TPG on whether should be defined. Some members think that this term is generally avoided in standards and avoiding its use could continue. Others think that it should be defined. TPG proposes that it could carry out an analysis of how is used in existing standards, and make a recommendation on whether it should be defined.
- *risk communication* : TPG recommends that the SC, after the standard is revised, decide if *risk communication* is properly explained in the text of the standard or if a definition is needed
- *uncertainty* : TPG recommends that the SC decides whether it wants a definition after the standard is revised.
- *prevalence* : This item was already on the agenda of the TPG. A proposed definition was finalized and will be presented to the SC in May 2007, before being sent for consultation in 2007.
- *incidence*: TPG recommends that it looks at how this term is used in existing standards, and see if can develop definition, and that this analysis also considers the term *infestation level*
- *infestation in the natural environment*: Understand from the comment that want to define infestation in the environment, by opposition to infestation of a consignment that is defined in the Glossary. However, the term infestation is not used in any special way. Nothing particular to this standard
- *unacceptable pest risk*: Not needed. *Pest risk* is now defined
- *alien plants*: TPG recommends that the term is not needed in the standard, and should not be defined. SC will need to decide based on how the draft ISPM is modified
- *infestation*. Not needed. Term *infestation* not used here in any special way.
- *natural range*: TPG proposes to analyze if the term is used in other ISPMs, and if it can develop definition

3 PHYTOSANITARY TREATMENTS FOR REGULATED PESTS

3.1 Recommendations with regard to term and definition in draft ISPM (treatment schedule)

1. *Treatment schedule* is used inconsistently in the standard and understood in different ways according to comments. There is a need to clarify what treatment schedule is intended to cover, in order to decide whether a definition is needed. Does *treatment schedule* cover the whole treatment description (as is implied in the last paragraph of section 3.3) , or only some of its elements (as is implied in the second last bullet of section 3.1) , If the treatment schedule only contains a limited amount of information, what should it be. E.g. in annex 2, *schedule* is one element of the treatment description, and is limited to "elements such as active ingredient, dose, duration and temperature"; in section 3.1, the description of the treatment includes a treatment schedule, but what is included in a schedule is not specified; under 3.3, treatment schedule includes application methods.
2. If a definition is needed, the TPG suggests:
 - that the term be changed to "treatment protocol" for the following reasons:
 - * *treatment protocol* is widely used in the usage of schedule in annex 2
 - * *protocol* is an appropriate term, and more common than schedule
 - * *schedule* implies a timing component, which is not needed in this context
 - the inconsistent use of the term makes it difficult to see if the current definition would be appropriate. For example, even in the more limited coverage of Annex 2, does *treatment schedule* cover only *critical* parameters which are listed, or others which are not mentioned, e.g. formulation of the product.
 - if the term *treatment protocol* is adopted, the introductory sentence of Annex 1 of ISPM No. 18 should be adjusted in due course to replace *schedule* with *protocol*.
3. due to the above, no detailed reactions to comments on *treatment schedule* are given below

3.2 Reaction to proposals made in comments for definition of new terms

- *stated efficacy*: Not needed; efficacy is already defined
- *phytosanitary treatment*: not needed; treatment is defined. However, the TPG also noted that the standard is not clear on the use of the term "phytosanitary treatment". In particular, the scope refers to treatments for regulated pests in international trade "*or other purposes*". What kind of treatments are intended to be covered ? and if "phytosanitary treatment" is intended to include "other phytosanitary purposes" would that be consistent with the definition of treatment which says that it is an "*official*" procedure

4 Areas of low pest prevalence for fruit flies

4.1 Recommendations with regard to term, definition and abbreviations in draft ISPM

4.1.1 target fruit fly species

Agrees that this definition is not necessary and recommends deletion

4.1.2 Section Abbreviations used in the standard

1. Need for abbreviations should derive from whether terms are used in standard (e.g. will the concept of fruit fly free pest of production and production sites be used in this standard).
2. In Spanish version, abbreviations should be used in the text, especially those which have been used in previous standards (e.g. ABPP)

4.2 Reaction to proposals made in comments for definition of new terms

- *prevalence*: this item was already on the agenda of the TPG. A proposed definition was finalized and will be presented to the SC in May 2007, before being sent for consultation in 2007.
- *sites and places of production*: not needed. Already definitions of place of production, pest free place of production and pest free production site
- *corrective action plan/corrective action*: there is a need to carry out an analysis of different types of plans (corrective action plans, emergency action plan, contingency plans, etc.), of how the terms are used in ISPMs, and of whether definition or recommendations on use are needed.
- *regulatory control*: would need to be looked at to consider what it means. Containment measures would be more in line with glossary language? Or phytosanitary measures in very general sense? Before prepare or not definition, should look at how is used in standards.

5. DRAFT ISPM - DEBARKED AND BARK-FREE WOOD

5.1 Recommendations with regard to term, definition and abbreviations in draft ISPM

5.1.1 bark

Proposed rewording based on country comments

bark: The layer of a woody trunk, branch or root, outside the cambium

Reasons

no change in meaning but easier to translate into French and Spanish ("stem" does not translate in one word trunk and branch)

5.1.2 bark-free wood

TPG does not propose modifications based on detailed comments.

Reasons

1. Definition compatible with use in the standard. Issue of tolerance should be dealt with in the standard and not in the definition
2. No need to change "bark pockets" to "areas of bark". Forest terminology.

