



# **REPORT**

## **Technical Panel for the Glossary**

**Fortaleza, Brazil**

**4 December – 8 December 2023**

**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, 2024



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 <https://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 (<https://www.fao.org/publications>) and can be purchased through [publications-sales@fao.org](mailto:publications-sales@fao.org). Requests for commercial use should be submitted via: <https://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 host country and the IPPC Secretariat.....	5
2.	Meeting arrangements .....	5
2.1	Selection of the chairperson .....	5
2.2	Selection of the rapporteur .....	5
2.3	Adoption of the agenda .....	5
3.	Administrative matters .....	5
4.	Update and reports.....	5
4.1	Previous meeting reports of the TPG (December 2022 and March 2023).....	5
4.2	Extracts from other meeting reports of relevance to the TPG.....	6
4.3	Updates from the IPPC Secretariat to the TPG.....	8
5.	Addressing TPG-related comments on draft ISPMs submitted to first consultation in 2023 (1 July – 30 September 2023).....	9
5.1	Reorganization and revision of pest risk analysis standards (2020-001), priority 1 ...	9
5.2	Draft annex to ISPM 46 ( <i>Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures</i> ): International movement of mango ( <i>Mangifera indica</i> ) fruit (2021-011), priority 1 .	12
5.3	Draft annex to ISPM 39 ( <i>International movement of wood</i> ): Use of systems approaches in managing the pest risks associated with the movement of wood (2015-004), priority 3 .....	14
5.4	Revision of CPM Recommendation on <i>Sea containers</i> (R-06).....	15
6.	Subjects on the TPG work programme.....	15
6.1	Proposal for deletion of the term “fresh” from the glossary .....	15
7.	Review of adopted ISPMs for consistency of terms and style.....	16
7.1	Consistency of adopted ISPMs (standard by standard).....	16
7.2	Proposed ink amendments to ISPM 5 .....	16
7.3	Applying bold to the term “treatment” in ISPM 5 .....	17
8.	Explanation of glossary terms .....	18
8.1	Annotated glossary: 2024 version .....	18
9.	TPG workplan 2024–2025.....	18
10.	Any other business.....	19
11.	SWOT analysis of the TPG .....	19
11.1	SWOT analysis.....	19
11.2	Current specification: TP 5 ( <i>Technical Panel for the Glossary</i> ).....	19
12.	Date and type of next meetings .....	19
13.	Close of the meeting .....	20
	Appendix 1: Agenda.....	21
	Appendix 2: Documents list.....	23
	Appendix 3: Participants list .....	24
	Appendix 4: Supplementary TPG paper on consistency recommendations on the draft revised PRA ISPMs for quarantine pests.....	26

Appendix 5: Proposed ink amendments ..... 36

Appendix 6: TPG workplan 2024-2025 ..... 38

## 1. Opening of the meeting

### 1.1 Welcome by the host country and the IPPC Secretariat

- [1] On behalf of the IPPC Secretariat (hereafter referred to as “the secretariat”), Artur SHAMILOV opened the annual meeting of the Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG), welcomed all participants and thanked the national plant protection organization (NPPO) of Brazil for hosting the meeting. The secretariat introduced Patricia Raquel CARUA GUAIGUA (Ecuador) as a new TPG member for the Spanish language.
- [2] The local host delivered the opening speech, welcoming the participants.
- [3] The secretariat acknowledged the absence of Shaza Roushdy OMAR (Egypt).

## 2. Meeting arrangements

### 2.1 Selection of the chairperson

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

### 2.2 Selection of the rapporteur

- [5] The TPG selected Rajesh RAMARATHNAM (Canada) as rapporteur.

### 2.3 Adoption of the agenda

- [6] The TPG agreed to address the draft agenda item 2.4 (Current specification: TP 5) as agenda item 11.2.
- [7] The TPG adopted the agenda as modified (Appendix 1).

## 3. Administrative matters

- [8] The documents list and the participants list are appended to this report as Appendix 2 and Appendix 3, respectively. The secretariat invited the TPG members to verify that the contact details were up-to-date.

