



# **REPORT**

## **Technical Panel for the Glossary**

### **Virtual Meeting**

**8–9 and 13–16 December 2021**

**IPPC Secretariat**

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

The views expressed in this information product are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of FAO.

© FAO, 2022



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

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

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

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

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

## CONTENTS

1.	Opening of the meeting .....	5
1.1	Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat .....	5
2.	Meeting arrangements .....	5
2.1	Selection of the chairperson .....	5
2.2	Election of the rapporteur.....	5
2.3	Adoption of the agenda .....	5
2.4	Current specification: TP 5 (TPG, 2016 – for information).....	5
3.	Administrative matters .....	5
4.	Reports.....	6
4.1	Previous TPG December 2020 – January 2021 virtual meeting report.....	6
4.2	Extracts from other meeting reports of relevance to the TPG.....	6
5.	Addressing TPG-related comments on draft ISPMs submitted to the first consultation (1 July–30 September 2021).....	6
5.1	Draft 2021 amendments to ISPM 5 ( <i>Glossary of phytosanitary terms</i> ) (1994-001).....	7
5.2	Draft annex to ISPM 20: Use of specific import authorizations (2008-006) .....	13
5.3	Draft revision of ISPM 4 ( <i>Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas</i> ) (2009-002).....	14
5.4	Draft revision of ISPM 18 ( <i>Guidelines for the use of irradiation as a phytosanitary measure</i> ) (2014-007).....	16
5.5	Draft PT: Irradiation treatment for <i>Pseudococcus jackbeardsleyi</i> (2017-027) .....	17
6.	Subjects on the TPG work programme.....	17
6.1	“phytosanitary action” (2020-006).....	17
6.2	“phytosanitary procedure” (2020-007).....	19
7.	Review of ISPMs for consistency of terms and style .....	20
7.1	Proposals to TPG 2021 for amendments to “General recommendations on use of terms in ISPMs” and introductory wording in the <i>IPPC style guide</i> (2019).....	20
7.2	Consistency of adopted ISPMs (standard by standard) – List of proposed or approved ink amendments for ISPMs .....	22
8.	Explanation of Glossary terms.....	23
9.	TPG workplan.....	23
10.	Any other business.....	24
11.	Next meetings dates and types.....	24
12.	Close of the meeting .....	24
	Appendix 1: Agenda.....	25
	Appendix 2: Documents list .....	27
	Appendix 3: Participants list .....	29
	Appendix 4: Draft 2022 Amendments to the Glossary (1994-001) .....	31
	Appendix 5: TPG workplan 2022–2023.....	35
	Appendix 6: Proposed amendments to ISPMs .....	45

Appendix 7: Revised “General recommendations on use of terms in ISPMs” (section 5.2) and introductory wording (section 5.1) in the *IPPC style guide* (2019).....46

## 1. Opening of the meeting

### 1.1 Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat

- [1] On behalf of the IPPC Standard Setting Unit, Artur SHAMILOV, representing the IPPC Secretariat (hereafter referred to as “the secretariat”), welcomed all participants to the annual meeting of the Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG) and introduced the members of the secretariat.
- [2] The secretariat welcomed Konstantin GREBENNIKOV (the Russian Federation) as a new TPG member and Andrei ORLINSKI as an invited expert. Mr GREBENNIKOV had been selected by the Standards Committee (SC) to be the new TPG member for the Russian language, and Mr ORLINSKI had been selected as an invited expert to facilitate the handover from him to the new TPG member.

## 2. Meeting arrangements

### 2.1 Selection of the chairperson

- [3] The TPG selected Beatriz MELCHO (Uruguay) as chairperson.

### 2.2 Election of the rapporteur

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

### 2.3 Adoption of the agenda

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

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

- [6] The secretariat confirmed that the specification for the TPG (TP 5) had not changed since the last TPG meeting.<sup>1</sup>
- [7] The secretariat suggested that the TPG consider raising with the SC the possibility of revising TP 5 to increase the number of panel members. They noted that, as a result of the numerous consultation comments in Spanish, the Spanish-speaking panel member has a high workload.
- [8] One TPG member asked about possible news regarding the SC’s decision on TPG stewardship. In reply, the secretariat noted that, because of the workload required, no SC member had yet offered to become the TPG steward and the decision had been deferred to the next SC meeting. In the meantime, the SC had confirmed Laurence BOUHOT-DELDUC (France) as the TPG steward and Mr NORDBO as the assistant steward. The TPG steward thanked the TPG assistant steward for his great help as regards TPG stewardship.
- [9] The TPG steward clarified that the SC prefers the TPG steward to be an SC member since the stewards’ attendance at SC meetings is beneficial for the TPG.
- [10] The TPG steward also underlined the necessity of having a TPG steward with experience in TPG-related matters.
- [11] The TPG:
- (1) *invited* the SC to revise TP 5 to increase the number of TPG members for the Spanish language.

## 3. Administrative matters

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

---

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

## 4. Reports

### 4.1 Previous TPG December 2020 – January 2021 virtual meeting report

[13] The TPG steward informed the TPG that Appendix 6 (“Proposed amendments to International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPMs) (for noting by the SC and archiving by the Secretariat for future revision of these ISPMs)”) of the report was missing the corrections made during the TPG meeting (December 2020 – January 2021) and therefore should be replaced by the version that she had sent to the secretariat.<sup>2</sup>

[14] The TPG noted that those amendments relating to ISPM 4 (*Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas*) are no longer relevant since the output from the Expert Working Group (EWG) on the Revision of ISPM 4 (2009-002) had resolved all the issues raised by the TPG.<sup>3</sup> Therefore, although Appendix 6 should be corrected, only those parts that are still relevant should be submitted to the SC.

[15] The TPG:

(2) *requested* that the secretariat incorporate the agreed amendments to Appendix 6 to the TPG 2020 December – 2021 January meeting report and replace the report version on the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP) accordingly; and

(3) *agreed* to submit to the SC the proposed amendments to ISPMs for noting, excluding the amendments for ISPM 4 (*Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas*).

### 4.2 Extracts from other meeting reports of relevance to the TPG

[16] The Secretariat presented extracts from 2020–2021 EWGs and SC virtual meetings, including the associated e-forum outcomes.<sup>4</sup>

[17] Referring to the SC discussions in July 2021 on the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) Focus Group on Strengthening Pest Outbreak Alert and Response Systems,<sup>5</sup> one TPG member asked whether any further steps from the TPG are expected as to the former request for a definition of “emerging pest”.

[18] The secretariat noted that the large number of recently formed CPM focus groups made it challenging to determine what and how each focus group would work, what it would accomplish, and how long it would function. Hence, the secretariat suggested that the TPG wait until the CPM focus groups present their recommendations to the CPM.

## 5. Addressing TPG-related comments on draft ISPMs submitted to the first consultation (1 July–30 September 2021)

[19] The TPG reviewed all consultation comments on the draft amendments to ISPM 5 submitted in the first consultation, together with selected comments on the other draft ISPMs, for consistency in the use of terms.

[20] Individual TPG members had been assigned one of the draft ISPMs and had drafted suggested TPG responses. Additionally, TPG members for the Spanish and French languages had produced draft TPG responses to translation comments. Issues in the Spanish language were particularly numerous. Draft responses had then been submitted for review and written commenting by all TPG members via the Online Comment System. Based upon this, the TPG responses were finalized in this virtual meeting.

---

<sup>2</sup> TPG 2020 December – 2021 January virtual meeting report: [www.ippc.int/en/publications/89822](http://www.ippc.int/en/publications/89822)

<sup>3</sup> 2020 December – 2021 January virtual meeting report of the EWG on the Revision of ISPM 4 (*Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas*) (2009-002): [www.ippc.int/en/publications/89755](http://www.ippc.int/en/publications/89755)

<sup>4</sup> 05\_TPG\_2021\_Dec.

<sup>5</sup> SC 2021-07, agenda item 7.3

[21] Recommendations from the TPG will be transmitted to the respective stewards of the draft standards and to the Standards Committee Working Group (SC-7) (May 2022). Replies by the TPG to translation comments will be transferred to the FAO Translation Services.

[22] Details of the TPG's recommendations and associated explanations are provided in the respective tables of compiled comments, and only a summary of major issues is presented in this report.

### 5.1 Draft 2021 amendments to ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*) (1994-001)

[23] Mr NORDBO, Assistant Steward, presented the draft TPG responses.<sup>6</sup>

#### *Proposed addition of "identity (of a consignment)" (2011-001)*

[24] The TPG considered the suggestions for including in the definition some further elements described in the phytosanitary certificate.

[25] The TPG acknowledged that, in colloquial phrasing, a consignment may often be understood to include, for example, the packaging and seals. However, the Glossary definition determines "consignment" to be those actual commodities being moved between countries and covered by a particular phytosanitary certificate. Therefore, elements in the phytosanitary certificate dealing with packaging, packages, distinguishing marks (as part of the packaging description), and conveyances do not belong to the consignment's identity. The packaging and its distinguishing marks and conveyances could change along the chain of delivery, but that would not change the identity of the consignment (and the national plant protection organization (NPPO) in the importing country should normally accept the consignment regardless of the change of packaging, conveyance, etc., according to ISPM 12 (*Phytosanitary certificates*)).

[26] The TPG noted that, in elaborating a definition, the presumption had been that "identity check" is intended to mean that the NPPO investigates to ascertain that *a particular consignment is identical to the one for which an exporting NPPO had issued a certain phytosanitary certificate*. As any phytosanitary certificate issued would exclusively cover the inspected collection of plants, plant products, or other regulated articles, the *origin* is an indispensable, non-material part of the consignment's identity (as inserted in the "place of origin" section of a phytosanitary certificate, described in ISPM 12, section 5 (I)).

[27] The TPG emphasized that the "identification" of a consignment is a different concept than the "identity" of a consignment. The *number* of the phytosanitary certificate is implicitly covered by the word "its" in the proposed definition and therefore need not be explicitly mentioned.

[28] While the TPG acknowledged that the "Name and address of the *exporter*" is operationally important for enabling NPPOs to trace a particular consignment, a consignment may go through several exporters without its identity being affected. This section of the phytosanitary certificate is therefore not deemed part of the identity. Likewise, the "Declared name and address of the *consignee*" may shift along the delivery chain without affecting the identity of the consignment.

[29] With regards to queries on "place of origin" versus "country of origin," the TPG concluded that according to the text in ISPM 12, section 5 (I) on "Place of origin", this concept includes "country of origin", and (as stated in that section), "In all cases, the name of the country or countries of origin should be stated". Furthermore, the "place of origin" is the wording used in the Model Phytosanitary Certificate.

[30] The TPG, therefore, recommended that the revised definition be retained exactly as worded in the version sent for the first consultation, to read:

<b>identity</b> (of a	The components of a <b>consignment</b> as covered by its <b>phytosanitary</b>
-----------------------	---

<sup>6</sup> 06\_TPG\_2021\_Dec; 07\_TPG\_2021\_Dec; 12\_TPG\_2021\_Dec; 1994-001.

<b>consignment)</b>	<b>certificate</b> and described in the sections “name of produce and quantity declared”, “botanical name of <b>plants</b> ” and “place of origin”
---------------------	--

***Proposed revision of “integrity (of a consignment)” (consequential) (2021-008)***

- [31] Triggered by comments as regards what kind of seals are meant to be covered by the definition and that seals could be legitimately broken by authorities other than the NPPO, the TPG discussed several definition options, particularly whether or not to include aspects of seals and packaging in the definition, noting that the original definition did not include those.
- [32] The TPG noted that, in the current wording of ISPM 23 (*Guidelines for inspection*), section 2.2, a physical examination may include checking for seals, but this is not linked to and need not influence the definition of “integrity”.
- [33] One member raised concerns that if a seal is broken or a package is damaged, there is the potential for infestation even if the identity is unaffected. This infestation aspect would not be covered if the phrase “seals or packaging undamaged” was not included in the definition.
- [34] Some members suggested returning as far as possible to the concept covered by the original definition by omitting any notion of seals and packaging but reintroducing “without substitution or loss” at the end of the definition.
- [35] One member queried whether seal and packaging aspects could ever be sufficiently well described in a definition of “integrity” to cover concerns of infestation. For example, there might be situations when the seal is not broken but changed, or the packaging is not damaged but inappropriate.
- [36] One member reminded the TPG that the description of a consignment includes a description of the packaging that partly serves to prevent the potential for infestation, and similarly for a container and its seal. Thus, the packaging and seal are tied to the phytosanitary aspect.
- [37] While the TPG maintained that damage to packaging or illegitimately broken seals could be warning signs that the consignment may have become prone to infestation or contamination, the TPG also acknowledged that the definition should reflect the fact that seals could be legitimately broken by other authorities before the compliance procedure.
- [38] Given that the consultation comments had mainly requested clarity as regards seals, the TPG concluded that their recommendation would be a revised definition incorporating a slight change to the version sent for the first consultation, to read:

<b>integrity (of a consignment)</b>	<u>Composition State of a <b>consignment</b> when its <b>identity</b> is unchanged, <b>packaging</b> undamaged and any seals intact until broken by the relevant authority as described by its <b>phytosanitary certificate</b> or other <b>officially</b> acceptable document, maintained without loss, addition or substitution</u>
-------------------------------------	---

***Proposed revision of “phytosanitary security (of a consignment)” (2013-008)***

- [39] The TPG considered the proposal to include “regulated articles” in the definition but decided not to do so. The TPG acknowledged that the definition of “contamination” also includes “unintended presence of a regulated article”. However, the TPG suggested that the possible contamination of the consignment proper (the components) by regulated *pests* is the crucial concern, whereas contamination by regulated articles (in its full meaning) does not in practice add substance to the concept and would make the definition overly complicated.
- [40] Another consultation comment had suggested that phytosanitary security is a series of activities rather than a state; however, in reviewing the present use of the term in ISPMs, the TPG concluded that the concept of phytosanitary security is meant to be a state.