5.1.3 Debarking

Proposed rewording based on country comments

debarked wood: Wood that has been subjected to any process designed to remove bark from wood. (Debarked wood is not necessarily bark-free wood)

Reasons

1. the current draft defines *bark-free wood* (i.e. product) and *debarking* (i.e. process). Makes sense to define the products, i.e. *debarked wood* and *bark-free wood*.
2. also consistent with title which uses debarked wood
3. no need to maintain a separate definition for debarking, as long as "any" process, which is the important part of that definition, is retained
4. the additional sentence is a useful explanation and can be retained between brackets (which is sometimes done in Glossary definitions)
5. *bark-free* is not defined, but *bark-free wood* is, so the definition can use that term

5.2 Reaction to proposals made in comments for definition of new terms

- *bark free*: not needed; there are already definitions for *bark free wood* and *bark*

6. RECOGNITION OF PEST FREE AREAS AND AREAS OF LOW PEST PREVALENCE

6.1 Reaction to proposals made in comments for definition of new terms

- *corrective action plan* (also under 4.2 above): there is a need to carry out an analysis of different types of plans (corrective action plans, emergency action plan, contingency plans, etc.), of how the terms are used in ISPMs, and of whether definition or recommendations on use are needed.
- *delimited area*: not needed; self-explanatory
- *official recognition*: Not needed; *official* is already defined
- *proposal to define terms related to principles: minimal impact; modification; -transparency; harmonization; risk analysis; managed risk; non-discrimination; cooperation; equivalence* - Not needed. These are explained adequately by ISPM No. 1 (2006).

PROPOSED WORK PROGRAMME

Table 1 - Regular tasks (to be carried out every year)

nature of the task	action	who	deadline (for 2006-2007)
Preparation of the report	finalize report	Secretariat with Chairperson - relevant items to SC November - full report to TPG for comments and finalization	27 October 2006 30 November 2006 (from 2007, mid-December)
Report to SC on TPG activities	on issues of relevance for the November meeting full report with decisions needed	steward steward with complete report	SC November 2006 (in 2006: reaction to comments, annotated glossary, review of ISPMs, <i>regulated</i>) SC May 2007
Reaction to country comments on definitions in draft ISPMs or amendments to ISPM No. 5	Recommendations to be integrated in tables of compiled comments to be sent to stewards and SC7/SC <i>(only to SC7/SC in the case of amendments to the Glossary)</i>	Secretariat with Chairperson	16 October 2006
Reaction to new terms and definitions proposed by countries	Integration of the TPG recommendation in compiled comments for review by the steward and SC Compilation of a separate table of recommendations for decision by SC in May Development of draft definitions as appropriate	Secretariat SC to decide on proposals in table 3 Secretariat informs persons identified in third table that paper needed by 1 September 2007, and TPG 2007 reviews proposals	16 October 2006 May 2007 SC to review table 3 June 2007
New or revised terms for country consultation in the following year	Compilation of proposed amendments to the Glossary to be compiled based on TPG discussions under different agenda items, and bold to be included for glossary terms in draft definitions	Secretariat to compile and submit by email to whole group for validation before paper made available to SC in May of the following year	Paper to whole group: 18 December as part of report (Appendix 3) Available for SC May as separate paper: 15 January 2006
Review of draft ISPMs for possible inconsistencies	2006: include some detected inconsistencies in tables of comments 2007: Preliminary preparation reviews drafts and recommendations made in the table of comments	Secretariat All TPG members prior to meeting TPG	16 October 2006 between the beginning of country consultation and 2007 TPG meeting to be tried out at 2007 TPG and procedure to be developed depending on how it works
Tasks in relation with language	check accuracy of translation of definitions in draft ISPMs before country consultation	TPG members in their language receive draft definitions and send them back to Secretariat	Mid-May 2007, to be completed within 1 or 2 days
Review of annotated glossary	update based on changes on the glossary	TPG	starting when first version will have been adopted
guidance on use of acronyms in draft ISPMs	addition to Administrative guidelines that acronyms defined in the Glossary can be used in standards without a mention of the full term	-SC -Secretariat	-to decide -to make change in next version of Procedural Manual / Administrative guidelines

Table 2 - One-off tasks

nature	action	who	deadline
Review of adopted ISPMs	Define task Preliminary work by a consultant. Revise paper and recruit consultant (estimated: 3 months) review preliminary work and make recommendations for SC	TPG Secretariat extra TPG meeting	Done and SC November 2006 2006-2007 or later depending on resources 2007 if consultant has done work and resources available (1st preference: not back to back)
annotated glossary	finalization of the explanatory document and circulation to TPG Comments to Secretariat revise document and send back to Secretariat Send to SC or TPG depending on changes (Ian Smith to decide)	Ian Smith to finalize Secretariat to circulate to TPG TPG members Ian Smith Secretariat	15 November 2006 10 December 2006 15 January 2007 15 February 2007 15 February 2007
paper on interpretation of CBD terms	finalize paper and send to CBD for reaction Finalization of paper based on reactions Presentation to SC and decision on status/process for document	Secretariat and CBD Secretariat Ian Smith, consulting TPG by email SC	25 October 2006 / 1 January 2007 15 February 2007 May 2007
anthology published by CBD	finalize comments and send to CBD Secretariat	Secretariat	15 November
regulated pests in relation to domestic measures	finalize paper for SC Paper to SC	during TPG Secretariat	done SC November 2006, postponed to SC May 2007
review of language versions of the Glossary	All languages : report to TP on nature/reason for each substantial change needed, then TPG to decide how to submit changes	TPG member	Papers to Secretariat : 1 August 2007 Decision at TP meeting October 2007
	French	Secretariat to contact French expert for cross-checking of French translations of draft ISPMs. If expert found, Ian Smith to interact for check of the Glossary	October 2006 Before TPG 2007
	Arabic	Secretariat to contact ASPP. Mohammad Katbeh Bader to take part in review of Glossary	October 2006 Before TPG 2007
	Spanish	Ana Peralta	Before TPG 2007
	Chinese	Secretariat already contacted Chinese authorities about Chinese translations Contact through Wu Lifeng	October 2006
Reference to supplement no. 2	include after relevant definitions in the Glossary	Secretariat	when ISPM No. 5 (2007) is prepared
Correction to the definition of "occurrence"	Correct typo in ISPM No. 5 in the definition of "occurrence"	Secretariat	when ISPM No. 5 (2007) is prepared