## 4. Update and reports

### 4.1 Previous meeting reports of the TPG (December 2022 and March 2023)

- [9] The steward introduced this agenda item.
- [10] A TPG member asked the secretariat for further information on the draft annex *Use of systems approaches in managing the pest risks associated with the movement of wood* (2015-004) to ISPM 39 (*International movement of wood*) and the Expert Working Group (EWG) on Field Inspection, namely the use of the term “field inspection”.
- [11] **Draft annex to ISPM 39.** The secretariat clarified that the Standards Committee (SC) had briefly discussed the draft annex to ISPM 39 in November and the steward had been invited to share the preliminary concerns arising from the first consultation. However, the steward had informed the SC that most of the comments submitted during first consultation were technically justified and should not impact the development of the draft annex. The secretariat added that further detailed discussion would take place at the SC meeting in May 2024.
- [12] **Field inspection.** Addressing inquiries about the use of “field inspection” and the approach taken by the EWG on Field Inspection (2021-018) (Annex to ISPM 23 (*Guidelines for inspection*)), the secretariat reported that the EWG had opted to refer to the definition of “field” contained in ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*) throughout the draft annex on field inspection. In addition, the EWG had reviewed the TPG’s proposals on inconsistency within ISPM 23 and had drafted the consequential changes to the standard to be submitted to the SC. Finally, the secretariat informed the TPG that a proposal for a new topic on the revision of ISPM 23 had been submitted in response to the 2023 IPPC Call for Topics: Standards and Implementation and the Task Force on Topics (TFT) was assessing the submission and

would present their final recommendation to the Eighteen Session of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM-18) in 2024.

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

- [13] The secretariat presented a paper providing extracts from other meeting reports of relevance to the TPG that had taken place in 2023.<sup>1</sup>
- [14] The secretariat highlighted some topics contained in the paper.
- [15] **Draft reorganization and revision of pest risk analysis (PRA) standards.** The TPG received an update regarding the latest development on draft PRA reorganization. The SC had agreed to pursue a dual approach: firstly, an SC small working group had been formed to draft a new specification for the revision of the draft reorganized PRA standard. The SC agreed that, simultaneously, the ongoing process for the current draft standard would be continued until the steward had addressed the first consultation comments. Once this had been completed, the revised draft would be reviewed by the SC in May 2024. The secretariat highlighted that this process had been agreed by the SC because the EWG on PRA reorganization had not been tasked, according to the specification, with revising the text of PRA standards; instead, the EWG had been tasked with reorganizing the text with the limited scope of addressing redundancy only when specific parts of the text were moved.
- [16] **Emerging pest.** The secretariat informed the TPG that the term “emerging pest” had been removed from the TPG work programme by the SC in consultation with the CPM Bureau. It had been highlighted that the efforts invested and the work done by the TPG, including the draft definition, would be transmitted to the Pest Outbreak Alert and Response Systems Steering Group. This input from TPG would contribute to the formulation of criteria to discern what qualifies as an emerging pest.
- [17] **Draft 2022 amendments to ISPM 5.** The secretariat informed the TPG that the SC had recommended all the terms in the draft 2022 amendments to ISPM 5 for adoption by the CPM. The secretariat highlighted that some of the SC members had specifically thanked the TPG for drafting the surveillance-related definitions.
- [18] **Pest free area (PFA) and breeding population.** The secretariat informed the TPG that the EWG on the Revision of ISPM 26 (*Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)*) had proposed that the TPG develop and review two terms: “pest free area” and “breeding population”. Regarding “pest free area”, the EWG had suggested that the TPG review the definition to decide whether further explanation was required, particularly to make a distinction between declarations of “absence” and an “official PFA”. Concerning “breeding population”, the EWG had proposed that the term be included in ISPM 5, with a definition giving the criteria for interpreting detections and what constitutes a breeding population, because these aspects were fundamental principles for the standard that applied to the establishment, maintenance, corrective action plans and reinstatement of fruit fly PFAs. If the request of the EWG was approved by the SC and these terms were included in the TPG work programme, the secretariat recommended that the TPG identifies individuals who could work on drafting discussion papers on these terms to be considered at the next face-to-face TPG meeting in 2024.
- [19] **SC small group on systems approaches.** The secretariat updated the TPG about the SC small group on systems approaches for the phytosanitary certification of seeds and the several options on the way forward outlined by the small group. The SC had agreed to form a small group of SC members to redraft Specification 70 (*Design and use of systems approaches for the phytosanitary certification of seeds*), with an increased focus on the role and responsibilities of NPPOs throughout the text aligning with the provisions and the principles laid out in ISPM 14 (*The use of integrated measures in a systems approach for pest risk management*). The redrafted Specification 70 would be considered at the SC meeting in May 2024.

---

<sup>1</sup> 16\_TPG\_2023\_Dec.