- [41] The TPG, therefore, recommended keeping the definition simple by retaining the amendment exactly as worded in the version sent for the first consultation, to read:

<b>phytosanitary security (of a consignment)</b>	<del>Maintenance of the integrity</del> State of a <b>consignment</b> when its <b>integrity</b> has been maintained and <del>prevention</del> of its <b>infestation</b> and <b>contamination</b> by <b>regulated pests</b> , prevented through the application of appropriate <b>phytosanitary measures</b>
--	---

***Proposed addition of “general surveillance” (2018-046)***

- [42] The TPG discussed a consultation comment suggesting that a definition of “general surveillance” (and of “specific surveillance”) is unnecessary since lack of clarity around this term had not been raised by a contracting party and that “general surveillance” is well described in ISPM 6 (*Surveillance*) and is too broad a concept to be defined in one sentence.
- [43] The TPG disagreed with that comment, noting that the revised ISPM 6 had resulted in a slight change in the meaning of general and specific surveillance, with the previous version of ISPM 6 referring to “specific surveys” for what is now called “specific surveillance”. Therefore, the SC had added the terms “general surveillance” and “specific surveillance” to the TPG work programme for inclusion in the Glossary to provide clarity without having to read ISPM 6.
- [44] The comment had suggested that there is no requirement in ISPM 6 for general surveillance to be “official”. However, the TPG noted that “surveillance” is a responsibility of an NPPO under the IPPC and is defined as an official process even if, according to ISPM 6, NPPOs may use a range of approaches to general surveillance with varying degrees of NPPO involvement.
- [45] The TPG disagreed with a proposal to change “data” to “information”, as maintaining the distinction between the two concepts is useful: the first step of general surveillance consists of collecting data from various sources, and only through the second step of analysing and verifying data are those data transformed into “information”.
- [46] In response to other consultation comments, the TPG noted that general surveillance and specific surveillance as described in ISPM 6 are disjunctive (i.e. mutually exclusive) concepts, although the procedures may, in practice, be used together.
- [47] To more correctly capture the concept that data may be collected from various sources, including non-official sources, the TPG recommended a revised definition, slightly changed in comparison to the version sent for the first consultation, to read:

<b>general surveillance</b>	An <b>official</b> process whereby data on <b>pests</b> in an <b>area</b> , collected from various sources other than <b>surveys</b> , are analysed and verified
-----------------------------	--

***Proposed addition of “specific surveillance” (2018-047)***

- [48] In response to a consultation comment suggesting that the definition should explicitly include the various survey types, the TPG noted this would be redundant given that the definition of “survey” already includes the concepts of the different survey types (i.e. determine the presence or absence of pests, or the boundaries or characteristics of a pest population).
- [49] The TPG, therefore, recommended that the revised definition be retained exactly as worded in the version sent for the first consultation, to read:

<b>specific surveillance</b>	An <b>official</b> process whereby information on <b>pests</b> in an <b>area</b> is obtained through <b>surveys</b>
------------------------------	---

***Proposed revision of “surveillance” (2020-009)***

- [50] A text proposal from a consultation comment had aimed to provide more explanation on the actual content of surveillance, rather than merely referring to general and specific surveillance. The TPG agreed with the proposal and therefore amended the revised definition of surveillance to express the generic characteristics of both types of surveillance while avoiding redundancy with the definitions of “general surveillance” and “specific surveillance”.
- [51] Consequently, the TPG recommended a revised definition, slightly changed in comparison to the version sent for the first consultation, to read:

<b>surveillance</b>	An <b>official</b> process whereby information on <b>pests</b> in an <b>area</b> is obtained through <b>general surveillance, specific surveillance or a combination of both</b> <del>which collects and records data on pest presence or absence by survey, monitoring or other procedures</del>
---------------------	---

***Proposed revision of “germplasm” (2020-005)***

- [52] Some consultation comments had suggested that the term need not be defined in the Glossary.
- [53] While the TPG acknowledged that the current definition is not specific to the IPPC (and therefore not particularly needed), they noted that the proposed revised definition makes the term specific and of specific relevance to the IPPC by defining germplasm as a subset of the rather fundamental IPPC concept of “plants for planting”. Plants for planting generally present a comparatively high pest risk and, among them, germplasm is considered to potentially present an even higher pest risk than other “plants for planting” since it may originate relatively recently from wild plants and information on its possible infestation by pests may be limited and based on a relatively short period of observation.
- [54] The TPG, therefore, recommended that the revised definition be retained exactly as worded in the version sent for the first consultation, to read:

<b>germplasm</b>	<b>Plants for planting</b> intended for use in breeding or conservation programmes
------------------	--

***Proposed revision of “emergency measure” (2020-004)***

- [55] In replying to consultation comments suggesting to maintain “emergency measure” as being a phytosanitary measure, the TPG reiterated that this would result in the contradiction being maintained that phytosanitary measures exclusively address regulated pests while, in fact, emergency measures may be taken against currently non-regulated pests.
- [56] In reply to various consultation comments, the TPG recommended that “introduced” in the original revision be replaced with “set up” for consistency with the proposed revision of the definition of the term “provisional measure”. Furthermore, to emphasize the urgency in setting up an emergency measure and for consistency with the definition of “emergency action”, the TPG recommended that the qualifier “promptly” be added before “set up” to read, “promptly set up”.
- [57] In conclusion, the TPG recommended a revised definition, slightly changed in comparison to the version sent for the first consultation, to read:

<b>emergency measure</b>	An <del>phytosanitary measure</del> <b>official rule or procedure established as a matter of urgency promptly set up to prevent the entry, establishment or spread of a pest</b> in a new or unexpected <del>phytosanitary</del> situation <del>not addressed by existing phytosanitary measures</del> . An <b>emergency measure</b> may or may not be a <b>provisional measure</b>
--------------------------	---

***Proposed revision of “provisional measure” (2020-008)***

- [58] In reply to a consultation comment suggesting to define “provisional measure” as being a phytosanitary measure, the TPG reiterated that this would result in the contradiction that phytosanitary measures exclusively address regulated pests, while provisional measures may, in fact, be taken against currently non-regulated pests, and also in the contradiction that, while phytosanitary measures should be established on the basis of pest risk analysis, provisional measures are set up without full technical justification.
- [59] In reply to a consultation comment suggesting the deletion of the concept of “subject to periodic review”, the TPG maintained that periodic review is a critical step to determine whether the provisional measure needs to be established as a permanent phytosanitary measure through the completion of a pest risk analysis or if the provisional measure can be discontinued.
- [60] The TPG, therefore, recommended that the revised definition be retained exactly as worded in the version sent for the first consultation, to read:

<b>provisional measure</b>	A <del>phytosanitary regulation</del> temporary <b>official rule</b> or procedure <u>to prevent the entry, establishment or spread of a pest, set up established</u> without full <b>technical justification</b> owing to current lack of adequate information; <u>and</u> A <del>provisional measure</del> is subjected to periodic review and full <b>technical justification</b> as soon as possible
----------------------------	---

***Proposed revision of “compliance procedure (for a consignment)” (2021-006)***

- [61] In reply to a consultation comment suggesting the deletion of “and” in the enumeration of possible elements of a compliance procedure, the TPG agreed that retaining “and” is useful to illustrate better the three core elements of a compliance procedure: “document checks”, “integrity verification” and “inspection or testing”. The TPG emphasized that retaining “and” does not mean that all elements should necessarily be carried out in order to perform a compliance procedure. Definitions do not set any obligations but merely provide an agreed, common understanding of the meaning of a “short-cutting” term.
- [62] In reply to a consultation comment suggesting that the objective of a compliance procedure should be simplified to “...to check if a consignment complies with phytosanitary import or transit requirements”, the TPG discussed the intended meaning of the current wording “phytosanitary measures related to transit”. Analysing ISPM 25 (*Consignments in transit*), which is the main and almost only ISPM on transit issues, the TPG concluded that “phytosanitary measure” has been used (mainly) in referring to such measures that the *country of transit* may apply to the consignment in transit; for such measures, a compliance procedure is obviously irrelevant. However, “phytosanitary measures” has also been used in the ISPM as a heading for measures that the *exporting country* may be required to apply before export; for such measures, a compliance procedure could clearly be relevant. The TPG, therefore, concluded that the reference to transit in both the current and the draft revised definition sent to the first consultation is potentially confusing and overly complicated and could be improved based on the suggestion made in the comment.
- [63] The TPG noted that the objective of a compliance procedure (for a consignment) is, in any case, to check if phytosanitary requirements that the exporting country is expected to fulfil have actually been met. For the import scenario, such phytosanitary requirements are simply named by the Glossary term “phytosanitary import requirements”. An analogous Glossary term has not been defined (and need not be defined) for the transit situation; therefore, and to retain “phytosanitary import requirements” as an unbroken term, the TPG recommended that the wording “*phytosanitary requirements related to transit*” be used. With this, the description of the objective of the compliance procedure could also be simplified, as “*complies with*” then refers to both the import and transit scenario.

- [64] In reply to another consultation comment, suggesting that the verb “to check” be changed back to “to verify” as, in the original definition, the TPG agreed, noting that a compliance procedure is expected to be a decisive process in contrast to an inspection that may not in itself be decisive.
- [65] In conclusion, the TPG recommended a revised definition, slightly changed in comparison to the version sent for the first consultation, to read:

<b>compliance procedure</b> (for a <b>consignment</b> )	<del>Official procedure used to verify that</del> <u>process of document checks, verification of <b>consignment integrity</b>, and <b>inspection or testing of plants, plant products</b> or other <b>regulated articles</b> to verify if a <b>consignment</b> complies with <b>phytosanitary import requirements</b> or phytosanitary <del>measures</del> <u>requirements</u> related to <b>transit</b></u>
--	--

***Proposed revision of “release (of a consignment)” (2021-007)***

- [66] In reply to a consultation comment suggesting that “with favourable results” be added at the end of the definition, the TPG acknowledged the logic of such an inclusion but at the same time suggested that the “favourable result” may seem a self-evident prerequisite that need not be mentioned in the definition.
- [67] In reply to a consultation comment suggesting that “of a consignment” be inserted within the definition, the TPG found that such an insertion would, on the one hand, seem slightly redundant but, on the other hand, could make the definition (as a stand-alone definition) clearer (in contrast to the term and definition of “*release (into the environment)*” of an organism (e.g. a biological control agent)).
- [68] The TPG, therefore, recommended a revised definition, slightly changed in comparison to the version sent for the first consultation, to read:

<b>release (of a consignment)</b>	Authorization for <b>entry of a <u>consignment</u></b> after <u>completion of the <b>compliance procedure</b> clearance</u>
-----------------------------------	---

***Proposed deletion of “clearance (of a consignment)” (2018-045)***

- [69] No consultation comments had been received, and the TPG recommended that the deletion be maintained as proposed at the first consultation.

***Proposed revision of “inspection” (2017-005)***

- [70] In reply to a consultation comment suggesting that “if pests are present” be changed to “the presence or absence of pests”, the TPG noted that the objective of a “detection survey” is to determine whether a pest is present, meaning that presence and absence are equally possible outcomes. This is reflected in the proposed revised definition of that term (“...to determine the presence or absence of pests”, as submitted by the SC to the CPM-16 (2022) for adoption) and similarly in the current definition of “survey (of pests)”.
- [71] In contrast, the objective of an inspection is to check that plants, plant products, or other regulated articles are not infested or contaminated by pests. The focus, therefore, is on the presence of pests. The TPG considered that the suggested replacement of “to determine if pests are present” with “to determine the presence or absence of pests” would make the definition of “inspection” less clear.
- [72] The TPG, therefore, recommended that the revised definition be retained exactly as worded in the version sent for the first consultation, to read:

<b>inspection</b>	<b>Official visual examination of plants, plant products or other regulated articles to determine if pests are present or to <del>determine compliance</del> <u>check conformity</u> with phytosanitary <u>requirements</u> <b>regulations</b></b>
-------------------	--

***Proposed revision of “test” (consequential to “inspection”) (2021-005)***

- [73] In reply to a consultation comment suggesting that “test” be changed to “testing”, the TPG maintained that “test” in the noun form is more appropriate than the present participle (testing). In ISPM 5, except for “dose mapping” (for which no adequate noun exists) and “monitoring” (for which no noun exists), terms are not expressed as present participles. Furthermore, as stated in the outline of reference in ISPM 5, “*Derived forms of words that appear in the Glossary (e.g. “inspected” from “inspection”) are also considered glossary terms*”.
- [74] The TPG agreed to an editorial change whereby the original “examination ... other than visual” as an interposed sentence is substituted by “non-visual examination”, thereby simplifying the definition.
- [75] In conclusion, the TPG recommended a revised definition, slightly changed in comparison to the version sent for the first consultation, to read:

<b>test</b>	<b>Official <u>non-visual</u> examination of plants, plant products or other regulated articles, <del>other than visual</del>, to determine if pests are present, identify pests or <del>determine compliance</del> <u>verify conformity</u> with specific phytosanitary requirements</b>
-------------	---

- [76] The TPG also considered consultation comments suggesting corrections to the Spanish translation of definitions and agreed to forward these to the FAO Translation Services.
- [77] The TPG:
- (4) *agreed* its responses to the first consultation comments on the draft 2021 Amendments to the Glossary (1994-01);
  - (5) *noted* that the TPG comments, and the draft 2021 Amendments to the Glossary (1994-01), as modified by this meeting, would be transmitted to the SC-7; and
  - (6) *requested* that the secretariat submit the proposals regarding language versions of terms and definitions to the FAO Translation Services.

## **5.2 Draft annex to ISPM 20: Use of specific import authorizations (2008-006)**

- [78] Mr NORDBO presented the draft TPG responses.<sup>7</sup> The TPG provided approximately 25 comments on the draft, the major ones of which are presented below.

### ***The standard chapeau***

- [79] In response to a consultation proposal to improve the text with more precise wording, the TPG agreed that the proposed references to ISPM 20 (*Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system*) section 5.1.9.2 and Article VII.2(b) of the IPPC more clearly expressed the intent and strengthened the annex’s coherence with globally agreed text.
- [80] Reflecting several comments on the first paragraph of the draft annex, the TPG found the discrepancy between the first sentence (“SIAs [Specific import authorizations] ... specify phytosanitary import requirements for those articles”) and the second (“SIAs may be used ... when phytosanitary import requirements have not been established”) rather confusing. The TPG recommended that the discrepancy be resolved, ensuring consistency with section 3. For that purpose, the TPG suggested that

<sup>7</sup> 08\_TPG\_2021\_Dec, 2008-006.

the steward consider the following rewording of the *second sentence*, lending a phrase from the first sentence of section 3:

SIAs may be used when official consent for import is necessary, or when phytosanitary import requirements for the particular purpose, articles or situations have not otherwise been established, or when import would otherwise be prohibited.

### ***Section 2.1***

- [81] The TPG found that the heading did not reflect the section’s actual content and queried the need for a heading.
- [82] Reflecting comments related to the distinction throughout the text between “use” and “issuance” of specific import authorization, the TPG believed the distinction to be important and that it should be retained. Hence, NPPOs may “use” specific import authorizations (SIAs) as an element in their import regulatory system and, in doing so, NPPOs “issue” individual SIAs on a case-by-case basis.
- [83] The TPG supported the insertion of the qualifier “*official*” before “languages of the Food and Agricultural Organization” for clarity and consistency with Article XIX of the IPPC.

### ***Section 3***

- [84] The TPG suggested that the phrasing “general phytosanitary import requirements”, as suggested in a consultation comment, would be unclear and confusing and recommended that it be avoided and replaced. The Glossary term “phytosanitary import requirements” should be used for that concept.

### ***Section 5***

- [85] The TPG noted that “general import authorization” and “specific import authorization” are legitimate and adequate for use throughout the annex. Both terms are implicitly used in ISPM 20, section 4.2.2, the heading of which is “Import authorization”, followed by the subheadings “General authorization” and “Specific authorization” that are therefore subsets of the concept “import authorization”.
- [86] The TPG did not agree with the suggestion to replace “SIAs may be transferred to general import authorizations” with “SIAs may be terminated”, because the current wording was much more precise. However, for ease of understanding, the TPG suggested that “transferred to” be replaced with “*replaced with*”.
- [87] The TPG:
- (7) *noted* that recommendations on consistency would be transmitted to the steward and SC-7 for consideration; and
  - (8) *requested* that the secretariat send the Spanish translation issues to the FAO Translation Services so that the Spanish version of the draft annex to ISPM 20: Use of Specific Import Authorizations (2008-006) is amended.

## **5.3 Draft revision of ISPM 4 (*Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas*) (2009-002)**

- [88] Shaza Roshdy OMAR (Egypt) presented the draft TPG responses.<sup>8</sup> The TPG provided approximately 65 comments on the draft, the major ones of which are presented below.
- [89] The TPG discussed a consultation comment stating that to interpret the requirements of this ISPM correctly, the terms “measures” and “phytosanitary measures”, respectively, should be used discriminately depending on the situation. According to the comment, “if the measures are for establishing and maintaining a pest free area (PFA), “measures” should be used because the measures

---

<sup>8</sup> 09\_TPG\_2021\_Dec, 2009-002.



to control domestic pests (i.e. other than the phytosanitary purposes) may also be applied to establish and maintain the PFA”.