Table 3 - New terms proposed in 2006 country comments for SC decision on future work

term [and draft ISPM under which comment was made]	TPG recommendation	action	deadline
pest risk (for RNQP) <i>[revised ISPM No. 2]</i>	proposes definition, to go through consultation in 2007	SC to decide	SC November included the proposed definition in the draft ISPM No. 2 for approval at CPM-2
corrective action plan <i>[draft ISPMs: FF-ALPPs; recognition of PFAs and ALPPs]</i>	analysis of different types of plans (corrective action plans, emergency action plan, contingency plans, etc.), of how the terms are used in ISPM, and of whether definition or recommendations on use are needed	SC to decide Ana Peralta to draft paper if needed	SC May 2007 If needed, paper before 1 September 2007
hazard <i>[revised ISPM No. 2]</i>	analysis on how is used in existing standards. No agreement on whether should be defined. Some think that generally avoided in standards and avoiding its use could continue. Some that it should be defined	SC to decide if analysis needed <i>Note: term is not used anymore in the draft sent to CPM-2</i>	SC May 2007. Further SC reaction in comments table from SC November 2006 If needed, paper before 1 September 2007
incidence <i>[revised ISPM No. 2]</i> <i>[see also 8.1 and 8.2]</i>	look at how term used in existing standards, and see if can develop definition. And discuss "infestation level" as well	SC to decide	SC May 2007 If needed, paper before 1 September 2007
natural range <i>[revised ISPM No. 2]</i>	See if used somewhere else and see if can come up with definition	SC to decide	SC May 2007 If needed, paper before 1 September 2007
risk communication <i>[revised ISPM No. 2]</i>	see how revised ISPM No. 2 is modified and decide if properly explained in standard or if definition is needed	SC to decide	SC May 2007. Further SC reaction in comments table from SC November 2006 If needed, paper before 1 September 2007
uncertainty <i>[revised ISPM No. 2]</i>	look at final standard and see if needs to be defined or not	SC to decide	SC May 2007. Further SC reaction in comments table from SC November 2006
regulatory control <i>[FF-ALPPs]</i>	See how it is used in standards and see if definition needed	SC to decide	SC May 2007 If needed, paper before 1 September 2007
alien plants <i>[revised ISPM No. 2]</i>	Not needed. TPG recommends not to define. See how standard modified	SC to decide <i>Note: term is not used anymore in the draft sent to CPM-2</i>	SC May 2007. Further SC reaction in comments table from SC November 2006 If needed, paper before 1 September 2007
sites and places of production <i>[FF-ALPPs]</i>	Not needed. Already definitions of place of production, pest free place of production and pest free production site	SC to decide	SC May 2007
stated efficacy <i>[phytosanitary treatments for regulated pests]</i>	Not needed. Efficacy already defined	SC to decide	SC May 2007

term [and draft ISPM under which comment was made]	TPG recommendation	action	deadline
phytosanitary treatment [phytosanitary treatments for regulated pests]	Not needed. Treatment is defined. But standard not clear on what the term covers	SC to decide	SC May 2007
bark free [debarked and bark free wood]	Not needed. Bark free wood and bark are defined	SC to decide	SC May 2007
delimited area [recognition of PFAs and ALPPs]	Not needed self-explanatory	SC to decide	SC May 2007
official recognition [recognition of PFAs and ALPPs]	Not needed. official is defined	SC to decide	SC May 2007
minimal impact; modification; transparency; harmonization; risk analysis; managed risk; non-discrimination; cooperation; equivalence [recognition of PFAs and ALPPs]	Not needed. Explained adequately by ISPM 1	SC to decide	SC May 2007

2007 AMENDMENTS TO THE GLOSSARY (FOR REVIEW BY THE SC IN MAY 2007)**EXPLANATORY NOTE FOR THE MAY 2007 MEETING STANDARDS COMMITTEE**

At its meeting in October 2006, the TPG made proposals in relation to additions, revisions and deletions for of terms and definitions, as requested by the SC or ICPM. As in 2006, it is proposed that explanations on reasons are given in the document that will be sent for country consultation. This paper was drafted by the Secretariat based on TPG discussions, reviewed by TPG members by email when finalizing the report. It is presented for review/modification by the SC in May 2007.

If the SC takes a decision on the issue of *regulated pest*, presented under a separate agenda item, it might decide to add to the Amendments to the Glossary some additions and revisions of terms prior to 2007 country consultation.

PROPOSED DOCUMENT FOR COUNTRY CONSULTATION**AMENDMENTS TO ISPM No. 5 (GLOSSARY OF PHYTOSANITARY TERMS)**

The Standards Committee is asked to consider the following proposals made by the Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG) in relation to additions, revisions and deletions in ISPM No. 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*) A brief explanation is given for each proposal. For revised terms and definitions, explanations of the changes made to the last approved definition are also given. It is suggested that comments should relate to these changes.

1. NEW TERMS AND DEFINITIONS**1.1 Prevalence****Background**

The term was a proposed addition to the Glossary and was sent out for country consultation in 2004. This term/definition was sent back to the GWG by the SC in November 2004 on the basis that a definition of *low pest prevalence* had been proposed in the draft on ALPP. That definition was not maintained in ISPM No. 22. The definition was revised by the GWG and proposed to the SC in May 2006, as part of the proposed amendments to the glossary. The SC sent it to the TPG for further review, with queries on the use of the word population in the definition, and whether it applied to field situations, or also to stored product pests or stored product situations. The definition proposed below was developed by the TPG in October 2006.

The following points may be considered when reviewing the definition below:

- *populations* is used in its statistical sense, and would therefore cover all cases referred to above.
- the proposed definition covers three different types of prevalence, always at a given time: number of production units in which the pest is present related to the total area surveyed; number of plants affected by pest; level of occurrence of a pest in an area (independently from plants or units).
- the concept of low pest prevalence in ALPP is a low level of population or a level of pest below a threshold level, without a time component. For that reason, this concept did not fit in the definition of "prevalence".