- [20] **Index for ISPM 5 and applying bold to glossary terms in ISPMs.** The TPG discussed two proposals originating from the IPPC regional workshops: incorporation of an index in ISPM 5 and applying bold to the glossary terms in all ISPMs. Regarding the first proposal, the secretariat presented a draft index and the TPG agreed to incorporate it into ISPM 5. However, considering the second proposal's potential for significant consumption of time, it was decided to not proceed with applying bold to glossary terms in all ISPMs. In addition, a TPG member raised with the secretariat the convenience and practicality of having a list of the Glossary terms with their equivalents in all languages, and the TPG requested that the secretariat explore the possibility of bringing back the spreadsheet that included one row per glossary term, with the term and the definitions in all languages. Finally, the TPG proposed that the secretariat include in the draft amendments to ISPM 5 a list of the terms undergoing addition, revision and deletion. The secretariat agreed to report back to the TPG at the next face-to-face meeting.
- [21] **Presentation session outside FAO premises.** In response to a proposal from one TPG member, the panel agreed that when the annual face-to-face TPG meeting is held outside of FAO premises, the panel would arrange a presentation (capacity-building) session for the host NPPO's employees, demonstrating the work of the TPG. The secretariat agreed to share this proposal with all technical panels and inform the SC accordingly.
- [22] **SC discussion of TPG *modus operandi*.** The TPG was informed that, during the SC meeting in November 2023, an SC member had proposed that the SC discuss the TPG working methods, taking into consideration the complex terms that had undergone third consultation and the issues arising from this. However, the discussion had been deferred to the SC meeting in May 2024.
- [23] **TPG's work programme.** The secretariat reminded the TPG that the SC requested the TPG to work and address the terms contained in the TPG's work programme, emphasizing that the inclusion of specific terms is ultimately decided by the SC. The TPG acknowledged this directive might influence or constrain the scope of the work of the panel.
- [24] **Test and method.** Regarding the use of the terms "test" and "method" in diagnostic protocols (DPs), the secretariat clarified that "test" referred to the official application of a method (a phytosanitary action) to determine if a pest is present or to identify a pest, therefore being official, while "method" referred to a procedure for applying a technique for a particular purpose and may also be used in the general, dictionary sense to mean a way of doing something. The secretariat reported that this change would eventually be reflected in the *Instructions to authors of diagnostic protocols for regulated pests* rather than the "General recommendations on use of terms in ISPMs", because this guidance was specific to DPs: for ISPMs generally, the glossary definition of "test" and the guidance in section 10.4 of the *IPPC style guide* (which said only to use "test" for official examinations) was sufficient. Hence, the secretariat's proposed text to be added to Appendix 2 of the instructions to authors, under the section on "Terminology", was as follows:
- Use *technique* to refer to a generic technique that has a variety of applications within science (e.g. PCR, LAMP).
- Use *method* to refer to a procedure for applying a technique for a particular purpose (e.g. PCR using the primers of Minsavage *et al.* (1994) to detect *Xylella fastidiosa*). In addition, *method* may be used in the general, dictionary sense to mean a way of doing something (e.g. sampling methods, grinding methods).
- Use *test* to refer to the official application of a method (a phytosanitary action) to determine if a pest is present or to identify a pest (e.g. a test of a sample for *X. fastidiosa*, using the Minsavage *et al.* (1994) method). Although *test* may be used to describe an official procedure (a phytosanitary procedure), procedures described in DPs may have been developed by bodies other than NPPOs and so are more appropriately described as *methods*: the *method* is the instruction and the *test* is the resulting action.
- [25] **Task Force on Topics.** The secretariat updated the TPG on the recommendations made by the TFT to the SC on the following topics for standards to include in the *List of topics for IPPC standards*: Annex *Remote audits* to ISPM 47 (*Audits in a phytosanitary context*) (2023-031), Revision of ISPM 12 *Phytosanitary certificates* (2023-020), and Revision of ISPM 23 (*Guidelines for inspection*) (2023-014).