- [90] One member noted that, according to the Scope, this ISPM is explicitly about PFAs as a phytosanitary measure, and therefore it does not deal with the establishment of PFAs for non-regulated pests, often called domestic pests, even if NPPOs may also establish PFAs for such a purpose.
- [91] One member mentioned that this issue reiterated lengthy discussions by the TPG and SC in 2014 on how to understand the relationship between “phytosanitary measure” and “regulated pests”, namely whether a measure applied in an exporting country for a pest that is not of regulatory concern to that country but is regulated for the phytosanitary import requirements of the country of destination could be deemed a phytosanitary measure?
- [92] In conclusion, the TPG suggested that the scope of “PFA as a phytosanitary measure” implies that measures applied to set up a PFA are also generally phytosanitary measures, but supplementary non-phytosanitary measures may be applied if contributing to the overall objective (e.g. in section 2.2, “imposition of domestic restrictions or other measures to control the movement or transit of regulated articles into or through the PFA”). The TPG believed that the current uses of the respective terms, in general, seemed adequate but recommended that the steward of the draft standard scrutinize the text to ensure that this is actually the case.
- [93] In reply to a consultation comment that terms such as “surveillance”, “pest monitoring”, “surveys”, “outbreak” and “detection” should be used consistently throughout the standard, the TPG agreed but suggested that, in general, the terms mentioned in the comment had been used consistently in the draft. Nevertheless, the TPG recommended that “routine pest monitoring” be changed to “continued surveillance”, for consistency with the correct wording used in section 3.2. Furthermore, in section 3.5.2, the TPG suggested that “detection survey” be changed to “surveys” (i.e. any of the three survey types), for consistency with the purpose as outlined later in the sentence “to ... record the distribution of the pest and its population dynamics... and to assess the effectiveness of the eradication measures”.
- [94] The TPG agreed with a consultation comment suggesting that the term “appropriate level of protection”, derived from the World Trade Organization Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS Agreement), should be replaced by the Glossary term “phytosanitary import requirements”.
- [95] In replying to a consultation comment suggesting the replacement of “phytosanitary measures” with “phytosanitary procedures”, the TPG noted that a phytosanitary measure may consist of a combination of several phytosanitary measures (for example, “phytosanitary legislation” usually consists of several “phytosanitary regulations”). Moreover, “procedure” is included in the definition of “phytosanitary measure” which is broader and therefore fits better in this context.
- [96] The TPG agreed with a consultation comment suggesting replacement of “implementation” with “establishment” of buffer zones but considered that the Glossary term “tolerance level” had been used correctly and disagreed with a suggested change to “prevalence level”. However, the TPG suggested that the word “low” before “tolerance level” was confusing and recommended that it be deleted, as setting the tolerance level is an NPPO prerogative, and it would obviously be low to fulfil its purpose.
- [97] In reply to a consultation comment suggesting that “legal” be replaced with “regulatory” because an administrative measure can also provide the necessary power for movement control, the TPG considered the use of “legal framework” to be appropriate in this context and consistent with similar uses in other ISPMs (e.g. ISPM 45 (*Requirements for national plant protection organizations if authorizing entities to perform phytosanitary actions*)), with the legal framework being overarching and including the use of a regulatory framework. The TPG therefore disagreed with the comment.
- [98] The TPG disagreed with a consultation comment suggesting that “status” be deleted from “PFA status”, because PFA status is a different concept from that of the Glossary term “pest status”. The

TPG noted that “PFA status” is correctly used in, for example, ISPM 26 (*Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)*). The TPG agreed that “condition of the PFA” could refer to several other concepts, such as climatic or ecological conditions, and that “PFA status” is clearer, particularly when saying that it is the status of the area which is suspended, not the PFA. The phrasing from ISPM 4 of “pest free status” for a PFA would become convoluted and redundant.

[99] The TPG:

- (9) *noted* that recommendations on consistency would be transmitted to the steward and SC-7 for consideration; and
- (10) *requested* that the secretariat send the Spanish translation issues to the FAO Translation Services so that the Spanish version of the draft revision of ISPM 4 (2009-002) is amended.

#### **5.4 Draft revision of ISPM 18 (*Guidelines for the use of irradiation as a phytosanitary measure*) (2014-007)**

[100] Ms MELCHO (Uruguay) presented the draft TPG responses.<sup>9</sup> The TPG provided approximately 40 comments on the draft, the major ones of which are presented below.

[101] In reply to a consultation comment suggesting that the Scope’s wording be changed from “technical guidance” to “requirements”, the TPG noted that other recently adopted, treatment-related ISPMs use the draft’s wording “technical guidance”. However, for both this draft standard and those other standards, “requirements” would better reflect the actual content of the standards and, in a broader perspective, the deeper objective of creating and adopting ISPMs. The TPG recommended that the steward consider this issue.

[102] In reply to a consultation comment suggesting that “load configuration” be defined, the TPG noted that three differing terms had been used in the draft: “load configuration”, “commodity configuration”, and “commercial-product configuration”. Recalling that the Glossary definition of “process load” uses “loading configuration”, the TPG recommended that the steward strive for consistency or provide sufficient explanation of the meaning if other terms are used. Furthermore, the TPG considered the phrasing “configuration of the process load” to be redundant, given the definition of “process load”. Finally, the TPG suggested that “loading configuration” is a common industry term used in ISPMs without a specific IPPC meaning and, therefore, need not be defined.

[103] The TPG agreed with the consultation comment that “irradiation treatment” is redundant, the Glossary definition giving “irradiation” as “treatment with any type of ionizing radiation”.

[104] In the Outline section, the TPG suggested that, for consistency with other treatment-related ISPMs, the first sentence be changed to “This standard provides guidance on irradiation and its application as a phytosanitary measure to comply with phytosanitary import requirements.”

[105] In reply to a consultation comment suggesting that “phytosanitary treatment dose” be simplified to “dose”, the TPG warned that the Glossary now defines “treatment (as a phytosanitary measure)” to implicitly distinguish it from “treatment” in its common meaning. The simpler “dose” could blur the distinction between irradiation in general and irradiation as a phytosanitary measure.

[106] A consultation comment had suggested that, although Regional Standard for Phytosanitary Measures (RSPM) No. 9 of the Asia and Pacific Plant Protection Commission was used in the development of the draft standard, reference to an RSPM should be avoided and deleted, as NPPOs should follow ISPM 18, not the RSPM. The TPG agreed and noted that avoiding reference to RSPMs is in line with an early, general SC decision.

---

<sup>9</sup> 10\_TPG\_2021\_Dec, 2014-007.



[107] The TPG:

- (11) *noted* that recommendations on consistency would be transmitted to the steward and SC-7 for consideration; and
- (12) *requested* that the secretariat send the Spanish translation issues to the FAO Translation Services so that the Spanish version of the draft ISPM: Revision of ISPM 18 (2014-007) is amended.

### 5.5 Draft PT: Irradiation treatment for *Pseudococcus jackbeardsleyi* (2017-027)

[108] Asenath Abigael KOECH (Kenya) presented the draft TPG responses.<sup>10</sup> The TPG provided two comments on the draft.

[109] In reply to both comments, the TPG recommended amendments for ease of understanding and consistency.

[110] The TPG:

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

## 6. Subjects on the TPG work programme

[111] Under this agenda item, the TPG discusses working documents prepared by TPG members on individual terms on the *List of topics for IPPC standards*. Proposals agreed by the TPG for new or revised terms and definitions, as well as justifications, will be included in the *2022 Amendments to the Glossary* and submitted to the SC meeting in May 2022 for approval for consultation.

### 6.1 “phytosanitary action” (2020-006)

[112] Rajesh RAMARATHNAM (Canada) introduced the paper,<sup>11</sup> explaining the background to the term “phytosanitary action”, its use in ISPMs, and the rationale for reviewing it.

[113] As per the current definition, phytosanitary actions are undertaken to implement phytosanitary measures. Phytosanitary measures have the purpose of preventing the introduction or spread of quarantine pests or limiting the economic impact of regulated non-quarantine pests. Thus, phytosanitary measures are used in relation to regulated pests.

[114] Phytosanitary action can be undertaken at import in relation to a compliance procedure, and the term is most often used in ISPMs specifically in relation to import of consignments and non-compliance. However, the paper suggested that phytosanitary actions can also be used in relation to domestic or export activities. For example, activities such as inspection, testing, surveillance and treatment are also conducted to support domestic or export activities; in such cases, the pest or pests of concern may not be regulated pests of the country where these activities are carried out. For example, phytosanitary actions are used in relation to the change in the status of an area of low pest prevalence, which may be used to facilitate exports or to limit pest impact in the area. Similarly, in ISPM 31 (*Methodologies for sampling of consignments*), the use of phytosanitary actions may be determined by acceptance number, tolerance level, and outcome of sampling. Sampling is used in import, domestic and export scenarios. Moreover, according to ISPM 45, NPPOs may authorize entities to perform phytosanitary actions on their behalf, and these phytosanitary actions can be undertaken in support of import, domestic and export activities.

[115] To provide for the wider scope of “phytosanitary action”, the paper suggested that the current definition be amended to read: “An *official operation*, such as *inspection, testing, surveillance or*

---

<sup>10</sup> 11\_TPG\_2021\_Dec, 2017-027.

<sup>11</sup> 14\_TPG\_2021\_Dec.

***treatment, undertaken to implement phytosanitary measures or to conform with specific phytosanitary requirements***”.

- [116] The TPG noted that the terms “phytosanitary action” and “phytosanitary procedure”, both referring to “phytosanitary measure” in their respective definitions, are strongly interconnected. The TPG discussion on amending the two definitions was therefore also intertwined and followed similar lines of argument.
- [117] The TPG recalled that a phytosanitary action is an official *operation*, and a phytosanitary procedure is an official *method* (i.e. a documented process or a methodology) for implementing phytosanitary measures (or, in fact, taking phytosanitary action). In simplified terms, the relationship between the three concepts may be illustrated as: a phytosanitary measure is *what to do*, a phytosanitary procedure is *how to do it*, and a phytosanitary action is actually *doing it*.
- [118] Some TPG members suggested that the proposed new wording be changed to “check”, “ensure” or “check or ensure”, with the phrase continuing “... conformity with specific phytosanitary requirements”, in order to reflect the objective of the various examples of operations mentioned in the definition.
- [119] The TPG went on to discuss, in broader terms, the scope of phytosanitary measures, phytosanitary procedures and phytosanitary actions, reflecting on the prolonged TPG and SC discussions in 2014 that had also included reference to the wording of the SPS Agreement. With the SC, there had been consensus that, following from the IPPC text, the term “phytosanitary” exclusively refers to regulated pests – that is, quarantine pests and regulated non-quarantine pests. In the SC’s discussions, it had also been broadly accepted that the term “phytosanitary” could be used in ISPMs in relation to scenarios where the NPPO of an exporting country *applied* official measures, procedures or actions in order to meet the phytosanitary import requirements of an importing country in preventing the spread of pests regulated in that importing country but not regulated in the country of export where such application is taking place.
- [120] The TPG, therefore, agreed that it would be pertinent for the definitions of phytosanitary action and phytosanitary procedure to be amended to explicitly reflect the fact that their respective scope (as also actually used in ISPMs) also covers such official actions and procedures, respectively, used in the export scenario to control pests that are regulated in an importing country but not in the exporting country applying the control.
- [121] The TPG, therefore, elaborated some precise wording to delimit the additional supplementary scope to the export scenario. As one option, it had been suggested that “...or to meet phytosanitary import requirements” be added to the current definition. However, the TPG noted that that wording could cause confusion as to whose requirements were at stake. The TPG, therefore, agreed to add the wording “...or to enable phytosanitary certification”. This wording retained the focus solely on the needs and deeds of the NPPO applying the procedures and actions, and the wording implicitly conveyed the meaning of meeting another country’s phytosanitary import requirements, because phytosanitary certification as per its definition can only be carried out once the exporting country is able to declare that phytosanitary import requirements have been met.
- [122] In summary, with the proposed addition, the amended definition of phytosanitary action thus covered and distinguished, on the one hand, implementation of phytosanitary measures related to pests regulated in the country where the operation is conducted from and, on the other hand, implementation of phytosanitary measures before the process of phytosanitary certification with the objective of meeting the phytosanitary import requirements of an importing country, which may relate to pests not regulated in the country where the operation is conducted.
- [123] In conclusion, the TPG agreed to propose that the definition be amended to read:

<b>phytosanitary action</b>	An <b>official</b> operation, such as <b>inspection, testing, surveillance</b> or <b>treatment</b> , undertaken to implement <b>phytosanitary measures or to</b>
-----------------------------	--

enable <b>phytosanitary certification</b>
---

## 6.2 “phytosanitary procedure” (2020-007)

- [124] Mr RAMARATHNAM introduced the paper,<sup>12</sup> explaining the background to the term “phytosanitary procedure”, its use in the text of the IPPC and in ISPMs, and the rationale for reviewing it.
- [125] The paper explained that, according to the current definition, “phytosanitary procedure” is an official method for implementing phytosanitary measures. Phytosanitary measures have the purpose of preventing the introduction or spread of quarantine pests or limiting the economic impact of regulated non-quarantine pests. Thus, phytosanitary measures are used in relation to regulated pests.
- [126] In ISPMs, the term “phytosanitary procedure” is most often used in relation to compliance procedure, non-compliance and so on, with respect to consignments at import or in transit. However, the paper suggested that phytosanitary procedures can also be followed in relation to domestic or export activities. For example, inspection, testing, surveillance and treatments are also conducted to support domestic or export activities; in such cases, the pest or pests of concern may not be a regulated pest of the country where these activities are carried out. For example, phytosanitary procedures are followed in relation to the establishment and maintenance of a PFA or an area of low pest prevalence, which may be used to facilitate exports. Phytosanitary procedures are also followed in relation to export certification as identified in ISPM 7 (*Phytosanitary certification system*) and ISPM 12.
- [127] The paper carried on to say that a phytosanitary procedure can also provide the method for implementing emergency measures and provisional measures, such as in the case of new or unexpected phytosanitary situations not addressed by existing phytosanitary measures and where the pest may not currently be regulated.
- [128] To provide for the wider scope of “phytosanitary procedure”, the paper suggested that the definition be amended by inserting “[implementing]...*emergency measures or provisional measures, or for conforming with specific phytosanitary requirements*”, the full definition to then read: “Any **official method for implementing phytosanitary measures, emergency measures or provisional measures, or for conforming with specific phytosanitary requirements, including the performance of inspections, tests, surveillance or treatments**”.
- [129] As explained in this report under “Phytosanitary action” (agenda item 6.1), the TPG had noted that there had been consensus within the SC that the term “phytosanitary” exclusively referred to regulated pests (i.e. quarantine pests and regulated non-quarantine pests, and not to non-regulated pests), and that the term “phytosanitary” could be used in ISPMs in relation to scenarios where the NPPO of an exporting country *applied* official measures, procedures or actions in order to meet the phytosanitary import requirements of an importing country in preventing the spread of pests regulated in that importing country but not regulated in the country of export where such application is taking place.
- [130] The TPG, therefore, agreed that it would be pertinent for the definition of “phytosanitary procedure” to be amended to explicitly reflect the fact that its scope (as actually used in ISPMs) also covers official procedures to control pests in the export scenario that are regulated in an importing country but not in the exporting country applying the control.
- [131] As with the case of “phytosanitary action”, the TPG, therefore, elaborated some precise wording to delimit the additional supplementary scope to the export scenario, and agreed on the analogous wording “...or for enabling phytosanitary certification”. This wording retained the focus solely on the needs and deeds of the NPPO applying the procedures and actions, and the wording implicitly conveyed the meaning of meeting another country’s phytosanitary import requirements, because phytosanitary certification as per its definition can only be carried out once the exporting country is able to declare that phytosanitary import requirements have been met.