Proposed definition

prevalence (of a pest)	Proportion of units in a population that is affected by a pest at a given time, or the level of occurrence of a pest in an area at a given time as expressed by a defined index.
-------------------------------	--

1.2 Tolerance**Background**

This term/definition was sent for country consultation in 2004, as part of the draft ISPM 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 had met. The definition proposed to the SC in May 2006 was sent back to the TPG for further consideration, and a new definition proposed by the TPG in October 2006.

The following points may be considered when reviewing the definition below:

- the term *tolerance* is used in various contexts, and that definition applied to pests. The term has a very wide application and its definition should be kept broad so as not to restrict its meaning and use. The term *tolerance level* is proposed.

- the SC had wondered whether the definition should use the term *phytosanitary action* or *phytosanitary measures*. The TPG noted that a *phytosanitary measure* is a procedure, written down, for example for fumigation of a consignment. If a consignment is fumigated, this is an action. In the case of the definition, action was therefore the correct word since finding of the pest above a certain level will trigger some action.
- the definition creates a link between tolerance and prevalence

Proposed definition

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

2. REVISED TERMS AND DEFINITIONS

2.1 Beneficial organisms

Background

Discussions of the revision of the definition of biological control following CPM-1 led to proposing deletion of that term from the Glossary at CPM-2, and revision of the definition of beneficial organisms to cover sterile insects.

Proposed definition:

beneficial organism	Any organism directly or indirectly advantageous to plants or plant products , including biological control agents and sterile insects
----------------------------	---

3. PROPOSED DELETIONS

ICPM-7 adopted the revised ISPM No. 3 (2005). A number of terms in the Glossary were defined when ISPM No. 3 (1996) was developed. It is proposed that the following terms and their definitions should be deleted. Reasons are given for each term.

term	reason for deletion
authority	ISPM No. 3 (2005) uses the words "NPPO or responsible authority". The existing definition of authority does not apply to that use. It also mentions the "code" which was ISPM No. 3 (1996). A definition is not needed.
biological pesticide (biopesticide)	The current definition is out of date, for example it does not cover plant extracts. The term is used in ISPM No. 3 (2005) and in ISPM No. 9 but does not have a meaning which is specific for the IPPC. A definition is not needed.
classical biological control, introduction (of a biological control agent), establishment (of a biological control agent)	The definition was linked to ISPM No. 3 (1996). There is no need for specific definitions in relation to any ISPM
exotic	The definition was linked to ISPM No. 3 (1996) and the term is not used in ISPM No. 3 (2005). It is now used only in ISPM No. 9. The TPG thought that it was preferable to delete the term and definition from the glossary, and recommended that the equivalent term <i>non indigenous</i> could be used in standards if needed instead of exotic, for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the definition uses the term <i>ecoarea</i>, which has already been deleted from the glossary. - this term causes confusion in Spanish and French since <i>alien</i> and <i>exotic</i> are translated by the same word (<i>exotico</i> in Spanish and <i>exotique</i> in French).
Import Permit (of a biological control agent)	<i>Import Permit</i> is defined in the glossary and its definition covers the case of import permit for biological control agents.
micro-organism	This is a common term which does not have a meaning which is specific for the IPPC
specificity	this term is self-explanatory and the current definition might cause confusion

REVIEW OF ISPMs

Background

The review of ISPMs for consistency was added to work programme by CPM-1 in April 2006. In May 2006, the SC approved a specification for the review of ISPMs (see annex 1) and concluded that the steward could provide advice to the SC on how to proceed on this topic. The scope of the specification addresses the review of adopted ISPMs and the review of draft ISPMs. These are presented separately in the present document, which was finalized following discussion by the Technical Panel for the Glossary in October 2006. It is for discussion at the present SC meeting in order that the review can start in 2006-2007 if resources are available.

1. Review of adopted ISPMs

Proposed process based on the specification

1. Consultant hired to do preliminary work
 2. TPG reviews proposed changes at a special meeting, reviews preliminary work and prepares proposals.
 - for consistency changes: proposes modifications needed and standard setting process to be followed
 - for extensive / non editorial changes: develops specification (task 2)
 - for other elements identified: makes recommendations for future improvements of consistency.
 3. All recommendations are presented to the SC, at a time appropriate to the standard setting process proposed.
- The standard setting work programme states that the review of ISPMs may be submitted under the fast-track standard setting process. As provided in task 3.c of the specification, the TPG could make a recommendation on the more appropriate process (fast-track or regular) for each of the modifications proposed. Very minor editorial changes could be made without country consultation.

Proposed timing

- When resources become available
- Consultant work. TPG estimated that it would take 3 months to do the preliminary work. Possibly end 2006-beginning 2007
- Special TPG meeting: possibly in 2007.

Elements to be considered in the review

A list of elements to be considered is given as Annex 2. The TPG suggests that the preliminary work should not be limited to major inconsistencies and to changes to be submitted through an approval process, but should be as complete as possible. Identification of editorial or structural inconsistencies will be useful for the further improvement of ISPMs.

Standards to be considered

All adopted standards except ISPM No. 2 (1995) whose revised version is close to adoption (consider ISPM No. 2, 2007, if adopted and review is done after the adoption). ISPM No. 5 should also be excluded.

Terms of reference for a consultant

1. Taking into account the elements listed in Annex 2, review the following sources to identify other consistency changes/types of changes which have already been identified:
 - reports (ICPM/CPM, Standards Committee and Glossary Working Group/Technical Panel for the Glossary)
 - successive published versions of the Glossary
 - draft annotated glossary
2. Propose to the Secretariat and TPG steward a format to facilitate review of inconsistencies and proposed modifications
3. Review all adopted ISPMs (except ISPM No. 2, 1995, and ISPM No. 5) taking into account the elements in Annex 2, those identified under 1, and others identified during the review
4. For findings necessitating change, list in the agreed format the inconsistencies and, if possible, propose modifications, with a rationale
5. For findings relating to style, format or structure, establish a list and identify where better guidance could be given in the *Administrative guidelines*.