- [26] **Revision of ISPM 23.** The secretariat reported that the SC had agreed with the recommendation made by the TFT and had proposed priority 2 for the revision of ISPM 23. This priority may be revised in May 2024, however, when the SC reviewed the draft annex to ISPM 23, as this review would make it easier to understand the priority of the proposed topic. In addition, the consequential changes to ISPM 23 proposed in 2023 by the EWG on Field Inspection (2021-018), as well as the paper developed by the TPG on the inconsistencies of the standard, would be considered by the potential EWG.
- [27] **Other standards.** The SC had recommended priority 1 for the Annex *Remote audits* to ISPM 47 (2023-031), because of the importance of remote activities, and for the Revision of ISPM 12 (*Phytosanitary certificates*) (2023-020), given the increasing use of electronic phytosanitary certification.
- [28] **Commodity standards.** The secretariat provided an update on the discussion within the SC regarding the proposal from the Technical Panel on Commodity Standards (TPCS) to consider commodity standards as “subjects”, which the SC had recommended to CPM-18 (2024) for adoption, and the subsequent discussion within the SC-7. If adopted, this approach would exempt specifications for commodity standards from the consultation process. Given the challenge of concurrently developing numerous priority 1 commodity standards, the SC had invited the TPCS to consider criteria that could guide the SC when considering priorities. The secretariat reported that eventually a call for information material would be opened, which would help the TPCS assess the feasibility of topics and identify priorities.
- [29] The TPG:
- (1) *noted* this paper;
  - (2) *invited* the SC to note that when the annual face-to-face TPG meeting is held outside of FAO premises, the panel would arrange a presentation (capacity-building) session for the host NPPO’s employees, demonstrating the work of the TPG;
  - (3) *agreed* with the proposal of the index for the glossary to be included in the TPG updates to the SC for consideration;
  - (4) *agreed* not to proceed with applying bold to glossary terms in all ISPMs;
  - (5) *requested* that the secretariat investigate options for developing a spreadsheet where terms and definitions could be included in all languages; and
  - (6) *proposed* that the secretariat include in the draft amendments to ISPM 5 a list of terms being added, revised and deleted.

### 4.3 Updates from the IPPC Secretariat to the TPG

- [30] The secretariat presented a paper on updates from the IPPC Secretariat to the TPG, following the decisions taken by the TPG in December 2022.<sup>2</sup>
- [31] **Noted as steward’s response.** A TPG member raised a query with the secretariat regarding the potential addition of the reply “Noted” to the response options for stewards when addressing consultation comments. The secretariat clarified that such a decision fell within the purview of the SC, as stewards were members of the SC. Therefore, the request would be included in the TPG updates presented to the SC for consideration at its meeting in May 2024.
- [32] The TPG:
- (7) *noted* the paper; and
  - (8) *invited* the SC to consider the request to include the option “noted” in the steward’s responses to the compiled consultation comments.

---

<sup>2</sup> 13\_TPG\_2023\_Dec.

## 5. Addressing TPG-related comments on draft ISPMs submitted to first consultation in 2023 (1 July – 30 September 2023)

### 5.1 Reorganization and revision of pest risk analysis standards (2020-001), priority 1

[33] The Assistant TPG Steward, Ebbe NORDBO (Denmark), presented the draft TPG responses<sup>3</sup> for TPG consideration. Beatriz MELCHO (Uruguay), TPG member for the Spanish language, and Laurence BOUHOT-DELDUC (France), TPG member for the French language, presented responses to comments in Spanish and French, respectively.

[34] **Injury, consequence and effect.** The assistant steward invited the TPG to discuss the use of the terms “injury”, “consequence” and “effect” throughout the draft PRA standards. Noting that these terms were employed interchangeably in an inconsistent manner, leading to confusion, the following general criteria were proposed:

- use the term “injury” for the physical relation between a pest and a plant;
- use “economic consequences” for the ramifications to economy, production, environment and the society at large, subsequent to plant injury, allowing for the use of “environmental” or “social” consequences where appropriate; and
- use “effect” for other ramifications not covered by the above two.

[35] **Effects and injury.** The TPG considered the use of the term “effect” in the context of injury of pests to plants. One TPG member pointed out that the definition of “pest” contained the word “injurious”, rendering the use of another term unnecessary. Another TPG member commented that the term “effect” was more appropriate than “injury”, as the latter did not encompass all cases of relationship between a pest and a plant as some might not necessarily lead to injury (e.g. a plant as a pest may compete for the same target plant’s resource, but this may not lead to injury).

[36] Consequently, the assistant steward proposed that the use of “impact” and “importance” be completely avoided. However, a TPG member pointed out that the definition of “quarantine pest” contained the word “importance”. The proposal was therefore made to replace the word “importance” with “consequences”.

[37] Eventually, the TPG agreed not to consider this proposal, affirming that while endorsing the general criteria, additional terms may be used contextually where appropriate.

[38] **Injury and injurious.** The TPG reached a consensus that the word “injurious” as employed in the definition of the term “pest”, pertained to the effect of a pest on a plant. The TPG did not support a general comment, which had suggested that the term “injury” be substituted with “damage” throughout the entire draft, as it only occurred six times and “injurious” was specifically included in the definition of “pest”.