---

<sup>12</sup> 15\_TPG\_2021\_Dec.

- [132] In summary, with the proposed insertion, the amended definition of the phytosanitary procedure thus covered and distinguished, on the one hand, the method for implementing phytosanitary measures related to pests regulated in the country where the procedure is followed and, on the other hand, the method for implementing phytosanitary measures before the process of phytosanitary certification with the objective of meeting the phytosanitary import requirements of an importing country, which may relate to pests not regulated in the country where the procedure is followed.
- [133] Given the inclusion of “phytosanitary” in the term itself and within both elements of the definition as “phytosanitary measures” and “phytosanitary certification”, the TPG found that the current phrasing “in connection with regulated pests” was redundant and potentially confusing, as it did not provide the immediate understanding that, with the export scenario, although the pest in question is regulated in the importing country, it may not be regulated in the exporting country where the procedure is being followed. The TPG, therefore, deleted the phrase from the proposed revised definition.
- [134] The TPG noted that pairs of terms and definitions had been developed as “phytosanitary measures” versus “emergency measures” and “phytosanitary actions” versus “emergency actions”, the terms in each pair relating to regulated and not (yet) regulated pests, respectively. A term and definition “emergency procedure” in-between “measure” and “action” (analogous to “phytosanitary procedure”) had not been developed and, in the view of the TPG, need not be developed. The TPG also agreed that, in practice, the current methods developed for regulated pests might be used in emergency situations – that is, also for implementing emergency measures and taking emergency actions – but this rather marginal aspect need not be spelled out in the definition of phytosanitary procedure, as it would become overly complicated and lose its strict relation to regulated pests. The TPG, therefore, concluded that mention of emergency measures or provisional measures should not be introduced to the definition.
- [135] The TPG discussed whether to retain “including the performance of inspection, test, surveillance or treatments” and decided that the phrasing was useful in illustrating the possible scope of phytosanitary procedures and in forming a link to the similar wording in the definition of “phytosanitary action”.
- [136] In conclusion, the TPG agreed to propose that the revised definition read:

<b>phytosanitary procedure</b>	Any <b>official</b> method for implementing <b>phytosanitary measures</b> <u>or for enabling <b>phytosanitary certification</b></u> , including the performance of <b>inspections, tests, surveillance</b> or <b>treatments</b> <del>in connection with regulated pests</del>
--------------------------------	---

- [137] The TPG:

(14) *proposed* a draft definition for “phytosanitary action” (2020-006) and “phytosanitary procedure” (2020-007) in the draft 2022 Amendments to the Glossary (1994-001) (Appendix 4) to be presented to the SC May 2022.

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

### 7.1 Proposals to TPG 2021 for amendments to “General recommendations on use of terms in ISPMs” and introductory wording in the *IPPC style guide* (2019)

- [138] Mr NORDBO presented proposals for amendments to the “General recommendations on use of terms in ISPMs” and associated introductory wording in the *IPPC style guide* (2019).<sup>13</sup> He also explained the background and the rationale for reviewing them.

<sup>13</sup> 04\_TPG\_2021\_Dec.

### **Section 5.1**

The TPG noted that the current wording of the second paragraph was incorrect and conflicted with the “Guidelines for a consistent ISPM terminology” section of the *IPPC procedural manual for standard setting* as developed by the TPG and endorsed by the SC in 2018.<sup>14</sup> The TPG, therefore, decided to substitute the erroneous parts with a straightforward quotation of the six principles outlined in the guidelines.

### **Section 5.2**

- [139] **Pest risk, phytosanitary risk.** The TPG noted that the phrase “phytosanitary risk” had been used in draft versions of a CPM Recommendation and a specification for an IPPC guide. It had also been used many times in two versions of ISPM 11 (*Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests*) (and sporadically in a few other ISPMs) produced before the revision of ISPM 2 (*Framework for pest risk analysis*), at which occasion the SC had decided that the phrasing should be avoided and only the Glossary term “pest risk” be used. The TPG, therefore, decided to provide a new heading on “pest risk, phytosanitary risk”, including a recommendation that “phytosanitary risk” should be avoided, and the Glossary term “pest risk” be used instead.
- [140] **(Non-)compliance, (non-)conformity.** The TPG agreed to add “phytosanitary certification” before “import” and to simplify the last sentence.
- [141] **Prevalence.** The TPG agreed to remove the term “prevalence” as a consequence of the SC discussions on “prevalence” and “incidence”, with the latter being proposed for deletion from the Glossary at CPM-16 (2022).
- [142] The TPG agreed on several editorial text changes for consistency within the document.

#### ***Proposed additions to the “General recommendations on use of terms in ISPMs”: verbs and prepositions used in ISPMs in connection with “pest risk”***

- [143] Mr NORDBO presented proposed additions to the “General recommendations on use of terms in ISPMs” regarding the verbs and prepositions used in ISPMs in connection with “pest risk”.<sup>15</sup> The working paper presented a list of the (at least) 11 differing verbs and prepositions currently used in ISPMs to specify a pest risk source and suggested some reductions in the unnecessary and potentially confusing variation of terminology. In contrast, the wording used in ISPMs to specify “victims” of pest risk had been far more consistent, and so the paper saw no need for any particular recommendations on that aspect.
- [144] Other TPG members suggested shortening even further the proposed list of acceptable phrasings to verbs and prepositions more frequently used in ISPMs in connection with “pest risk”, in particular taking into account the different interpretations in other languages.
- [145] In conclusion, the TPG agreed to add the following two new paragraphs to the new subsection on “pest risk”:

When the meaning of “pest risk” is intended, the full wording “pest risk” should be used (in line with the principle of appropriately using Glossary terms) instead of simply “risk”, except in phrases where retaining the word “pest” would be redundant.

Phrasing to specify the pest risk transmitting entity or event (“X”) may vary as: “X poses a pest risk”, “X presents a pest risk”, “pest risk associated with X”, “pest risk of X”, and including derivatives thereof. Other verbs or prepositions than those should be avoided. Within each ISPM, the number of differing expressions used should be limited further.

---

<sup>14</sup> *IPPC procedural manual for standard setting*: [www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/ippc-standard-setting-procedure-manual](http://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/ippc-standard-setting-procedure-manual)

<sup>15</sup> 13\_TPG\_2021\_Dec.



[146] The TPG:

- (15) *agreed* on the revised “General recommendations on use of terms in ISPMs” (section 5.2) and introductory wording (section 5.1) in the *IPPC style guide* (2019) (Appendix 7) and *invited* the SC to note the revised sections 5.1 and 5.2 of the *IPPC style guide*; and
- (16) *requested* that the Secretariat archive the TPG recommendation to avoid the use of “phytosanitary risk” at the revision of ISPM 17 (*Pest reporting*), ISPM 33 (*Pest free potato (Solanum spp.) micropropagative material and minitubers for international trade*), and in particular, ISPM 11 (*Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests*), which is soon up for revision and merging with ISPM 2 (*Framework for pest risk analysis*), and in which the phrase has been used rather frequently (Appendix 6).

## 7.2 Consistency of adopted ISPMs (standard by standard) – List of proposed or approved ink amendments for ISPMs

[147] A hyperlink to the *List of proposed or approved ink amendments for ISPMs* had been included on the agenda for this meeting.<sup>16</sup>

[148] The secretariat confirmed that the latest ink amendments had been applied at CPM-15 (2021). Since the list does not include information on annexes to ISPM 27 (*Diagnostic protocols for regulated pests*) and ISPM 28 (*Phytosanitary treatments for regulated pests*), the secretariat proposed that the TPG members discuss the possibility of their inclusion to the list.

[149] As for future ink amendments, the secretariat recalled the SC’s agreement on the deletion of the word “measures” from the end of the definition of “area of low pest prevalence” as an ink amendment to ISPM 5 that would be presented to CPM-16 (2022) for noting.<sup>17</sup> Following the new process for consistency review and ink amendments for specific terms in languages, the secretariat proposed that the TPG discuss the possibility of preparing the tables for each language for this definition currently provided in ISPM 5. This would allow TPG members not to translate them but to adapt the new wording to the different languages so that it was ready once CPM-16 (2022) had noted this change in ISPM 5. The secretariat also recalled that, in the TPG meeting in 2019, the TPG had agreed to draft proposed translations for ink amendments, provided the Secretariat could prepare the table in languages beforehand.<sup>18</sup>

[150] The secretariat also noted that the identified errors and ambiguities in ISPM 11, ISPM 17 and ISPM 33 (from agenda item 7.1) would be presented to the SC for noting. Once the SC noted them, the secretariat would prepare the tables for these errors and ambiguities and archive them for future revisions.

[151] One TPG member asked when the table in languages would be distributed to the TPG members.

[152] The secretariat recalled that it had been agreed that the best time to prepare and disseminate the tables would be between the SC meeting in May and the following CPM. Although the current process had been delayed, the ink amendments under discussion would only affect the deletion of a single word, which could be implemented directly in ISPM 5. Hence, the secretariat proposed that they send the tables in the middle of January 2022 to the TPG members (Arabic, French, Russian and Spanish languages), for the TPG members to send the amendments back to the secretariat by the end of February 2022. Since there is no TPG expert in the Chinese language, the Chinese table would be sent to the FAO Translation Services.

---

<sup>16</sup> List of ink amendments proposed or approved for ISPMs: [www.ippc.int/en/publications/82115](http://www.ippc.int/en/publications/82115)

<sup>17</sup> SC 2021-06, agenda item 4.1.

<sup>18</sup> TPG 2019-11, agenda item 4.3.

[153] One TPG member asked whether the terms revised at this meeting would have to be translated and sent to the FAO Translation Services. The secretariat clarified that the TPG members usually provide the first translation of new terms to the FAO Translation Services as a reference. The secretariat also noted that even though the TPG offers translation, the FAO Translation Services have the final say since they provide the official translation of ISPMs.

### *Annotated Glossary: 2022 intermediate version*

[154] Ms MELCHO informed the TPG members that, in preparing the next version of the Annotated Glossary, she would reflect the outcomes from this TPG meeting. Then, according to the TPG workplan, the amended Annotated Glossary would be sent out for review by the TPG members.

## 8. Explanation of Glossary terms

[155] This standing agenda item allows for TPG members to enquire about and discuss specific Glossary terms. The following term was discussed.

<b>refusal</b>	Forbidding <b>entry</b> of a <b>consignment</b> or other <b>regulated article</b> when it fails to comply with <b>phytosanitary regulations</b> [FAO, 1990; revised FAO, 1995]
----------------	--

[156] The TPG considered whether this definition should be more precise by changing “phytosanitary regulations” to “phytosanitary import requirements” since, in this case, it refers to a consignment for import.

[157] The TPG highlighted that if “phytosanitary regulations” were changed to “phytosanitary import requirements”, the term’s coverage would be restricted only to the aspect of import. However, in the definition of “refusal”, “forbidding entry of a consignment” covers the movement of a consignment or entry into a country or an area, and “forbidding entry of” “other regulated article” refers to the movement restrictions that can be applied when official controls of a pest are in place, for example for a PFA or an outbreak area. Hence, the TPG concluded that “phytosanitary regulations” provide the overarching concept covering both the aforementioned scenarios, and thus, the term “refusal” is not only related to a consignment.

[158] The TPG concluded that no change to this definition was needed, and agreed that the note in the Annotated Glossary for this term would be updated.

## 9. TPG workplan

[159] The TPG updated its workplan for 2022–2023 (Appendix 5).

[160] The secretariat informed the TPG that no proposals for new terms had been submitted in response to the 2021 Call for Topics, and none of the EWGs held since the last TPG meeting had recommended developing new definitions.

[161] The TPG steward proposed that the deadlines be kept as in the TPG workplan for 2019–2020.

[162] One TPG member suggested that the secretariat update the TPG workplan immediately after the CPM, SC and EWG meetings and clear out all obsolete data in sufficient time so that the TPG members would be informed of the latest developments before the next TPG meeting. Some TPG members also suggested adding the date of the last change to the TPG workplan for version tracking.

[163] The secretariat informed the TPG that in 2022 they would be working on upgrading the TPG workplan into a user-friendly, dynamic system that would show the overall progress of the TPG work, always be up to date, and be accessible to everyone.

[164] One TPG member suggested improving the logistics of document provision to TPG members to follow the standard setting process related to the TPG’s work, particularly with respect to the latest changes to the amendments to the Glossary. In particular, the member suggested that all TPG-related

materials from the CPM, SC and EWG meetings be placed in the TPG restricted work area to keep everything and everyone updated and because, over time, many links to various publications on the IPP become inaccessible.

[165] The TPG steward noted that the changes to the Amendments to the Glossary (1994-001) approved by the SC meetings for submission to consultations are enclosed as appendices to SC meeting reports, which are publicly available.<sup>19</sup>

[166] The secretariat asked the TPG members to inform them about non-working links to the IPP to allow them to be fixed as soon as possible and also invited members to subscribe to the IPPC announcements for the latest information on published SC meeting reports.<sup>20</sup>

[167] The TPG:

(17) *invited* the SC to note the TPG workplan for 2022–2023 (Appendix 5).

## 10. Any other business

[168] The secretariat informed the TPG that Ms KOECH's term as a TPG member (English language) ends in 2022 and invited the panel to discuss whether they would recommend to the SC that her term be renewed. The secretariat also asked Ms KOECH to confirm her willingness to continue as a TPG member and whether her supervisors supported her in this.

[169] Ms KOECH confirmed her willingness to continue as a TPG member and that her supervisors supported this decision.

[170] The TPG agreed to recommend the renewal of her membership.

[171] The secretariat also informed the TPG that a call for an expert for the Chinese language for the TPG would be launched at the beginning of 2022.

[172] The TPG:

(18) *recommended* that the SC renew the membership of Asenath Abigael KOECH as a TPG member for the English language, beginning in 2022.

## 11. Next meetings dates and types

[173] The next face-to-face TPG meeting was tentatively scheduled for 28 November – 2 December 2022, with an extension to 5–7 December 2022 should the meeting be held in virtual mode.

## 12. Close of the meeting

[174] The secretariat thanked the TPG members for their contributions to the work of the TPG and invited them to respond to the evaluation survey for the meetings.<sup>21</sup>

[175] The chairperson also expressed her gratitude to the TPG members, who in turn thanked the secretariat.

[176] The chairperson closed the meeting.