2. Review of draft ISPMs

Background

One element in the scope of the specification for the TPG is to "... ensure changes to terms are reflected in draft ISPMs". This would aim at avoiding terminological inconsistencies in draft ISPMs. The review of adopted ISPMs would also identify some elements to be considered for the review of draft ISPMs.

Appropriate timing

The TPG should review draft ISPMs at a stage when the SC still has the possibility to review its proposals, and when the draft is less likely to undergo drastic changes.

Ideally this should take place between the SC-7 and the SC, but this is not possible under the current standard setting timing.

In the current timing, such a review should take place before the SC meeting in November (for standards in the regular standard setting process).

Process proposed

The TPG envisaged several solutions. It recommends that draft ISPMs sent for consultation should be reviewed at the regular TPG meeting, based on preliminary work to be done by each TPG members to identify inconsistencies.

Recommendations would then be forwarded to the steward/SC-7/SC, at the same time as recommendations on country comments (note that this has been done this year for the draft revised ISPM No. 2, in which two inconsistencies were identified and added to the compiled table of comments).

The TPG excluded carrying out this activity entirely by email, or in an additional annual meeting.

SPECIFICATION NO. 32

Title: Review of ISPMs.

Reason for the review: ICPM-7 (2005) requested that “the Standards Committee, in coordination with the Glossary Working Group and the Secretariat, to develop a proposal for the first meeting of the CPM on technical adjustments to definitions or other text in ISPMs to promote consistency among standards, taking into account their evolution over time” (Report of ICPM-7, paragraph 97.9).

The Standards Committee (SC), at its meeting in April 2005, followed up on this by asking the Glossary Working Group (GWG), while doing a review of the definitions sections of standards (as requested in section 97.8 of the ICPM-7 report), to also give consideration to the need of revision of the standards, and to provide advice to the next SC meeting.

In carrying out this task, the GWG felt that a more complete review of ISPMs was needed and suggested a technical consultant be hired to conduct an initial review. The results of this initial review would be submitted to a group of experts to determine which revisions are necessary and a strategy for their revision.

Scope and purpose: To review existing ISPMs to determine which require revisions, ensure terms are correctly used throughout existing ISPMs, ensure changes made to terms are reflected in these existing ISPMs and to ensure changes to terms are reflected in draft ISPMs.

Tasks: The experts should:

1. Review the preliminary work to be done by a technical consultant in relation to existing ISPMs to identify areas needing correction (terms of reference for consultant to be developed by the IPPC Secretariat).
2. Make recommendations on ISPMs requiring extensive/non editorial revision by:
 - a) identifying need for revision
 - b) drafting as appropriate specifications for ISPMs requiring revision
 - c) presenting recommendations and specifications to the Standards Committee.
3. Ensure terms are correctly used throughout existing ISPMs and that changes made to terms are reflected in these existing ISPM by:
 - a) reviewing editorial aspects of how changes in terminology have affected adopted ISPMs
 - b) making recommendations as appropriate to the SC on the use of the term *country of origin* in ISPMs No. 11 and 20
 - c) making recommendations as appropriate to the SC on changes to be made in ISPMs (taking into account ISPMs to be considered by separate expert drafting groups, such as ISPMs No. 7, 12 and 15) and on a possible process to be used for approval of the changes (including the fast-track process, as appropriate)
 - d) reviewing the use of terms “must”, “shall”, “should” and “may” as decided at CPM-1 (2006).

Provision of resources: Funding for meetings is provided from the regular programme of the IPPC (FAO) except where expert participation is funded voluntarily by the expert’s government.

Steward: John Hedley (New Zealand).

Collaborator: To be determined.

Expertise: For the preliminary study, one consultant having knowledge of ISPMs and IPPC terminology, outside of the membership of the Technical Panel for the *Glossary*. For the review, experience in reviewing glossary terms and the glossary of phytosanitary terms.

Participants: To be determined.

Approval: Added to the work programme by CPM-1 (2006). Specification approved by the Standards Committee, May 2006.

References: SC document 2005-SCNov-39; ISPM No. 5; all existing ISPMs; discussion paper on the use of the term *country of origin* in ISPMs as modified by the SC in May 2006.

Annex 2 (to Appendix 4 of the TPG report)

List of elements to be taken into account during the review of adopted ISPMs

From the specification

- Editorial aspects of how changes in terminology have affected adopted ISPMs [this is covered by several points below]
- Use of the term *country of origin* in ISPMs No. 11 and 20 (considering suggestions by Sc May 2006 - See 2006-TPG-08, 2006-SC-May-08)
- Use of terms “must”, “shall”, “should” and “may”, or other expressions used to convey a level of obligation without using these terms

From GWG prior recommendations

- Introduction of new concepts into old standards. Example: ISPMs No. 4 and 10 might need to be reviewed in relation with the subsequent developments with regard to systems approaches.
- Introduction of new terms which have impact on the wording of previous standards. Example: phytosanitary import requirements.
- Terms and definitions which have changed in the glossary, and which don't apply to earlier standard. These cases were identified when finalizing the section "definitions" in the book of standards : use of outbreak in ISPMs No. 8 and No. 9 - outbreak to be replaced by incursion
- Change of usage of terms: e.g. ISPMs No. 4, 6, 10 and 13 may need to be reviewed as due to changes in terminology these standards were no longer consistent with the present usage of the terms “phytosanitary measures/actions” and “emergency measures/actions”
- Adjustment of terms for items already worked on by the GWG and approved in definitions in 2004:
 - identify the use of “*phytosanitary*” in standards. *Phytosanitary* can be used with an unrestricted sense or with the restricted meaning in relation only to “*related to regulated pests*”. In these cases, appropriate wording could be added to specify this (where part of a glossary term (e.g. “*phytosanitary measure*”, it can remain as it is).
 - identify the use of “*phytosanitary regulation or procedure*” can now be changed to “*phytosanitary measure*”, because of the agreed interpretation for phytosanitary measure.
 - officially recognized, officially authorized, officially prescribed can refer to official, which is defined in the glossary.
- Use of a word instead of the correct Glossary term (e.g. in ISPM No. 23 "rejection" is used instead of "refusal" (GWG 2005))
- Terms which are not in the glossary and which use has changed over the year
- Inconsistencies in the use of *NPPO* versus *contracting party* or *country* or *government*
- Technical inconsistencies between standards
- Possible change in titles – to take into account changes of practice over time and the present unpopularity of “guidelines”.