[39] **Economic consequences.** The assistant steward brought the TPG’s attention to a general comment, which disagreed with the use of the term “consequences” without the qualifier “economic”. The suggestion was to maintain the use of terms associated with potential economic importance, aligning with the current ISPM 11 (*Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests*). The comment referred to Supplement 2 of ISPM 5, which clarified that the term “economic consequences” encompassed all types of consequences. In addition, the comment stated that this expression was part of the definition of “quarantine pest”.

[40] The assistant steward emphasized that the CPM, during the adoption of Supplement 2 of ISPM 5, had agreed on the comprehensive meaning of “economic consequence” without formally defining it in the glossary. The supplement highlighted the fact that economic effects considered in PRA extended beyond market impacts, encompassing goods and services with economic value and considering a broad spectrum of effects, including environmental and social impacts.

---

<sup>3</sup> 05\_TPG\_2023\_Dec; 2020-001.

- [41] **Economic consequences vs consequences.** When discussing the phrase “economic consequences”, the secretariat informed the TPG that the EWG on Reorganization and Revision of Pest Risk Analysis Standards (2020-001) had agreed that the “environmental, economic, social, etc. consequences” were subsumed under the broader term “consequences”, with the term “economic” being mentioned specifically. Conversely, a general comment pointed out that the adopted ISPM 11 referred to “economic consequences”. Acknowledging these comments, and taking into account the definition of “quarantine pest” which referred to “potential economic importance”, the TPG concurred that the term “economic consequences” should be retained.
- [42] **Damage and impact.** The assistant steward highlighted an additional general comment, which urged consistency in the use of the words “consequences” and “impact”, particularly concerning economic, environmental and social consequences or impact. With “consequences” appearing over 70 times and “impact” over 30 times in the text, the suggestion was to opt for “consequences”, as “impact” was only used in association with regulated non-quarantine pests.
- [43] The TPG supported the comment, emphasizing that “economic consequence” was employed in the definitions of “pest risk” and “pest risk assessment (for quarantine pests)”. On the other hand, similar definitions for regulated non-quarantine pests used “economically unacceptable impact”.
- [44] **Direct and indirect effect.** The assistant steward highlighted the inconsistency in the use of “direct effect” and “indirect effect”, identifying four different meanings throughout the text. To address this, the assistant steward proposed that “effect” be used in those cases where the terms “injury” or “economic consequence” were inadequate and provided several solutions or examples.
- [45] The TPG questioned whether these additional comments, which related to technical aspects, should be retained in the TPG’s response to the consultation comments. The secretariat clarified that these considerations could be forwarded to the steward, who might incorporate them in the steward’s notes to the SC. A TPG member suggested that the TPG’s general comments remain for the steward’s consideration, with the additional comments that related to the concept and technical aspects of the draft PRA standards being included in a separate paper since they were not raised as consultation comments. The secretariat recommended that this paper be attached to the report, allowing the SC to review it during the SC meeting in May 2024. The SC would then take note of it and it would be brought to the attention of the future EWG tasked with the holistic revision of the draft PRA standards.
- [46] The TPG agreed to retain the TPG’s general comments in the TPG response to the consultation comments and elaborate a separate paper of the technical comments for noting by the SC and consideration by the future EWG.
- [47] **Quarantine pest.** The assistant steward pointed out the inconsistent descriptions of a pest given in ISPM 2 (*Framework for pest risk analysis*), ISPM 11 and other ISPMs. Clarifying the PRA process, the assistant steward emphasized that the pest in question may be a “potential quarantine pest” but does not attain the status of a “quarantine pest” until it is regulated as such (as follows from the definition of a “regulated pest”) and suggested to use one phrasing for the process of and as a conclusion of pest categorization, and another for the process of and as a conclusion of PRA stage 2. The TPG agreed to recommend that only the following phrasing be used and all other phrasings avoided:
- the pest “has the characteristics of a quarantine pest”; and
  - the pest “meets the criteria for a quarantine pest”.
- [48] **Environmental risk vs environmental consequences.** The TPG observed the interchangeable use of the terms “environmental risk” and “environmental consequences”. In particular, Annex 4 was entitled “Environmental risk” while section 4 referred to “environmental consequences”. The assistant steward felt that the use of the term “environmental risk” was imprecise and potentially confusing, as it might imply a risk caused by the environment rather than to it. Therefore, the proposal was to exclusively use “environmental consequences” and, in a broader way, refer only to “pest risk”, because the IPPC, and in particular the PRA standards, dealt with “pest risk”, meaning the risk posed by a pest. Another TPG member acknowledged the inappropriateness of “environmental risk” but argued for the retention of the