---

<sup>19</sup> SC meeting reports: [www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/standards-setting/standards-committee](http://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/standards-setting/standards-committee)

<sup>20</sup> IPPC announcements: [www.ippc.int/en/news/category/announcements](http://www.ippc.int/en/news/category/announcements)

<sup>21</sup> Survey: <https://forms.office.com/r/KCGfNHVM05>



**Appendix 1: Agenda**

<b>N</b>	<b>Agenda item</b>	<b>Document number / link</b>	<b>Presenter / (IPPC Secretariat support)</b>
<b>1.</b>	<b>Opening of the Meeting</b>		
1.1.	Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat	–	Secretariat
<b>2.</b>	<b>Meeting Arrangements</b>		
2.1.	Selection of the Chairperson	–	–
2.2.	Election of the Rapporteur	–	<b>Chairperson</b>
2.3.	Adoption of the Agenda	01_TPG_2021_Dec	<b>Chairperson</b>
2.4.	Current specification: TP 5 (TPG) (2016) [Posted June 2016 in three languages]	<a href="#">Link to TP 5</a>	Secretariat
<b>3.</b>	<b>Administrative Matters</b>		
3.1.	Documents list	02_TPG_2021_Dec	Secretariat
3.2.	Participants list	03_TPG_2021_Dec <a href="#">TPG membership list</a>	Secretariat
<b>4.</b>	<b>Updates / reports</b>		
4.1.	Previous meeting report of the TPG (December 2020 – January 2021), including the TPG work plan	<a href="#">2020 December - 2021 January TPG Meeting Report (virtual)</a> <a href="#">Link to the TPG work plan 2021-2022</a>	<b>BOUHOT-DELDUC</b>
4.2.	Extracts from other meeting reports of relevance to the TPG	05_TPG_2021_Dec	Secretariat
<b>5.</b>	<b>Addressing TPG-related comments on draft ISPMs submitted to the first consultation</b> Draft answers to compiled comments (CC) proposed by the TPG members via OCS		
5.1.	TPG OCS review of TPG-related compiled comments (1994-001)	07_TPG_2021_Dec	<b>NORDBO / ALL</b>
	Surveillance, general surveillance, specific surveillance	06_TPG_2021_Dec	
	Two notes to TPG discussions on Draft 2021 Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms) (1994-001)	12_TPG_2021_Dec	
	Draft 2021 Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms) (1994-001)	1994-001	
5.2.	TPG OCS review of TPG-related compiled comments (2008-006)	08_TPG_2021_Dec	<b>NORDBO</b>
	Draft Annex to ISPM 20: Use of Specific Import Authorizations (2008-006)	2008-006	
5.3.	TPG OCS review of TPG-related compiled comments (2009-002)	09_TPG_2021_Dec	<b>OMAR</b>
	Draft Revision of ISPM 4 (2009-002)	2009-002	
5.4.	TPG OCS review of TPG-related compiled comments (2014-007)	10_TPG_2021_Dec	<b>MELCHO</b>

	Draft ISPM: Revision of ISPM 18 (2014-007)	2014-007	
5.5	TPG OCS review of TPG-related compiled comments (2017-027)	11_TPG_2021_Dec	<b>KOECH</b>
	Draft PT - Irradiation treatment for <i>Pseudococcus jackbeardsleyi</i> (2017-027)	2017-027	
<b>6.</b>	<b>Subjects on the TPG work programme</b> Proposals for new or revised terms/definitions will be compiled into new draft Amendments to the Glossary, to be submitted to the SC in May 2022.		
6.1	- phytosanitary action (2020-006)	14_TPG_2021_Dec	<b>RAMARATHNAM</b>
	- phytosanitary procedure (2020-007)	15_TPG_2021_Dec	
<b>7.</b>	<b>Review of ISPMs for consistency of terms and style</b>		
7.1	Proposals to TPG 2021 for amendments to 'General recommendations on use of terms in ISPMs' and introductory wording in the IPPC Style Guide (2019)	04_TPG_2021_Dec <a href="#">Link to IPPC Style Guide</a>	<b>NORDBO</b>
	Verbs and prepositions used in ISPMs in connection with "pest risk"	13_TPG_2021_Dec	
7.2	Consistency of adopted ISPMs (standard by standard): - List of proposed or approved ink amendments for ISPMs	<a href="#">List of proposed or approved ink amendments for ISPMs</a>	Secretariat
<b>8.</b>	<b>Explanation of Glossary terms</b> Standing agenda item for TPG meetings. Members identify before the meeting some glossary terms/definitions requiring further explanations. These terms/definitions will be discussed during the TPG meeting and the need for additional explanations (e.g., in the annotated glossary) discussed.		
<b>9.</b>	<b>TPG work plan</b>		
9.1	TPG work plan for 2022-2023 The TPG will update its work plan for the coming year, based on discussions at the meeting, to be presented to the SC May 2022 for noting.	To be prepared during the meeting	Secretariat
<b>10.</b>	<b>Any other business</b>		<b>Chairperson</b>
<b>11.</b>	<b>Next meetings dates and types</b>		<b>Secretariat / Chairperson</b>
12.	<b>Close of the meeting</b>		<b>Chairperson</b>
	Evaluation	<a href="#">Link to survey</a>	

**Appendix 2: Documents list**

<b>DOCUMENT NO.</b>	<b>AGEND A ITEM</b>	<b>DOCUMENT TITLE</b>	<b>DATE POSTED / UPDATED</b>
<b>Draft ISPMs</b>			
1994-001	5.1	Draft 2021 Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms) (1994-001)	2021-11-08
2008-006	5.2	Draft Annex to ISPM 20: Use of Specific Import Authorizations (2008-006)	2021-11-08
2009-002	5.3	Draft Revision of ISPM 4 (2009-002)	2021-11-08
2014-007	5.4	Draft ISPM: Revision of ISPM 18 (2014-007)	2021-11-08
2017-027	5.5	Draft PT - Irradiation treatment for <i>Pseudococcus jackbeardsleyi</i> (2017-027)	2021-11-08
<b>Meeting documents</b>			
01_TPG_2021_Dec	2.3	Provisional agenda	2021-11-26 2021-11-27 2021-11-29 2021-12-06
02_TPG_2021_Dec	3.1	Documents list	2021-11-26 2021-11-27 2021-11-29 2021-12-06
03_TPG_2021_Dec	3.2	Participants list	2021-11-26
04_TPG_2021_Dec	7.1	Proposals to TPG 2021 for amendments to 'General recommendations on use of terms in ISPMs' and introductory wording in the IPPC Style Guide (2019)	2021-11-26
05_TPG_2021_Dec	4.2	Extracts from other meeting reports of relevance to the TPG	2021-11-26
06_TPG_2021_Dec	5.1	Surveillance, general surveillance, specific surveillance	2021-11-26 2021-11-27
07_TPG_2021_Dec	5.1	TPG OCS review of TPG-related compiled comments (1994-001)	2021-11-26
08_TPG_2021_Dec	5.2	TPG OCS review of TPG-related compiled comments (2008-006)	2021-11-26
09_TPG_2021_Dec	5.3	TPG OCS review of TPG-related compiled comments (2009-002)	2021-11-26
10_TPG_2021_Dec	5.4	TPG OCS review of TPG-related compiled comments (2014-007)	2021-11-26
11_TPG_2021_Dec	5.5	TPG OCS review of TPG-related compiled comments (2017-027)	2021-11-26
12_TPG_2021_Dec	5.1	Two notes to TPG discussions on Draft 2021 Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms) (1994-001)	2021-11-29
13_TPG_2021_Dec	7.1	Verbs and prepositions used in ISPMs in connection with "pest risk"	2021-11-29
14_TPG_2021_Dec	6.1	Phytosanitary action (2020-006)	2021-12-06
14_TPG_2021_Dec	6.1	Phytosanitary procedure (2020-007)	2021-12-14

**Documents links** (presented in the order of the agenda items)

<b>Links</b>	<b>Agenda item</b>	<b>Document link</b>
Current specification: TP 5 (TPG) (2016) [Posted June 2016 in three languages]	2.4	<a href="#">Link to TP 5</a>
Participants list	3.2	<a href="#">TPG membership list</a>
Previous meeting report of the TPG (December 2020 – January 2021), including the TPG work plan	4.1	<a href="#">2020 December-2021 January TPG Meeting Report (virtual)</a> <a href="#">Link to the TPG work plan 2021-2022</a>
IPPC Style Guide	7.1	<a href="#">Link to IPPC Style Guide</a>
List of ink amendments proposed or approved for ISPMs	7.2	<a href="#">List of ink amendments proposed or approved for ISPMs</a>
Evaluation	12	<a href="#">Link to survey</a>

**Appendix 3: Participants list**

Participants details			TPG member's term	
Name, mailing, address, telephone	Participant role	Email address	begins	ends
<b>Ms Laurence BOUHOT-DELDUC</b> Ministry of Agriculture and Food, General directorate for food Sub-directorate for plant quality, health and protection 251 rue de Vaugirard 75732 Paris Cedex 15 <b>FRANCE</b> Tel: (+33) 149558437 Fax: (+33) 149555949	Steward / French	<a href="mailto:laurence.bouhot-delduc@agriculture.gouv.fr">laurence.bouhot-delduc@agriculture.gouv.fr</a>	November 2013	<b>2023</b>  (1 <sup>st</sup> term: 2013 - 2018)
<b>Ms Asenath Abigael KOECH</b> Pest Risk Analysis expert/Plant health inspector Kenya Plant Health Inspectorate Service (KEPHIS) KEPHIS Headquarters OLOOLUA RIDGE , KAREN P.O. BOX 49592-00100, NAIROBI, <b>KENYA</b> Mobile: +254 -722973535 Office: +254 – 709891110 Fax: +254 -020 3536175	English	<a href="mailto:akoech@kephis.org">akoech@kephis.org</a> ; <a href="mailto:abigakoech@gmail.com">abigakoech@gmail.com</a>	May 2017	<b>2022</b>
<b>Ms Beatriz MELCHO</b> Ministry of Livestock, Agriculture and Fisheries, General Direction of Agricultural Services, Plant Protection Division Avda. Millan 4703 CP 12900 Montevideo, <b>URUGUAY</b> Tel: (+598) 2 309 8410 ext 267	Spanish	<a href="mailto:bmelcho@mgap.gub.uy">bmelcho@mgap.gub.uy</a> ; <a href="mailto:bemelcho@hotmail.com">bemelcho@hotmail.com</a>	November 2015	<b>2025</b>  (1 <sup>st</sup> term: 2010 - 2015)  (2 <sup>nd</sup> term: 2015 - 2020)
<b>Mr Ebbe NORDBO</b> <b>DENMARK</b> Mobile: (+45) 28740095	English	<a href="mailto:ebbenordbo@outlook.com">ebbenordbo@outlook.com</a>	Oct 2009	<b>2024</b>  (2 <sup>nd</sup> term: 2014 - 2019)
<b>Ms Shaza Roushdy OMAR</b> 8 Kamal El-Din Salah street Garden City, Cairo <b>EGYPT</b> Mobile: (+20) 227972454 Fax: (+20) 227963989	Arabic	<a href="mailto:shaza.roshty@gmail.com">shaza.roshty@gmail.com</a>	May 2017	<b>2022</b>  (1 <sup>st</sup> term: 2012 - 2017)
<b>Mr Konstantin GREBENNIKOV</b> Senior researcher, deputy head of the scientific-methodological and experimental center of FGBU "VNIIEKR" 140150, Moscow Region, Ramenskoye, Bykovo, Pogranichnaya str. 32 <b>RUSSIAN FEDERATION</b> Tel.: +74997072227 (ext.1669)	Russian	<a href="mailto:kgrebennikov@gmail.com">kgrebennikov@gmail.com</a>	November 2021	<b>2026</b>

Participants details			TPG member's term	
Name, mailing, address, telephone	Participant role	Email address	begins	ends
<b>Mr Rajesh RAMARATHNAM</b> Senior Specialist – International Phytosanitary Standards International Affairs Branch Canadian Food Inspection Agency (CFIA) 59 Camelot Drive, Ottawa ON K1A OY9 <b>CANADA</b> Tel: (+1) 613-773-7122	English	<a href="mailto:rajesh.ramarathnam@inspection.gc.ca">rajesh.ramarathnam@inspection.gc.ca</a>	January 2019	<b>2024</b>

Invited experts	
Name	Email address
<b>Mr Andrei ORLINSKI</b> EPPO	<a href="mailto:adorlinski@gmail.com">adorlinski@gmail.com</a>

IPPC Secretariat	
Name	Email address
<b>Mr Artur SHAMILOV</b> Standard Setting Officer	<a href="mailto:Artur.Shamilov@fao.org">Artur.Shamilov@fao.org</a>
<b>Mr Edgar MUSHEGIAN</b> Standard Setting Associate	<a href="mailto:Edgar.Mushegyan@fao.org">Edgar.Mushegyan@fao.org</a>
<b>Ms Aixa DEL GRECO</b> Standard Setting Associate	<a href="mailto:Aixa.DelGreco@fao.org">Aixa.DelGreco@fao.org</a>

## Appendix 4: Draft 2022 Amendments to the Glossary (1994-001)

### DRAFT 2022 AMENDMENTS TO ISPM 5: *GLOSSARY OF PHYTOSANITARY TERMS* (1994-001)

#### Publication history

(This is not an official part of the standard)

<b>Date of this document</b>	2022-03-07
<b>Document category</b>	Draft 2022 Amendments to ISPM 5 ( <i>Glossary of phytosanitary terms</i> ) (1994-001)
<b>Current document stage</b>	To first consultation
<b>Major stages</b>	CEPM (1994) added topic: 1994-001, Amendments to ISPM 5: Glossary of phytosanitary terms 2006-05 Standards Committee (SC) approved specification TP5 2012-10 Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG) revised specification 2012-11 SC revised and approved revised specification, revoking Specification 1 2021-12 TPG proposed 2022 amendments below 2022-05 SC revised the 2022 amendments via the Online Comment System and approved the 2022 amendments for the first consultation via e-decision (2022_eSC_MayXX)/virtual meeting.
<b>Notes</b>	Note to Secretariat formatting this paper: formatting in definitions and explanations (strikethrough, bold, italics) needs to remain.

#### Introduction

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

## 1. REVISION

The following introduction refers to both proposals for the revision of the terms “phytosanitary action” (2020-006) and “phytosanitary procedure” (2020-007):

- In the context of discussing the term and definition of “emergency action” (2018-044), the TPG in November 2019 discussed the current definitions of “phytosanitary action” and “phytosanitary procedure” and concluded that these definitions might need a major overhaul through analyzing their inter-relations and current use in ISPMs. The Standards Committee (SC) in November 2020 agreed to the TPG conclusion and added the terms “phytosanitary action” (2020-006) and “phytosanitary procedure” (2020-007) to the TPG work programme in the *List of topics for IPPC standards*.
- The TPG in December 2021 recalled that a phytosanitary action is an official *operation*, and a phytosanitary procedure is an official *method* (i.e., a documented process or a methodology) for implementing phytosanitary measures (or taking phytosanitary action). The relationship between the three concepts may be illustrated as: a phytosanitary measure is *what to do*, a *phytosanitary procedure* is *how to do it*, and a phytosanitary action is actually *doing it*.
- The terms “phytosanitary action” and “phytosanitary procedure” both refer to “phytosanitary measures” in their respective definitions and are strongly interconnected. TPG discussions on the two definitions were therefore also intertwined and followed similar lines of argumentation.
- Phytosanitary measures have the purpose of preventing the introduction or spread of quarantine pests or limiting the economic impact of regulated non-quarantine pests (RNQPs). Thus, phytosanitary measures are established exclusively in relation to regulated pests, i.e., quarantine pests and RNQPs.
- A national plant protection organization (NPPO) can apply phytosanitary actions and phytosanitary procedures against pests regulated in the country itself. Furthermore, to fulfill all prerequisites for performing phytosanitary certification in export situations, the NPPO may similarly apply *phytosanitary actions* and *phytosanitary procedures* against pests regulated in other (importing) countries in order to meet the phytosanitary import requirements of those countries. Thus, the qualifier “phytosanitary” can be used, and has been widely used, in ISPMs in relation to scenarios where the NPPO of an exporting country is *applying* procedures or actions to meet phytosanitary import requirements of an importing country as established to prevent the spread of pests regulated in that importing country, but not necessarily regulated in the country of export where such application is taking place.
- Examples of such inclusive use of the concepts and terms ‘phytosanitary procedure’ and ‘phytosanitary action’ are provided below:
  - Inspection, testing, surveillance, treatment, etc., may also be conducted to support phytosanitary certification prior to export, and in such cases, the pests of concern may not be regulated pests of the country where these activities are carried out.
  - Phytosanitary actions may be applied in relation to changes in the status of an Area of Low Pest Prevalence (ALPP), and phytosanitary procedures may be followed in relation to the establishment and maintenance of a pest free area (PFA) or an ALPP. PFA and ALPP may be used in a country to exclude or control pests regulated in that country, or to exclude or control pests regulated in another country in order to enable phytosanitary certification and thereby facilitate exports to that country.
  - In ISPM 31 (*Methodologies for sampling of consignments*), the application of various phytosanitary actions may be determined by the outcome of sampling, and sampling of consignments may be performed prior to phytosanitary certification or at import.
  - According to ISPM 45 (*Requirements for national plant protection organizations if authorizing entities to perform phytosanitary actions*), NPPOs may authorize entities to perform phytosanitary actions on their behalf, and these phytosanitary actions can be



- undertaken in support of import or domestic activities (against pests regulated in the actual country) or export activities (against pests regulated in another, importing country).
- Phytosanitary procedures are followed in relation to export certification as described in ISPMs 7 (*Phytosanitary certification system*) and 12 (*Phytosanitary certificates*).
  - To explicitly express the full scope of ‘phytosanitary action’ and phytosanitary procedure’, including the aspect of pests regulated in another, importing country, the proposed additional wording is “...or to enable phytosanitary certification”, and “...or for enabling phytosanitary certification” (in the definitions of “phytosanitary action” and “phytosanitary procedure”, respectively). This additional wording provides conceptual focus on the scenario as seen from the perspective of the NPPO *applying* the procedures and actions. Implicitly, the wording refers to the objective of ‘meeting another country’s phytosanitary import requirements’, because phytosanitary certification (as per definition) can only be carried out once the exporting country is able to declare that phytosanitary import requirements have been met.