Editorial, format and structure

- Inconsistencies of vocabulary for non-Glossary terms which are editorials (e.g. trade partner versus trading partner, etc.) . .
- Inconsistency of style (e.g. quotes or references, references to ISPMs, etc.)
- Recurrent inconsistencies relating to vocabulary, structure, format, etc. for which better guidance could be given in the *administrative guidelines*. E.g. content of scope, use of words.
- Inconsistencies with the format and structure of ISPMs (e.g. inappropriate scope)
- Lack of clarity in ISPMs.

References in standards:

- If section reference refers to previous version of the glossary, see which terms have changed since, and whether reference can be updated to the latest version of the Glossary
- Verify the section *References* to make sure that it is up-to-date for standards which have been updated
- Verify existing cross-references, and introduce appropriate cross-references, i.e. add references to later standards in earlier ones, as appropriate.

**Explanatory Document on (or Guidelines for the Interpretation of the)
Terminology of the Convention on Biological Diversity
in relation to International Standard for Phytosanitary Measures N° 5
(Glossary of Phytosanitary Terms)**

Ian M. Smith
European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization
Paris
September 2006

Introduction

Since 2001, initiatives have been taken by the Standards Committee of the ICPM (now CPM) to accommodate, within the framework of the IPPC, the protection of the environment and of biological diversity in relation to the introduction and spread of non-indigenous species. In particular, ISPM no. 11 on Pest Risk Analysis for quarantine pests has been extensively adjusted to ensure that it covers risks arising from pests which primarily affect the environment and biological diversity, including harmful plants in particular. Supplement no. 2 of ISPM no. 5 Glossary of phytosanitary terms has analysed in detail how the concept of “potential economic importance” which appears in the definition of a “quarantine pest” can be understood to cover effects on the environment and biological diversity. This clarification of the scope of the IPPC is now basically understood and accepted by contracting parties.

In this process, there has been continued contact and cooperation with the other main international body responsible for this subject area, i.e. the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD). The CBD has formulated similar recommendations to its members, but in different terms. Over the years, an attempt has been made within the two bodies to explore the areas of compatibility between the objectives of the two conventions, so as to facilitate their parallel implementation.

In this respect, a key area is the use of compatible terminology. The IPPC system has already in place an agreed and consistent terminology in the form of ISPM no. 5 Glossary of phytosanitary terms. The CBD has established a number of terms and definitions in the framework of its Guiding Principles. Since 2001, there have been several consultative exchanges between the secretariats of the respective conventions on this subject. On the IPPC side, this has resulted in several attempts by the Glossary Working Group to incorporate CBD terminology into the Glossary. However, none of the proposals made up to the present time have seemed entirely satisfactory either to the Glossary Working Group or to the Standards Committee to which it reported.

The problem is that the two bodies use not only different terminology, but also different concepts. In particular, the CBD is only concerned with species which are moved by human agency, and its terminology only refers to those species (“alien species”) which have already been moved into an area where they are not indigenous. This movement as such is referred to as “introduction”, which accordingly does not include “establishment” (as it does for the IPPC). So it is not possible to include CBD terms and definitions directly in the Glossary, and maintain at the same time the general rule that Glossary definitions use Glossary terms wherever possible. Nor is it very practical to solve the problem by inserting “agreed interpretations” of the terms and definitions which present a difficulty.

The present document accepts that, although the CBD terms and definitions are established and in current use, they cannot simply be incorporated into the Glossary. In some related cases, for example in connection with the SPS Agreement or with the Cartagena Protocol on living modified organisms, it has been possible to incorporate external terminology directly into the Glossary. The definitions concerned do not “interfere” with the Glossary terminology. In the case of the CBD terms and definitions, however, there is real interference, which cannot be accommodated. Accordingly, this document proposes another solution, which is, outside the Glossary, to explain the meanings of the CBD terms using IPPC terminology (and in particular Glossary terms).

Presentation

In relation to each term considered, the CBD definition is first provided. This is followed by a proposed “explanatory definition in IPPC terms”, in which, as usual, Glossary terms are shown in **bold**. These explanatory definitions may also include CBD terms, in which case these are also in **bold** and followed by “(CBD)”. In a few cases, it has been necessary to use Glossary terms which are also CBD terms, in which case these are distinguished by being followed by “(IPPIC)”. The resulting set of explanatory definitions constitutes the main body of this explanatory document.

Each definition is followed by notes, providing further explanation and clarification of some of the difficulties. However, the explanatory definitions, in IPPC language, are intended to be self-sufficient.

Alien species

CBD definition: a species, subspecies or lower taxon, introduced outside its natural past or present distribution; includes any part, gametes, seeds, eggs, or propagules of such species that might survive and subsequently reproduce

Explanatory definition in IPPC terms: an **alien species (CBD)** is an individual or population, at any life stage, of an **organism** which is not indigenous to an **area** and which has been **introduced (CBD)** into that **area**.

Notes

1. For CBD purposes, an alien has already entered the **area** of concern (see **Introduction** below). It is sometimes stated that “alien” means the same as “exotic”, or “not indigenous”, or “not native”. In the Glossary, we find a definition only of “exotic”, which relates primarily to **biological control agents** and is applied to **organisms** “intentionally or accidentally **introduced**”. So “exotic” is effectively a synonym of “alien” without its pejorative implications. ISPMs use the words “indigenous” or “native”, and by implication their opposites, without special definition. For IPPC purposes, these words need to be understood broadly: a **pest** which is not indigenous in an **area** does not naturally occur there, whether it has been found there or not. Thus, **PRAs** may be done on non-indigenous **pests** which do not **occur** in the **PRA area**, or on non-indigenous **pests** which do **occur (alien pests in the CBD definition)**, or on indigenous **pests** not widely distributed in the **PRA area**.