term, asserting that it still held its meaning without creating ambiguity. The assistant steward, referencing the definition of “pest risk” in ISPM 5 and taking into consideration prior discussion on the meaning of “economic consequences” encompassing environmental consequences, suggested that it would be appropriate to speak of “environmental consequences” since a pest posed a risk and that risk included the risk of environmental consequences as per the definition of “pest risk”. Recognizing the consistency issue, a TPG member emphasized that this proposed change was substantial and should be highlighted to the SC to be forwarded to the future EWG. Moreover, the TPG agreed to provide a general comment for the steward’s consideration without making recommendations, as further analysis was needed on the use of these terms from a consistency perspective.

- [49] **Unintended habitat and unintended location.** The assistant steward pointed out a consultation comment regarding organisms spreading to unintended habitats and argued that the term “habitat” was inconsistent and too restrictive compared to the term “location”. The contention was whether the organism may spread to unintended locations, irrespective of whether those locations were of the same or of another habitat type. For example, a certain grass species may have been introduced and planted for nature conservation purposes in one particular dune area but may then spread to another unintended dune area (i.e. of the same habitat type) further down the coast and cause injury to plants there. Therefore, the assistant steward proposed that the term “habitat” be replaced with the term “location”. Another TPG member replied that the term “habitat” was appropriate as the paragraph referred to different habitats. The TPG discussed an example involving two different dunes separated by several kilometres, ultimately agreeing they share the same habitat type but not the same habitat. A TPG member questioned whether this matter fell within the scope of TPG, as it was a technical matter, and suggested that the term “habitat” should be kept because it was defined in ISPM 5.
- [50] Another TPG member asserted that “habitat” and “location” were distinct, with the latter being broader. Eventually, the TPG reached a consensus to include both terms, for consistency with section 4.4 of Annex 6 (Pest risk analysis for plants as quarantine pests).
- [51] **Pest risk management options vs options for phytosanitary measures.** The assistant steward raised a query regarding the use of “pest risk management options” versus “options for phytosanitary measures”. While acknowledging the use of “options for phytosanitary measures” in commodity standards, the TPG unanimously recommended “pest risk management options”. This proposal aligned with the definition of “pest risk management (for quarantine pests)” in ISPM 5. The TPG further proposed applying this as a global change throughout the draft standard.
- [52] **Efficacy and effectiveness.** The TPG discussed a consultation comment regarding the need for monitoring the efficacy or effectiveness of proposed phytosanitary measures. The contracting party’s comment clarified that, according to the *IPPC style guide*, the generally accepted understanding was that efficacy referred to measurable results under controlled conditions, whereas effectiveness was the degree to which something was successful in producing the desired results. During the discussion, a TPG member stated that “efficacy” was appropriate for treatment considering it is a phytosanitary measure, while “effectiveness” was used in the case of other phytosanitary measures. Another member pointed out that referring only to the effectiveness of a phytosanitary measure excluded treatment as a phytosanitary measure. Following the proposal of a third member, the TPG agreed to retain both terms, recognizing that one term was strongly linked to phytosanitary measures and the other one to treatments.
- [53] **Protected environments and conditions.** The TPG addressed the varying use of the terms “environments” and “conditions”. In the context of the paragraph referring to a glasshouse, a TPG member clarified that a greenhouse is considered a protected environment, not a condition. The secretariat noted that the term currently used was “controlled environments” and not “protected environments”. Another TPG member highlighted that the comment was made for consistency with another paragraph, which cited a glasshouse as an example of “protected conditions”. The TPG therefore agreed to recommend the term “conditions” rather than “environment” for consistency.
- [54] **Danger vs hazard.** The TPG agreed to propose that the term “danger” be replaced with “hazard”.

[55] **Partial equilibrium analysis.** The TPG addressed a consultation comment regarding “partial equilibrium analysis”, which was deemed necessary to measure welfare changes or net changes arising from pest impacts on producers and consumers. The comment proposed the replacement of the term “impacts” with “consequences”. Initially, a TPG member proposed that the term “pest” be removed and “consequences” be used instead of “impacts”, but it was noted that the removal of the term “pest” would have affected the meaning of the paragraph. The TPG considered the relative merits of the terms “consequences” (since the paragraph clearly referred to economic consequences), “effects” (since it was a neutral term), and the original term “impacts” (since “impacts” was more appropriate when referring to producers and consumers while “effects” was more appropriate when referring to plants). The assistant steward recalled the TPG’s earlier general comments and stated that if the terms “consequences” and “injury” could not be used, then “effects” should be used; in this case, this would result in the removal of “pest” and the insertion of “effects”. Considering the concern that removing “pest” would compromise the meaning of the paragraph, the TPG considered that “pest consequences” should be used.