**a. “phytosanitary action” (2020-006)**

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

- An NPPO may apply phytosanitary actions against pests regulated in the country itself. Furthermore, to fulfill all prerequisites for performing phytosanitary certification in export situations, the NPPO may similarly apply *phytosanitary actions* against pests regulated in other (importing) countries in order to meet the phytosanitary import requirements of those countries. Thus, the qualifier “phytosanitary” for an action can be used when the NPPO of an exporting country is carrying out operations to meet phytosanitary import requirements of an importing country against pests that are regulated in that importing country, but not necessarily regulated in the country of export where the operation takes place.
- The proposed additional wording is “...or to enable phytosanitary certification” which describes the scenario from the perspective of the NPPO carrying out the operations. Implicitly, this wording refers to the objective of ‘meeting another country’s phytosanitary import requirements’, because phytosanitary certification (as per definition) can only be carried out once the exporting country is able to declare that phytosanitary import requirements have been met.
- The proposed revised definition reflects the actual use of the term ‘phytosanitary action’ in ISPMs. It does not conflict with and therefore does not necessitate amendments to ISPM texts.

**Current definition**

<b>phytosanitary action</b>	An <b>official</b> operation, such as <b>inspection, testing, surveillance</b> or <b>treatment</b> , undertaken to implement <b>phytosanitary measures</b> [ICPM, 2001; revised ICPM, 2005]
-----------------------------	---

**Proposed revision**

<b>phytosanitary action</b>	An <b>official</b> operation, such as <b>inspection, testing, surveillance</b> or <b>treatment</b> , undertaken to implement <b>phytosanitary measures</b> <u>or to enable phytosanitary certification</u>
-----------------------------	--

**b. “phytosanitary procedure” (2020-007)**

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

- An NPPO may apply phytosanitary procedures against pests regulated in the country itself. Furthermore, to fulfill all prerequisites for performing phytosanitary certification in export situations, the NPPO may similarly apply *phytosanitary procedures* against pests regulated in other (importing) countries in order to meet the phytosanitary import requirements of those

countries. Thus, the qualifier “phytosanitary” for a procedure can be used when the NPPO of an exporting country is applying procedures to meet phytosanitary import requirements of an importing country against pests that are regulated in that country, but not necessarily regulated in the country of export where the operation takes place.

- The proposed additional wording is “...or for enabling phytosanitary certification” which describes the scenario from the perspective of the NPPO carrying out the operations. Implicitly, this wording refers to the objective of ‘meeting another country’s phytosanitary import requirements’, because phytosanitary certification (as per definition) can only be carried out once the exporting country is able to declare that phytosanitary import requirements have been met.
- Given the inclusion of ‘phytosanitary’ in the term itself and within both elements of the definition as ‘phytosanitary measures’ and ‘phytosanitary certification’, the current phrasing ‘in connection with regulated pests’ is redundant and potentially confusing, as it does not provide the immediate understanding that, with the export scenario, although the pest in question is regulated in the importing country, it may not be regulated in the exporting country where the procedure is being followed. The phrasing therefore should be deleted from the definition.
- ‘An’ as the introductory article of the definition is consistent with far the most Glossary definitions and is more precise than the original ‘Any’.
- The proposed revised definition reflects the actual use of the term ‘phytosanitary procedure’ in ISPMs. It does not conflict with and therefore does not necessitate amendments to ISPM texts.

#### Current definition

<b>phytosanitary procedure</b>	Any <b>official</b> method for implementing <b>phytosanitary measures</b> including the performance of <b>inspections, tests, surveillance</b> or <b>treatments</b> in connection with <b>regulated pests</b> [FAO, 1990; revised FAO, 1995; CEPM, 1999; ICPM, 2001; ICPM, 2005]
--------------------------------	--

#### Proposed revision

<b>phytosanitary procedure</b>	Any <b>official</b> method for implementing <b>phytosanitary measures</b> <u>or for enabling phytosanitary certification</u> , including the performance of <b>inspections, tests, surveillance</b> or <b>treatments</b> <del>in connection with regulated pests</del>
--------------------------------	--

**Appendix 5: TPG workplan 2022–2023**

(Last update: 2022-02-17)

**TABLE 1 - REGULAR TASKS**

Regular tasks	Detailed task	Responsible	Deadline	Comments	
<b>1. Meeting reports: preparation and update to SC</b>	<b>January-February 2022</b>	Draft report to Steward, Chairperson and rapporteur	Secretariat	2022-01-25	
		Steward, Chairperson and rapporteur send back draft report	Steward, Chair & rapporteur	2022-02-15	
		Secretariat finalizes report and sends to editor	Secretariat	2022-02-18	
		Editor reviews report and send comments	Editor	2022-02-25	
		Final report	Secretariat	2022-02-28	(To allow review in Secretariat)
	<b>Update for SC May 2022</b>	Prepare update (incl. decisions) from TPG December 2021 meetings for SC May 2022	Secretariat with stewards	2022-03-25	Secretariat to draft; steward to respond by 25/03 tent.
<b>2. Draft ISPMs in 1<sup>st</sup> consultation (except Amendments, see 3)</b>	Going to SC-7 / 2 <sup>nd</sup> consultation	Terms and consistency comments extracted.	Secretariat	2021-10-07	
		Review for possible inconsistencies and consideration of comments	All	At the TPG meeting	
		Reactions to comments/consistency review integrated in tables: all drafts, and send to stewards via Secretariat	Secretariat with stewards	2022-02-15	Comments from TPG on these will not be solicited, documents will be finalized by Secretariat and Steward
		Check accuracy of translation of definitions in draft ISPMs and propose translations for Chinese, Arabic and Russian	French, Spanish Russian, Chinese, Arabic	2022-02-15	These will be submitted to translation-services when drafts go for translation before CPM
<b>3. Terms and definitions (incl. Amendments to the Glossary)</b>	<b>2021 Amendments</b>	Volunteers sends draft meeting papers to Secretariat	ALL, as allocated in Table 3	2020-10-02	TPG 2020 (in fact January 2021)
		Draft 2021 Amendments compiled based on discussions at TPG 2021-01	Secretariat and steward	2021-01-21	Back to Secretariat by 2021-02-10
		TPG members' help to translate new terms proposed for the draft amendments in languages for the List of topics (LOT)	Secretariat	TPG meeting	N/A

Regular tasks	Detailed task	Responsible	Deadline	Comments
	Draft 2021 Amendments finalized	ALL	2021-02-26	
	Amendments processed for SC	Secretariat	2021-02-26	Posting deadline for SC May 2021 is 1 March
	Draft amendments to 1 <sup>st</sup> Consultation		2021-07 to 09	
	Draft amendments and 1 <sup>st</sup> Cons. comments reviewed		TPG 2021-12	
	Finalize amendments and responses	Secretariat and steward	2021-12-21	Back to Secretariat by 2022-01-09
	Amendments and responses for TPG comments	ALL	2022-01-28	Draft Amendments and responses to compiled comments to be posted by 1 March for SC-7 / 2 <sup>nd</sup> Cons.
	Check accuracy of translation of definitions in draft ISPMs and propose translations for Chinese, Arabic and Russian	French, Spanish Russian, Chinese, Arabic	2022-01-28	These will be submitted to translation-services when drafts go for translation before CPM
	Draft amendments in 2 <sup>nd</sup> Consultation		2022-07 to 09	
	Consultation by email on 2 <sup>nd</sup> Cons. comments	ALL	in 2022-10	If Steward feels consultation is needed. The draft Amendments and responses to 2 <sup>nd</sup> Cons. comments are submitted to SC November
	Check of translations of draft Amendments going for adoption (i.e. after SC November and when it has been revised/translated into all languages)	Members for languages	TBD, in 2023-01	The translations will be ready for review around the beginning of January and must be posted by 1 March for CPM.
<b>2022 Amendments</b>	Volunteers sends draft meeting papers to Secretariat	ALL, as allocated in Table 3	2021-10-01	TPG Dec 2021
	Draft 2022 Amendments compiled based on discussions at TPG 2021-12	Secretariat and steward	2021-12-16	Back to Secretariat by 2022-01-10
	TPG members' help to translate new terms proposed for the draft amendments in languages for the List of topics (LOT)	Secretariat	TPG meeting	N/A
	Draft 2022 Amendments finalized	ALL	2022-02-28	
	Amendments processed for SC	Secretariat	2022-02-28	Posting deadline for SC May 2022

Regular tasks	Detailed task		Responsible	Deadline	Comments
					is 1 March
		Draft amendments to 1 <sup>st</sup> Consultation		2022-07 to 09	
		Draft amendments and 1 <sup>st</sup> Cons. comments reviewed		TPG 2022	
		Finalize amendments and responses	Secretariat and steward	2022-12-21	Back to Secretariat by 2023-01-09
		Amendments and responses for TPG comments	ALL	2023-01-28	Draft Amendments and responses to compiled comments to be posted by 1 March for SC-7 / 2 <sup>nd</sup> Cons.
		Check accuracy of translation of definitions in draft ISPMs and propose translations for Chinese, Arabic and Russian	French, Spanish Russian, Chinese, Arabic	2023-01-28	These will be submitted to translation-services when drafts go for translation before CPM
		Draft amendments in 2 <sup>nd</sup> Consultation		2023-07 to 09	
		Consultation by email on 2 <sup>nd</sup> Cons. comments	ALL	in 2023-10	If Steward feels consultation is needed. The draft Amendments and responses to 2 <sup>nd</sup> Cons. comments are submitted to SC November
		Check of translations of draft Amendments going for adoption (i.e. after SC November and when it has been revised/translated into all languages)	Members for languages	TBD, in 2024-01	The translations will be ready for review around the beginning of January and must be posted by 1 March for CPM.
<b>4. Annotated Glossary – (to be published every 3 years, last published in March 2019)</b>	2019 (intermediate)	To prepare intermediate update based on TPG comments, outcomes of CPM 2019, SC May 2019	Beatriz Melcho	2019-06-15	
		To review intermediate update	All	2019-06-30	
	2020 (intermediate)	To prepare intermediate update based on TPG comments, outcomes of TPG 2019, including updates from SC Nov. 2019, CPM 2020, SC May 2020	Beatriz Melcho	After SC 2020-05	All to review / provide comments by end June 2020
	2021 (intermediate)	To prepare intermediate update based on TPG comments, outcomes of TPG 2020, including updates from SC Nov. 2020, CPM 2021, SC May 2021	Beatriz Melcho	After SC 2022-05	All to review / provide comments by end June 2021
	2022 (for	To prepare update based on TPG comments, outcomes of	Beatriz Melcho	2023-02-15	All to review / provide comments

Regular tasks	Detailed task	Responsible	Deadline	Comments
	publishing) TPG 2021, including updates from SC Nov. 2021. To review update	All	TPG meeting	during TPG 2021 meeting To be approved by SC via e-decision asap in 2022.
<b>5. Explanation of Glossary terms</b>	Members to identify before the meeting some Glossary terms/definitions requiring further explanations (and not already explained in other places, such as the Annotated Glossary)	All	2022-10-01	
<b>6. Review of membership</b>	Annual review of membership to make recommendations to SC on new members needed		TPG meeting	

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

One-off tasks	Detailed task	Responsible	Deadline	Comments
<b>7. Review of ISPMs for consistency and style (other than in draft ISPMs)</b>	Ongoing consistency review	All during TPG meeting		TPG meeting
	Present all ink amendments / proposals for revision made so far	Secretariat	Ongoing	TPG meeting
<b>8. Other tasks</b>	General recommendations on consistency: yearly updates as needed	Secretariat with stewards	2022-01-07	
	General recommendations on consistency	ALL	2022-01-28	Appended to TPG report

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

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

N	Term	Status	Lead	Comments & next steps
1.	clearance (of a consignment) (2018-045)	To SC-7 2022	Abigael Koech	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- TPG 2018-12: proposed to add to the LOT following discussions on the definition of inspection</li> <li>- SC 2019-05: added to LOT</li> <li>- TPG 2019-11: proposed the revision to be presented to SC May 2020 as a draft 2020 Amendments to ISPM 5</li> <li>- SC 2021-05: approved as modified at the meeting for submission to the 1st consultation</li> <li>- TPG 2021-12: recommended the deletion be maintained as proposed at the 1st consultation</li> </ul>
2.	compliance procedure (for a consignment) (2021-006)	To SC-7 2022	Ebbe Nordbo	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- TPG 2020-12: discussed 1st consultation comments clearance (of a consignment) and proposed to add to work programme "Compliance procedure (for a consignment) and presented revised definition to SC May 2021 as draft 2021 Amendments to ISPM 5 for 1st consultation</li> <li>- SC 2021-05: agreed to add the subject to the TPG work programme and approved as modified at the meeting for submission to the 1st consultation</li> <li>- TPG 2021-12: recommends a revised definition as slightly changed in comparison to the version sent for the 1st consultation</li> </ul>
3.	detection survey (consequential to the revision of "survey" (2013-015))	To CPM-16 (2022)	Laurence Bouhot-Delduc	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- SC-7 2018-05: asked the TPG to consider whether the definition of "detection survey" should be amended to include "or absence"</li> <li>- TPG 2018-12: discussed the term and proposed revision in 2019 Amendments to ISPM 5</li> <li>- SC 2019-05: agreed with TPG proposal and approved it for 1st consultation, noting that the consultation would be postponed until 2020</li> <li>- The term was sent for 1st consultation in 2020</li> <li>- TPG 2020-12: discussed 1st consultation comments and provided revised proposed definition</li> <li>- SC-7 2021: approved as modified at the meeting for submission to the 2nd consultation</li> <li>- SC 2021-11: approved for adoption by CPM-16 (2022)</li> </ul>
4.	emergency action (2018-044)	To CPM-16 (2022)	Laurence Bouhot-Delduc	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- TPG 2018-12: proposed to add to the LOT following discussions on the definition of treatment.</li> <li>- SC 2019-05: added to LOT</li> <li>- TPG 2019-11: proposed the revision to be presented to SC May 2020 as a draft 2020 Amendments to ISPM 5</li> <li>- SC 2020-05: approved via e-decision for the 1<sup>st</sup> consultation</li> <li>- TPG 2020-12: discussed 1<sup>st</sup> consultation comments and provided revised proposed definition</li> <li>- SC-7 2021: approved as modified at the meeting for submission to the 2<sup>nd</sup> consultation</li> <li>- SC 2021-11: approved for adoption by CPM-16 (2022)</li> </ul>
5.	emergency measure (2020-	To SC-7 2022	Rajesh Ramarathnam	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- TPG 2019-11: invites the SC to add it to the work programme</li> <li>- SC 2020-11: via e-decision agreed to add it to the LOT</li> </ul>