2. A species which is not indigenous and has entered an **area** through natural means is not an **alien species (CBD)**. It is simply extending its natural range. For **IPPC** purposes, such a species could still be considered as a potential **quarantine pest**.

3. The CBD definition throws emphasis on the physical presence of individuals of a species at a certain time, whereas the IPPC concept of occurrence relates to the geographical distribution of the taxon in general.

4. The qualification concerning “past and present” distribution is not relevant for IPPC purposes, since the IPPC is only concerned with existing situations. It does not matter that the species was present in the past if it is present now. The word “past” in the CBD definition presumably allows for the re-introduction of a species into an area where it has (recently) become extinct. Conservationists would not wish such a species to be considered alien. “Recently” is bracketed, because it is not stated explicitly; presumably, “ancient” extinctions, as attested by fossils, would not qualify.

Introduction

CBD definition: the movement by human agency, indirect or direct, of an alien species outside of its natural range (past or present). This movement can be either within a country or between countries or areas beyond national jurisdiction

Explanatory definition in IPPC terms: **introduction (CBD)** is the **entry** of a **species** into an **area where it is not indigenous**, through movement by human agency, either directly from an area where the species is indigenous or indirectly (by successive movement from an area where the species is indigenous through one or several areas where it is not).

Notes

1. As formulated, the CBD definition suggests that **introduction (CBD)** concerns an **alien species (CBD)**, and thus a species which has already been **introduced (CBD)**. However, it may be supposed from the text of many of the CBD Guiding Principles that this is not so, and that a non-indigenous species entering for the first time is being **introduced (CBD)**.

2. The issue of “areas beyond national jurisdiction” is not relevant for the IPPC.

3. In the case of indirect movement, it is not specifically stated in the definition whether all the movements from one **area** to another must be **introductions (CBD)** (i.e. by human agency, intentional or unintentional), or whether some can be by natural **spread**. This question arises, for example, where a species is **introduced (CBD)** into one **area** and then spreads naturally to an adjoining **area**. It seems that this may be considered as an indirect **introduction (CBD)**, so that the species concerned is an **alien species (CBD)** in the adjoining area, despite the fact that it **entered** it naturally. In the IPPC context, the intermediate country, from which the natural spread occurs, has no obligation to act to limit the natural spread, though it may have obligations to prevent intentional or unintentional **introduction (CBD)** if the importing country concerned establishes corresponding **phytosanitary measures**.

Invasive alien species

CBD definition: an alien species whose introduction and/or spread threaten biological diversity

Explanatory definition in IPPC terms: in the context of the IPPC, an **invasive alien species (CBD)** is an **alien species (CBD)** which by its **establishment** or **spread** has become injurious to (or had a harmful impact on) **plants** or **plant products**, or which by **risk analysis (CBD)** is shown to be potentially injurious to (or to have a potential harmful impact on) **plants** or **plant products**.

Notes

1. This is an interpretation which tries to bring the definition of an **invasive alien species (CBD)** as close as possible to those of a **pest** and of a **quarantine pest**, taking particular account of the explanations in Supplement 2 of ISPM no. 5 on what is meant by “economic importance” in the **IPPC** context. This Supplement considers that, provided a species has a potential for **introduction (IPPC)** and **spread**, economic importance depends on a harmful impact on crops, or on the environment, or on some other specific value (recreation, tourism, aesthetics). The threat to biological diversity is accordingly covered.

2. This interpretation is only to be understood in the context of the **IPPC**, i.e. of the protection of **plants**. It is clear that there are effects on biological diversity which do not concern **plants**, so that there are **invasive alien species (CBD)** which are not relevant to the **IPPC**.

3. Though, at one time, an attempt was made to equate **invasive alien species (CBD)** with **quarantine pest**, this now appears difficult. It is only feasible if “biological diversity” is given an extremely wide meaning, extending even to the integrity of crops in agroecosystems. It supposes that crop damage is a kind of reduction of agrobiological diversity. There is an opposing tendency in CBD circles to use “biological diversity” in a rather narrow sense, which would exclude cultivated **plants**, non-indigenous **plants** which have been imported and **planted** for amenity or habitat management, and even indigenous **plants** in all **habitats** which are to a certain degree “man-made”. Clearly, the **IPPC** does protect **plants** in these situations, so its scope is necessarily broader than that of the CBD. Further, the **IPPC quarantine pest** concept can be applied to **organisms** which have never entered the **endangered area**. In other words, there are various kinds of **quarantine pests** which are not **invasive alien species (CBD)**.

4. The CBD definition and its interpretation, as given above, have the disadvantage that they are not concerned with the usual meaning of the word “invasive”. In effect, only **alien species (CBD)** can be invasive. In common language, “invasive” seems to imply a particular kind of harmfulness, essentially by competition and exclusion of the harmed species, as happens between **plants**, or between animals. But the CBD definition also extends, for example, to the effects of animals on **plants**, or of microorganisms on **plants**, not normally associated with the idea of invasiveness. Besides, in common language, there is no reason why an indigenous species should not be called invasive. These problems are circumvented by defining only the term **invasive alien species**, and not the term **invasive**. The situation is akin to that of “regulated” in **regulated pest** in the **IPPC**.

5. The CBD Guiding Principles also refer to **invasive alien species** as threatening “ecosystems, habitats or species”, rather than “biodiversity”.

Establishment

CBD definition: the process of an alien species in a new habitat successfully producing viable offspring with a likelihood of continued survival

Explanatory definition in IPPC terms: **establishment (CBD)** is the **establishment** of an **alien species (CBD)** in a **habitat** in the **area** which it has **entered**, by successful reproduction.