[56] **Parts of the text considered obsolete.** The TPG had noted and discussed that in the current draft some parts of the text (e.g. on phytosanitary certification) seemed irrelevant to and far beyond the PRA process and should be removed for consistency.

[57] The TPG:

- (9) *agreed* its responses to the first consultation comments on the *Reorganization and revision of pest risk analysis standards* (2020-001);
- (10) *noted* that the TPG comments would be transmitted to the steward; and
- (11) *agreed* to elaborate a paper (Appendix 4) on the following topics to be considered by the SC and forwarded to the potential EWG on the holistic revision of the draft reorganized PRA standards:
  - the use of “injury”, “consequences”, “effect” and similar terms,
  - the avoidance of “direct effect” and “indirect effect”, and
  - the use of “environmental consequences” over “environmental risk”.

## 5.2 Draft annex to ISPM 46 (*Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures*): International movement of mango (*Mangifera indica*) fruit (2021-011), priority 1

[58] Xuemei JI (Australia) presented the draft TPG responses<sup>4</sup> for TPG consideration.

[59] **Hygiene practices vs sanitation.** The TPG discussed the consultation comment suggesting the replacement of “hygiene practices” with “sanitation” for consistency. The TPG agreed with the comment, recognizing that “sanitation” was a more commonly used term in plant health while the term “hygiene practices” tended to be associated more with human health.

[60] **Consistency with ISPM 26.** The TPG discussed a consultation comment regarding the title of Table 2 “Options for phytosanitary measures that may be relevant to all pests associated with fresh *Mangifera indica* fruit”. The comment proposed that the word “all” be removed from the title because some options of phytosanitary measures in Table 2 were not applicable to all pests, for example ISPM 26, which applies only to fruit flies. However, a TPG member argued that the table referred to generic measures and removing “all” would compromise its purpose. He pointed out that the next table in the draft annex referred to pest-specific options while the table in question contained general options for phytosanitary measures. In addition, the TPG member suggested that the TPG not focus on each option and related reference but on the intent of the table, which was to bring together the phytosanitary measures and references to ISPMs that included such phytosanitary measures. Eventually, the TPG agreed that this comment fell outside the scope of the TPG.

[61] **Schedules for irradiation.** The TPG discussed a consultation comment regarding the addition of the term “treatment” to “irradiation” in the table of irradiation schedules. Although adding the term “treatment”

<sup>4</sup> 06\_TPG\_2023\_Dec; 2021-011.

would align it with other tables in the draft annex, the TPG agreed that the addition would be redundant as the definition of “irradiation” already contained “treatment”.

- [62] **Analysis vs test.** The TPG commented on the paragraphs regarding the samples taken during inspection that are sent to an official laboratory for analysis and identified to species level. The TPG discussed whether “test” should be used instead of “analysis”. A TPG member commented that the pests concerned were mealybugs and they were analysed under a microscope; therefore, the right term might not be “test” but “analysis”. A further comment pointed out that the analysis under the microscope might also be an inspection, therefore the term “test” was not the appropriate term. Eventually, the TPG agreed that the term “analysis” should be retained, as it was a general term, and acknowledged that this comment fell outside the scope of the TPG.
- [63] **Remedial and corrective action.** The TPG commented on the term “remedial action”, seeking clarification on its meaning. A TPG member stated that the term “remedial” was used in certain countries but another member replied that this comment did not refer to a single country and the term “corrective action” was commonly used. Eventually, the TPG agreed that “remedial action” should be replaced with “corrective action”.
- [64] **Alternative treatments.** The TPG discussed the paragraph concerning the consideration of the CPM recommendation on the *Replacement or reduction of the use of methyl bromide as a phytosanitary measure* (R-03). A TPG member proposed that the phrase “alternative treatments that are more environmentally friendly are being pursued” should be deleted, as it was considered imprecise and would downgrade the CPM recommendation. Another TPG member recalled that a consultation comment had stated that alternative treatments already existed for mango pests, referring to the first table of the draft annex. The TPG ultimately agreed that this comment fell outside the scope of the TPG.
- [65] **Field management.** A TPG member drew the TPG’s attention to the phrase “targeted field management using pest control”, which was used in the draft annex as an example of pre-harvest control measures, and questioned in particular the meaning of “field management” and whether it referred to any existing text. Another TPG member commented that it clearly referred to pest management in the field, so both members proposed that “targeted field management using pest control” be replaced with “targeted pest management in the field”. A third TPG member, however, pointed out that the pest control might include, for example, the use of fungicides and if mention of pest control were deleted, then the phrase would lose its meaning. Considering also that it was just an example of pre-harvest control measures, the TPG member proposed that, rather than suggesting an amendment to the phrase, the TPG should recommend that the steward provide more clarity regarding the meaning of the term “field management”. Eventually, the TPG agreed to this proposal.
- [66] **Phytosanitary security.** The TPG considered a consultation comment regarding the following measure in the list of general agricultural practices and production procedures: “storing and transporting fruit in a secure manner to prevent contamination and infestation (e.g. use of insect-proof packaging)”. The comment proposed that “in a secure manner” be replaced with “in conditions of phytosanitary security”. A TPG member proposed that the TPG disagree with the consultation comment, as the glossary term “phytosanitary security (of a consignment)” specifically pertained to the “condition of a consignment when its integrity has been maintained and its infestation and contamination by regulated pests prevented through the application of phytosanitary measures” whereas the text in question related to the conditions under which the fruit was stored and transported to prevent contamination and infestation, at a stage before consignment. The TPG noted that the glossary term “integrity” (and therefore the glossary term “phytosanitary security”) only had meaning for a consignment because it was linked to its phytosanitary certificate. Ultimately, the TPG disagreed with the consultation comment considering its potential to cause confusion with defined term “phytosanitary security (of a consignment)”.