N	Term	Status	Lead	Comments & next steps
	004)			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- TPG 2021-01: revised definition and presented to SC May 2021 as draft 2021 Amendments to ISPM 5 for 1<sup>st</sup> consultation</li> <li>- SC 2021-05: approved as modified at the meeting for submission to the 1<sup>st</sup> consultation</li> <li>- TPG 2021-12: recommends a revised definition as slightly changed in comparison to the version sent for the 1<sup>st</sup> consultation</li> </ul>
6.	emerging pest (2018-003)	Pending	Ebbe Nordbo	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- SC 2018-05: considered proposal from TC-RPPOs and agreed to include the term in the TPG work programme</li> <li>- TPG 2018-12: TPG proposed a draft definition of “emerging pest” – for SC to consider future steps</li> <li>- SC 2019-05: considered TPG proposal and agreed to not send the definition for consultation for inclusion in ISPM 5 at this time. Discussions on the topic were forwarded to CPM Bureau as input into the wider discussion on the concept of “emerging pests”</li> </ul>
7.	general surveillance (2018-046)	To SC-7 2022	Beatriz Melcho	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- TPG 2018-12: proposed to add to the LOT following discussions on the note on “surveillance” in the Annotated Glossary</li> <li>- SC 2019-05: added to LOT</li> <li>- TPG 2019-11: agreed to continue working on term</li> <li>- TPG 2021-01: elaborated definition and presented to SC May 2021 as draft 2021 Amendments to ISPM 5 for 1<sup>st</sup> consultation</li> <li>- SC 2021-05: approved as modified at the meeting for submission to the 1<sup>st</sup> consultation</li> <li>- TPG 2021-12: to more correctly capture that data may be collected from various, also non-official sources, the TPG recommends a revised definition as slightly changed in comparison to the version sent for the 1<sup>st</sup> consultation</li> </ul>
8.	germplasm (2020-005)	To SC-7 2022	Abigael Koech	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- TPG 2019-11: invites the SC to add it to the work programme</li> <li>- SC 2020-11: via e-decision agreed to add it to the LOT</li> <li>- TPG 2021-01: revised definition and presented to SC May 2021 as draft 2021 Amendments to ISPM 5 for 1<sup>st</sup> consultation</li> <li>- SC 2021-05: approved as modified at the meeting for submission to the 1<sup>st</sup> consultation</li> <li>- TPG 2021-12: recommends the revised definition be retained exactly as worded in the version sent for the 1<sup>st</sup> consultation</li> </ul>
9.	identity (of a consignment) (2011-001)	To SC-7 2022	Ebbe Nordbo	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- SC 2011-05: added based on CPM-6 discussion. At CPM-6, in relation to the revised ISPM 12, some members suggested that the SC consider whether there is a need to define the term “identity”, and the SC added the term to the work programme as TPG subject</li> <li>- TPG 2012: suggested an approach, but asked SC to validate before further work</li> <li>- SC 2013-05: agreed (see TPG 2012-10 report and SC 2013-05 report)</li> <li>- TPG 2014: discussed and incorporated into Amendments (2014)</li> <li>- SC 2014-05: withdrew from Amendments (2014) for TPG to reconsider identity, integrity (of a consignment), phytosanitary security (of a consignment) and section 6.1 of ISPM 12 be reviewed together, and possibly propose revised definitions of the terms and possible consistency changes to section 6.1 of ISPM 12</li> <li>- TPG 2014-12: reviewed; deferred final decision to e-forum discussion but agreed that terms and ISPM 12 will be processed combined only (for SC May 2015)</li> <li>- SC 2015-05: reviewed but asked TPG to prepare draft specification for the review of ISPM 12 in combination with this term, as not consistency changes or ink amendments</li> <li>- TPG 2015-06: prepared specification via TPG_2015-06_e-decision_03: Draft specification for the revision of ISPM 12 and submitted to 2015-08 Call for topics</li> <li>- SC 2015-11: recommended addition of topic to LOT to be approved by CPM-11 (2016). If approved, focused revision of ISPM 12 will be prepared. (Consider if apply “phytosanitary status” revisions as well)</li> </ul>



N	Term	Status	Lead	Comments & next steps
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Secretariat suggesting waiting with further work pending revision of ISPM 12 (SC not made pending)</li> <li>- CPM-11 (2016): approved the addition of the Revision of ISPM 12 on Phytosanitary certificates (2015-011), with priority 2. The draft specification will be submitted to consultation in July 2017.</li> <li>- SC 2017-11: agreed to review the comments and consider the draft specification by SC e-decision</li> <li>- SC approved Specification 67: Focused revision of ISPM 12 (Phytosanitary certificates) in relation to re-export by e-decision (2018_eSC_May_03)</li> <li>- TPG 2019-11: TPG Steward and TPG Assistant Steward prepared discussion paper for EWG on sections 4 and 6 of ISPM 12 and agreed to continue working on term</li> <li>- TPG 2021-01: revised definition and presented to SC May 2021 as draft 2021 Amendments to ISPM 5 for 1<sup>st</sup> consultation</li> <li>- SC 2021-05: approved as modified at the meeting for submission to the 1<sup>st</sup> consultation</li> <li>- TPG 2021-12: recommends the revised definition be retained exactly as worded in the version sent for the 1<sup>st</sup> consultation</li> </ul>
10.	incidence (2018-010)	To CPM-16 (2022)	Laurence Bouhot-Delduc	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Topic submitted during 2018 joint call for topics: standards and implementation to revise the definition of the term “incidence” and define the term “prevalence” as their meaning can be confused in epidemiological and phytosanitary context</li> <li>- SC 2018-11: discussed TFG recommendation and noted that these terms had been discussed in depth previously. SC agreed to include the term “incidence” in TPG work programme and requested the TPG consider deleting it from the Glossary and using the dictionary definition of incidence and prevalence in ISPMs</li> <li>- TPG 2019-11: agreed to propose to SC May 2020 deletion as a draft 2020 Amendments to ISPM 5</li> <li>- SC 2020-05: approved via e-decision for the 1<sup>st</sup> consultation</li> <li>- TPG 2020-12: discussed 1<sup>st</sup> consultation comments and left their proposal for deletion unchanged</li> <li>- SC-7 2021: approved as modified at the meeting for submission to the 2<sup>nd</sup> consultation</li> <li>- SC 2021-11: approved for adoption by CPM-16 (2022)</li> </ul>
11.	inspection (2017-005)	To SC-7 2022	Rajesh Ramarathnam	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- TPG 2016-12: invited the SC to consider if inspection should be revised to adequately reflect current inspection practices that may also include examination methods other than visual and if so add this term to the LOT</li> <li>- SC 2017-05: added “inspection” to the LOT</li> <li>- TPG 2017-12: proposed a revision of the term in the 2018 Amendments</li> <li>- SC 2018-05: discussed TPG proposal and agreed to further consider this term in an SC e-forum.</li> <li>- 2018_eSC_Nov_01: SC decided that the term requires further discussion during SC November 2018 and TPG 2018-12</li> <li>- TPG 2018-12: discussed the term and agreed to continue discussion during TPG 2019 based on current TPG working definition to potentially include meaning as in ISPM 23</li> <li>- TPG 2019-11: agreed to continue working on it</li> <li>- TPG 2021-01: revised definition and presented to SC May 2021 as draft 2021 Amendments to ISPM 5 for 1<sup>st</sup> consultation</li> <li>- SC 2021-05: approved as modified at the meeting for submission to the 1<sup>st</sup> consultation</li> <li>- TPG 2021-12: recommends the revised definition be retained exactly as worded in the version sent for the 1<sup>st</sup> consultation</li> </ul>
12.	integrity (of a consignment)	To SC-7 2022	Ebbe Nordbo	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- See identity</li> <li>- SC 2014-05: withdrew from Amendments (2014), TPG to reconsider</li> </ul>

N	Term	Status	Lead	Comments & next steps
	(consequential) (2021-008)			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- TPG 2014-12: reviewed; deferred final decision to e-forum discussion but agreed that terms and ISPM 12 will be processed combined only (for SC May 2015)</li> <li>- SC 2015-05: reviewed but asked TPG to prepare draft specification for the review of ISPM 12 in combination with this term, as not consistency changes or ink amendments</li> <li>- TPG 2015-06: prepared specification via TPG_2015-06_e-decision_03: Draft specification for the revision of ISPM 12 and submitted to 2015-08 Call for topics</li> <li>- SC 2015-11: recommended addition of topic to the LOT to be approved by CPM-11 (2016). If approved, focused revision of ISPM 12 will be prepared</li> <li>- CPM-11 (2016): approved the addition of the Revision of ISPM 12 on Phytosanitary certificates (2015-011), with priority 2. The draft specification will be submitted to consultation in July 2017</li> <li>- SC 2017-11: agreed to review the comments and consider the draft specification by SC e-decision</li> <li>- SC approved Specification 67: Focused revision of ISPM 12 (Phytosanitary certificates) in relation to re-export by e-decision (2018_eSC_May_03)</li> <li>- TPG 2019-11: TPG Steward and TPG Assistant Steward prepared discussion paper for EWG on sections 4 and 6 of ISPM 12 and agreed to continue working on term</li> <li>- TPG 2021-01: revised definition and presented to SC May 2021 as draft 2021 Amendments to ISPM 5 for 1<sup>st</sup> consultation</li> <li>- SC 2021-05: agreed to add the subject to the TPG work programme and approved as modified at the meeting for submission to the 1<sup>st</sup> consultation</li> <li>- TPG 2021-12: given that countries' comments had mainly requested clarity as regards seals, the TPG conclusively recommends a revised definition as slightly changed in comparison to the version sent for the 1<sup>st</sup> consultation</li> </ul>
13.	phytosanitary action (2020-006)	To TPG 2021	Rajesh Ramarathnam	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- TPG 2019-11: invites the SC to add it to the work programme</li> <li>- SC 2020-11: via e-decision agreed to add it to the LOT</li> <li>- TPG 2021-01: agreed to continue working on it</li> <li>- TPG 2021-12: revised and agreed to propose the amended definition to SC May 2022</li> </ul>
14.	phytosanitary procedure (2020-007)	To TPG 2021	Rajesh Ramarathnam	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- TPG 2019-11: invites the SC to add it to the work programme</li> <li>- SC 2020-11: via e-decision agreed to add it to the LOT</li> <li>- TPG 2021-01: agreed to continue working on it</li> <li>- TPG 2021-12: revised and agreed to propose the amended definition to SC May 2022</li> </ul>
15.	phytosanitary security (of a consignment) (2013-008)	To SC-7 2022	Ebbe Nordbo	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- See identity</li> <li>- TPG 2012, added SC 2013-05: Details in TPG 2012-10 report</li> <li>- SC 2013-05: added term to List of topics</li> <li>- TPG 2014: incorporated to Amendments (2014)</li> <li>- SC 2014-05: withdrew from Amendments (2014), TPG to reconsider</li> <li>- TPG 2014-12: reviewed; deferred final decision to e-forum discussion but agreed that terms and ISPM 12 will be processed combined only (for SC May 2015)</li> </ul>

N	Term	Status	Lead	Comments & next steps
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- SC 2015-05: reviewed but asked TPG to prepare draft specification for the review of ISPM 12 in combination with this term, as not consistency changes or ink amendments</li> <li>- TPG 2015-06: prepared specification via TPG_2015-06_e-decision_03: Draft specification for the revision of ISPM 12 and submitted to 2015-08 Call for topics</li> <li>- SC 2015-11: recommended addition of topic to LOT to be approved by CPM-11 (2016). If approved, a focused revision of ISPM 12 will be prepared</li> <li>- CPM-11 (2016): approved the addition of the Revision of ISPM 12 on Phytosanitary certificates (2015-011), with priority 2. The draft specification will be submitted to consultation in July 2017</li> <li>- SC 2017-11: agreed to review the comments and consider the draft specification by SC e-decision</li> <li>- SC approved Specification 67: Focused revision of ISPM 12 (Phytosanitary certificates) in relation to re-export by e-decision (2018_eSC_May_03)</li> <li>- TPG 2019-11: TPG Assistant Steward and TPG Steward prepared discussion paper for EWG on sections 4 and 6 of ISPM 12 and agreed to continue working on term</li> <li>- TPG 2021-01: revised definition and presented to SC May 2021 as draft 2021 Amendments to ISPM 5 for 1<sup>st</sup> consultation</li> <li>- SC 2021-05: approved as modified at the meeting for submission to the 1<sup>st</sup> consultation</li> <li>- TPG 2021-12: recommends keeping the definition simple by retaining the amendment exactly as worded in the version sent for the 1<sup>st</sup> consultation</li> </ul>
16.	provisional measure (2020-008)	To SC-7 2022	Rajesh Ramarathnam	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- TPG 2019-11: invites the SC to add it to the work programme</li> <li>- SC 2020-11: via e-decision agreed to add it to the LOT</li> <li>- TPG 2021-01: revised definition and presented to SC May 2021 as draft 2021 Amendments to ISPM 5 for 1<sup>st</sup> consultation</li> <li>- SC 2021-05: approved as modified at the meeting for submission to the 1<sup>st</sup> consultation</li> <li>- TPG 2021-12: recommends the revised definition be retained exactly as worded in the version sent for the 1<sup>st</sup> consultation</li> </ul>
17.	release (of a consignment) (2021-007)	To SC-7 2022	Ebbe Nordbo	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- TPG 2020-12: discussed 1st consultation comments clearance (of a consignment) and proposed to add to work programme Release (of a consignment) and presented revised definition to SC May 2021 as draft 2021 Amendments to ISPM 5 for 1st consultation</li> <li>- SC 2021-05: agreed to add the subject to the TPG work programme and approved as modified at the meeting for submission to the 1st consultation</li> <li>- TPG 2021-12: recommends a revised definition as slightly changed in comparison to the version sent for the 1st consultation</li> </ul>
18.	specific surveillance (2018-047)	To SC-7 2022	Beatriz Melcho	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- TPG 2018-12: proposed to add to the LOT following discussions on the note on “surveillance” in the Annotated Glossary</li> <li>- SC 2019-05: added to LOT</li> <li>- TPG 2019-11: agreed to continue working on it</li> <li>- TPG 2021-01: elaborated definition and presented to SC May 2021 as draft 2021 Amendments to ISPM 5 for 1<sup>st</sup> consultation</li> <li>- SC 2021-05: approved as modified at the meeting for submission to the 1<sup>st</sup> consultation</li> <li>- TPG 2021-12: recommends the revised definition be retained exactly as worded in the version sent for the 1<sup>st</sup> consultation</li> </ul>
19.	surveillance (2020-009)	To SC-7 2022	Beatriz Melcho	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- TPG 2019-11: agreed to recommend to SC to add it to the work programme</li> <li>- SC 2020-11: via e-decision agreed to add it to the LOT</li> </ul>