Notes

1. The differences from the **IPPC** definition are not very significant:

- survival in an entirely man-managed situation is not **establishment (CBD)**, since this is not “in a habitat”;
- **establishment (CBD)** is a process, not a result. It seems that a single generation of reproduction can be **establishment (CBD)**, provided the offspring have a likelihood of continued survival (otherwise there would be a comma after “offspring”). The **IPPC** concept of “perpetuation for the foreseeable future” is not clearly expressed;
- “offspring” is not clearly understood. In ordinary English, it implies new individuals. In the definition, it is not clear how far it applies to **organisms** which propagate themselves vegetatively, so that the concept of an “individual” is not always easy to recognize (many **plants**, most fungi, other microorganisms). By using “perpetuation”, the **IPPC** avoids the question of reproduction or replication of individuals altogether. It is the species as a whole which survives. Even the growth of long-lived individuals to maturity could be considered to be perpetuation for the foreseeable future (e.g. plantations of a non-indigenous **plant**).

2. It may be noted that, despite the fact that **introduction (CBD)** does not include **establishment (CBD)**, CBD Guiding Principle 12 only proposes that “mitigation” measures should be taken after **establishment (CBD)**. In this Principle, the distinction between introduction and establishment is not clear.

Intentional introduction

CBD definition: deliberate movement and/or release by humans of an alien species outside its natural range

Explanatory definition in IPPC terms: **intentional introduction (CBD)** is import of a non-indigenous species as such, including its **release** into the environment.

Note

The “and/or” of the CBD definition is a little difficult to interpret. Movement and release is clear. Deliberate movement without release is by definition **intentional introduction (CBD)**, but what does it mean (maintenance under confinement?). Accidental movement by a human-mediated pathway, followed by deliberate release, seems even stranger. These situations are not in any case foreseen in the **IPPC** context, and would not be covered by international **phytosanitary measures**.

Unintentional introduction

CBD definition: all other introductions which are not intentional.

Explanatory definition in IPPC terms: **unintentional introduction (CBD)** is **entry** of a non-indigenous species with an traded **consignment** which it **infests** or **contaminates**, or by some other human-mediated **pathway** (passengers’ baggage, vehicles, artificial waterways, etc.)

Note.

This is the situation with which the IPPC is most concerned.

Risk analysis

CBD definition: 1) the assessment of the consequences of the introduction and of the likelihood of establishment of an alien species using science-based information (i.e., risk assessment), and (2) the identification of measures that can be implemented to reduce or manage these risks (i.e., risk management), taking into account socio-economic and cultural considerations

Explanatory definition in IPPC terms: **risk analysis (CBD)** is: 1) evaluation of the probability of **establishment** and **spread**, within an area, of an **alien species (CBD)** which has entered that area, 2) evaluation of the associated potential undesirable consequences, and 3) evaluation and selection of options to reduce the risk of such **establishment** and **spread**.

Note

This explanation is based on the IPPC definitions of **pest risk assessment** and **pest risk management**, rather than on that of **pest risk analysis**. It should be noted that **risk analysis (CBD)** is, as defined, domestic rather than international, since it is not specified that the measures applied can include restrictions on further **introductions (CBD)** of the species. However, it may be supposed (on the basis of CBD Guiding Principles 7 and 10) that the measures can include such restrictions, in which case the definition of **pest risk analysis (IPPC)** does apply.

It is not clear what kinds of consequences are considered (except that, being “risks”, they are presumably undesirable), nor at what stages in the process of **risk analysis (CBD)** socio-economic and cultural considerations are taken into account (during assessment, or during management, or both). No interpretation can be offered in relation to ISPM no. 11 or supplement 2 of ISPM no. 5.

Other concepts

The CBD Guiding Principles do not define other concepts, but they do use a number of others which do not seem to be considered in the same light by the IPPC and the CBD, or are not distinguished by the IPPC. These include:

- border controls
- quarantine measures
- burden of proof
- precautionary approach
- provisional measures
- control (does not include eradication or containment in Guiding Principles 13-15)
- statutory measures
- regulatory measures
- social impact
- economic impact

List of participants

TPG members	
<p>Steward: Mr. John HEDLEY Principal Adviser, Policy, Biosecurity New Zealand Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry Pastoral House, 25 The Terrace P.O. Box 2526 Wellington NEW ZEALAND Phone: +64 4 894 0428 Fax: +64 4 894 0731 E-mail: john.hedley@maf.govt.nz</p>	<p>Ms. Reinouw BAST-TJEERDE Manager, international plant protection issues Canadian Food Inspection Agency 59 Camelot Drive Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0Y9 CANADA Phone: +1 613 221 4344 Fax: +1 613 2286602 E-mail: rbast@inspection.gc.ca</p>
<p>Mr. Mohammad KATBEH BADER P.O. Box 11732/662 Amman JORDAN Phone: +962 6 5686151; 795895691 Fax: +962 6 5686310 E-mail: katbehbader@moa.gov.jo</p>	<p>Ms. Ana PERALTA Coordination Secretary - COSAVE Avda. Presidente Bulnes no.107, piso 2, Depto 24 Santiago CHILE Phone: (56 2) 6710722; 6714459; 6713371 Fax: (56 2) 6712947 E-mail: ana.peralta@sag.gob.cl; cosave@sag.gob.cl</p>
<p>Mr. Ian SMITH Mailing address: c/o EPPO 1 rue Le Nôtre 75016 Paris FRANCE Email: ian@ianclaresmith.com</p>	<p>Mr. WU Lifeng National Agro-technical Extension and Service Center Building 20 Maizidian Street Chaoyang District, Beijing, P.R.C. 100026 Phone: (8610)64194524 Fax: (8610)64194726 E-mail: wulifeng@agri.gov.cn</p>
IPPC Secretariat	
<p>Ms. Fabienne GROUSSET, Information officer Email: fabienne.grousset@fao.org</p> <p>Mr. Brent LARSON, Standards officer Email: brent.larson@fao.org</p>	<p>IPPC Secretariat Food and Agriculture Organization of the UN Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00153 Rome ITALY Phone: (+39) 06 5705 4812 Fax: (+39) 06 5705 4819 E-mail: ippc@fao.org</p>