N	Term	Status	Lead	Comments & next steps
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- TPG 2021-01: revised definition and presented to SC May 2021 as draft 2021 Amendments to ISPM 5 for 1<sup>st</sup> consultation</li> <li>- SC 2021-05: approved as modified at the meeting for submission to the 1<sup>st</sup> consultation</li> <li>- TPG 2021-12: recommends a revised definition as slightly changed in comparison to the version sent for the 1<sup>st</sup> consultation</li> </ul>
20.	test (consequential to "inspection") (2021-005)	To SC-7 2022	Ebbe Nordbo	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- TPG 2020-12: discussed revision of "inspection" and agreed to proposed to add to work programme "test" consequential revision and presented revised definition to SC May 2021 as draft 2021 Amendments to ISPM 5 for 1<sup>st</sup> consultation</li> <li>- SC 2021-05: agreed to add the subject to the TPG work programme and approved as modified at the meeting for submission to the 1<sup>st</sup> consultation</li> <li>- TPG 2021-12: recommends a revised definition as slightly changed in comparison to the version sent for the 1<sup>st</sup> consultation</li> </ul>
<b>Related to consistency</b>				
21.	Review of the use of and/or in adopted ISPMs (2010-030)	Ongoing	Stays on the work programme to be implemented during the consistency review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- TPG discussion 2009</li> <li>- Modified SC November 2010</li> <li>- Consistent with general recommendations on consistency, but require a review of every occurrence. Will be considered during consistency study</li> </ul>

**TABLE 4 - MAIN DEADLINES FOR TPG MEMBERS (EXCEPT TASKS ONLY FOR STEWARD AND SECRETARIAT) - FOR DETAILS ON TASKS, SEE TABLES ABOVE**

Only deadlines until the next meeting are listed below

Deadline	Activity in tables	Resp.	Task
2022-01-15	3. Terms and defs	Language leads	Check of translations of draft 2022 Amendments to ISPM 5 going for adoption
N/A	2. ISPMs from 1 <sup>st</sup> cons.	Language leads	Check accuracy of translations of draft ISPMs from first consultation, and for terms and definitions of draft Amendments to ISPM 5 check translations in Fr and Es and propose translations in Ar, Ru and Zh (via email to Secretariat)
2022-02-28	3. Terms and defs	ALL	Review draft 2022 Amendments to ISPM 5 following TPG 2021-12 meeting and provide comments in track changes
2022-03-19	1. Meeting reports	ALL	Review report of TPG 2021-12 meeting and provide comments in track changes
2022-01-29	8. Other tasks	ALL	Review general recommendations on consistency for inclusion in the 2020 version of the IPPC Style guide
2022-06-30	4. Ann. Gloss.	ALL	Comment on 2020 intermediate version of Annotated Glossary
2022-10-01	5. Explanation of glossary terms	ALL	Identify terms that need explanation (and which are not explained elsewhere) and provide a paper for TPG 2022 meeting.
<b>2022-12</b>			<b>TPG meeting</b>

## Appendix 6: Proposed amendments to ISPMs

*(For noting by the SC and archiving by the secretariat for future revision of these ISPMs)*

- [1] ISPM 11 and ISPM 17 had been adopted prior to the discussions in 2004-2006 leading to the adoption of the revised ISPM 2 in 2007.

ISPM #	Sect	Current text	Proposed amendment
11	1.1 §1	The PRA process may be initiated as a result of: - the identification of a pathway that presents a potential <b>pest hazard</b>	The PRA process may be initiated as a result of: - the identification of a pathway that presents a potential <b>pest risk</b>
	numerous	... <b>phytosanitary risk</b> ...	... <b>pest risk</b> ...
17	5.2	... <b>phytosanitary risk</b> ...	... <b>pest risk</b> ...
33	3.1.2 and 3.2 (similar wording)	- provision for the use of dedicated protective clothing (including dedicated footwear or disinfection of footwear) and hand washing on entry (with particular care being taken if staff members work in areas of higher <b>phytosanitary risk</b> , e.g. the testing facility)	- provision for the use of dedicated protective clothing (including dedicated footwear or disinfection of footwear) and hand washing on entry (with particular care being taken if staff members work in locations of higher <b>phytosanitary concern</b> , e.g. the testing facility)
33	4.1	- the <b>phytosanitary risks</b> to minitubers have been assessed and, if identified, the other plant species have been tested and found to be pest free before entering the facility	- the <b>pest risks</b> to minitubers have been assessed and, if identified, the other plant species have been tested and found to be pest free before entering the facility

- [2] It is noted in passing, that “phytosanitary status” still appears in ISPM 33, sect. 3.1.2, 3.3 (3 times) and 6, despite former decisions by TPG/SC that the term is undesirable (being a so-called ‘deprecated term’ according to ISO 704).

## Appendix 7: Revised “General recommendations on use of terms in ISPMs” (section 5.2) and introductory wording (section 5.1) in the *IPPC style guide* (2019)

### Introductory note to the Standards Committee

The latest version of this “General recommendation on use of terms in ISPMs”, as appearing as section 5.2 in the *IPPC style guide* (2019), had been produced by the TPG in 2017 and *noted* by the Standards Committee in May 2018. With this amendment, some terms have been added (*phytosanitary hazard and pest hazard*, as well as *pest risk and phytosanitary risk*), and one term (*prevalence*) deleted from the list. Furthermore, erroneous and conflicting introductory text in section 5.1 “General content and structure guidance” of the style guide has been corrected, and some editorial adjustments inserted in both sections.

### 5.1 General content and structure guidance

*Terminology.* All drafters of draft specifications and ISPMs should refer to ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*) to ensure correct terminology is used.<sup>22</sup> For each concept, use only one term – this applies both to terms that are in ISPM 5 and those that are not (see “Guidelines for a consistent ISPM terminology” in the *IPPC procedural manual for standard setting*).

*Definitions.* All definitions for phytosanitary terms are those found in ISPM 5. Some definitions are applicable only to the specific ISPM and not incorporated into ISPM 5. Others are definitions that are added to the specific draft ISPM but with the intention of incorporating them into ISPM 5 after adoption.<sup>23</sup> Guidelines for defining terms intended for inclusion in ISPM 5 are given in the *IPPC procedural manual for standard setting* section on “Guidelines for a consistent ISPM terminology”,<sup>24</sup> stipulating and explaining the following six principles:

- (1) For each concept, use only one term.
- (2) Only define terms actually used in international phytosanitary documents, in particular the IPPC or ISPMs.
- (3) Develop a definition only where a certain term is used with a specific IPPC meaning.
- (4) The definition should be as short as possible but as complex as necessary.
- (5) A qualifier to a term may be used to delimit the definition to that specific association.
- (6) Where a term is used in an ISPM in a meaning specific to that ISPM, it should be defined in that ISPM and not in the Glossary.

*Level of obligation.* Attention must be paid to the level of obligation in standards. Refer here to the question of *should, shall, must and may* (see section 5.3).<sup>25</sup>

*FAO disclaimer and copyright.* The FAO disclaimer and copyright is posted on the [Adopted standards page](#) of the IPP; FAO personnel may also access it on the Publications Workflow System. All IPPC standard setting publications, including reports, are covered by this notice even if it is not included in every document. It is nevertheless advisable to include a copyright statement in any publication.<sup>26</sup> See the SOP for the copyright disclaimer (currently in preparation) for further details.

---

<sup>22</sup> As decided by SC 2014-11, agenda item 4.3.

<sup>23</sup> When reformatting standards in 2011, definitions in ISPMs were moved to ISPM 5 unless these were local definitions applicable only the ISPM in question.

<sup>24</sup> As agreed in 2017-12 by SC e-decision (2018\_eSC\_May\_01).

<sup>25</sup> As decided by SC 2014-11, agenda item 4.3.

<sup>26</sup> As decided by SC 2014-11, agenda item 4.3.

*Text left out of a revised publication or errors in listing of references can be added and corrected after adoption when not part of the legal text.*<sup>27</sup>

## 5.2 General recommendations on use of terms in ISPMs

Drafting groups should follow these recommendations<sup>28</sup> to ensure consistency across ISPMs:

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

### Recommendations on use of specific terms

#### *Accredit, authorize and certify*

These terms are used by many bodies and organizations in ways that may make them appear to have the same or similar meanings. In ISPMs and other IPPC documents, it is recommended that the terms be used with the following restrictions:

“accredit” – to give authority to a person or a body to do something when certain requirements have been met

“authorize” – to give authority to a person or a body to do something

“certify” – to state that a product or article meets certain requirements.

#### *Appropriate level of protection, acceptable level of risk*

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

#### *(Non-)compliance, (non-)conformity*

According to IPPC Article VII (2f), “Importing contracting parties shall ... inform ... of instances of non-compliance with phytosanitary certification ...”. Furthermore, “Compliance procedure (for a consignment)” has been defined in the Glossary. Thus, in those cases, compliance and non-compliance are clearly linked to consignments and thus to phytosanitary certification and import. For cases referring to correct or incorrect application of measures (e.g. regarding requirements prescribed for an entire place of production) the term “(non-) conformity” should be used instead.

#### *Contamination, contaminating pest and contaminant*

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

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

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

<sup>27</sup> Advice from FAO Legal service.

<sup>28</sup> Previous process approved by the TPG 2010-10 (Annex 13), noted by the SC 2011-05; revised by TPG 2013-02, approved by SC 2013-11 (Appendix 16); recommendations revised by TPG 2014-02, noted by SC 2014-05; revised by TPG 2015-12, noted by SC 2016-05; revised by TPG 2016-12, noted by SC 2017-05; revised by TPG 2017-12, noted by SC 2018-05; minor editorial amendments by TPG 2018-12; revised by TPG 2021-12.



Article IV of the IPPC, the term “NPPO” is more accurate. Otherwise, “country” can be used instead of “contracting party” for the requirements specified in ISPMs, as it is more straightforward, easier to understand and shorter.

#### *Dispersal, dissemination and spread*

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

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

#### *Efficacy, effectiveness*

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

#### *Hazard, pest hazard, phytosanitary hazard*

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

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

None of these terms are defined in the Glossary. Used in their normal dictionary sense, the terms “indigenous” and “non-indigenous” are the preferred terms to be used in ISPMs, while the use of other terms should be avoided. In particular, the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) term “alien” should in any case be avoided in ISPMs, so as not to create confusion or conflict with that convention.

#### *Inspection*

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

#### *Intended use, end use*

This is the Glossary term, which should be used, while other wordings such as “end use” should be avoided.

#### *Invasive, invasiveness, invasion*

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

### *IPPC*

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

### *Official*

Anything “established, authorized or performed by an NPPO” is by definition “official”. Many Glossary terms are defined as “official” (e.g. “area”, “inspection”, “phytosanitary action”, “phytosanitary measure”, “quarantine”, “surveillance”, “test”, “treatment”). The word “official” should therefore not be used where it is redundant.

### *Pest list*

There are different types of pest lists, and the terms “pest list”, “list of pests” or “pest listing” used on their own may be ambiguous, especially where they may be interpreted as referring to the pests *regulated* by a country or the pests *present in* a country. Therefore, the terms “pest list”, “list of pests” or “pest listing” should always be qualified.

In relation to the pests regulated by a country, proper wording would be, for example, “list of regulated pests” or “regulated pest list” (or, where applicable, the narrower “list of quarantine pests”, or “list of regulated non-quarantine pests”). In relation to the pests present in a country, “list of pests present in the country” may be used. The terms “national pest list” or “categorized pest list” are ambiguous and should be avoided.

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

### *Pest free*

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

### *Pest risk, phytosanitary risk, risk*

When the meaning of “pest risk” is intended, the Glossary term “pest risk” in full should be used (and not reduced to “risk” except in sentences with repetitions where “pest” may be redundant). The term “phytosanitary risk” should be avoided.

It is recommended that the phrasing used to specify the entity or event (“X”) that transmits the risk may vary only as: “X poses a pest risk”, “X presents a pest risk”, “the pest risk associated with X”, “the pest risk of X”, and including derivatives thereof. Other verbs or prepositions than those four mentioned should be avoided. Within each ISPM, the number of differing expressions used should be limited further.

### *Pest risk management*

“Pest risk management” is defined as being part of “pest risk analysis”. It relates to the selection and evaluation of phytosanitary measures before they are implemented. Accordingly, the term should only be used in the strict context of pest risk analysis (PRA). It is not appropriate in referring to activities involving the actual implementation of phytosanitary measures. “Pest management” or “reduction of pest risk” may, in this case, be the suitable alternative term.

### *Phytosanitary certificate, certificate*

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

*Phytosanitary import requirements*

This is the defined Glossary term, and should be used whenever possible (rather than alternative wordings, such as “requirements of the importing country”). See also “restriction”, below.

*Phytosanitary measures, phytosanitary actions*

Care should be taken to use these terms correctly. Though in common language “measures” can be “actions”, this is not so in the Glossary. “Phytosanitary measure” is “legislation, regulation or official procedure” (in accordance also with the use of this term in the SPS Agreement), while “phytosanitary action” is “official operation”. For a fuller explanation, see Note 10 of the Annotated Glossary.

*Phytosanitary status*

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

*Point of entry*

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

*Prescribed, required, target*

The terms “prescribed”, “required” and “target” have been used in ISPMs to indicate the desired level of a temperature, dose or similar. However, “target” indicates that which is aimed for, but which may not be reached. Thus, the word “target” should not be used in ISPMs in this context. “Required” indicates the level as set for example in the phytosanitary import requirements of a country, and is therefore the correct term. “Prescribed” is synonymous with “required”, but “required” is the term to be used in ISPMs.

*Presence, occurrence*

The terms “presence” and “occurrence” have been used in ISPMs in relation to pest status. However, it is recommended that the term “presence” be used rather than the term “occurrence”<sup>29</sup>.

*Restriction*

While this previously defined Glossary term has been used in ISPMs, it was used to mean “phytosanitary import requirements”. The term “phytosanitary import requirements” is defined in the Glossary and, as such, is the preferred term<sup>30</sup>.

*Security, phytosanitary security*

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

*Shipment, consignment, dispatch*

“Shipment” is ambiguous and should be avoided. Where the intended meaning is “consignment”, that Glossary term should be used. Where “dispatch” is meant, that term should be used.

*Trading partner*

“Trading partner” (or “trade partner”) is ambiguous and should be avoided. In ISPMs, it has often been used to make reference to the “NPPO of an importing country”, while not covering the broader understanding of the term which may include stakeholders. Where it is intended to mean “importing country”, this expression should be used. Otherwise more precise wording should be used.

---

<sup>29</sup> CPM-10 (2015) adopted the deletion of the definition of “occurrence” and confirmed that the term “presence” does not need a specific IPPC definition.

<sup>30</sup> CPM-10 (2015) adopted the deletion of the Glossary term “restriction” and thus the term can now be used with its general English meaning.

## Other recommendations

### *and/or*

Use of “and/or” should be avoided as it may confuse understanding and cause problems in translation. Usually, “and/or” can be replaced by “or”, without loss of meaning. “Or” means that either option or both options can apply at the same time. Only when a sentence reads “either ... or ...”, does it mean that the two options cannot occur at the same time.

### *References to the text of the IPPC*

ISPMs may include references to the text of the IPPC. If it is necessary to explain the reference, this should not be done by providing an interpretation or abridgement of the IPPC text. The relevant text of the IPPC should be quoted as written.

### *“/” and “(s)”*

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

- “and” or “or” may be used instead of “/” depending on what is meant in the context (e.g. “insects and fungi”, “insects or fungi”).
- Single or plural should be used instead of (s) (e.g. “the consignment is” or “the consignments are”). In some cases, it may be necessary to keep both, separated by “or” (e.g. “the consignment or consignments”).