[67] The TPG:

- (12) *agreed* its responses to the first consultation comments on the draft annex *International movement of mango* (*Mangifera indica*) *fruit* (2021-011) to ISPM 46 (*Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures*); and
- (13) *noted* that the TPG comments would be transmitted to the steward and SC-7 for consideration.

### 5.3 Draft annex to ISPM 39 (*International movement of wood*): Use of systems approaches in managing the pest risks associated with the movement of wood (2015-004), priority 3

[68] Konstantin GREBENNIKOV (Russian Federation) presented the draft TPG responses<sup>5</sup> for TPG consideration.

[69] **Density.** A TPG member highlighted a comment regarding pest-population density, stated that the appropriate term was “pest incidence” or “pest prevalence”, and proposed that the word “density” be deleted to avoid adding a third term, which would create more confusion.

[70] **Organisms vs pests.** The TPG noted that several comments proposed the replacement of the term “organisms” with “pests” in the title of a subsection of the appendix of the draft annex to align with the title. A TPG member expressed the view that organisms might not necessarily be pests, and that the appendix referred to organisms. Another member pointed out that this change could alter the meaning of the subsection, and therefore it fell outside the scope of the TPG. Eventually, the TPG agreed not to proceed with the response.

[71] **Phytosanitary certification vs certification.** The TPG discussed a consultation comment regarding one of the pre-dispatch practices listed in the table of practices, namely certification, which read as follows: “certificates should be issued in accordance with the importing country’s phytosanitary import requirements.”

[72] A TPG member proposed that this be amended to “phytosanitary certificates”, but another member stated that there were certain wood certification programmes, run by NPPOs, that met import requirements without the issuance of phytosanitary certificates. Another member emphasized that ISPMs aimed to advance global harmonization and dealt with phytosanitary certificates, making other certificates resulting from bilateral agreements irrelevant to ISPMs. The member proposed that the TPG highlight to the steward the question of whether the certification referred to phytosanitary certificates or bilateral agreements. The secretariat reported that the EWG had included in the responsibilities of the NPPO the responsibility to agree to the alternative certification documents that would accompany the consignments produced under the wood commodities systems approach, for example industry-produced certificates. Therefore, the EWG had named the practice “certification”, as the intent was to cover more than just phytosanitary certificates.

[73] **Examination vs inspection.** A TPG member highlighted a comment proposing the replacement of the term “examination” with “inspection” in the phrase “visual examination of wood commodities”. The TPG disagreed with the comment, because “visual examination” was correct in this case (as the action was not necessarily official, which it would be if the term “inspection” was used).

[74] The TPG:

- (14) *agreed* its responses to the first consultation comments on the draft annex *Use of systems approaches in managing the pest risks associated with the movement of wood* (2015-004) to ISPM 39 (*International movement of wood*); and
- (15) *noted* that the TPG comments would be transmitted to the steward and SC-7 for consideration.

---

<sup>5</sup> 07\_TPG\_2023\_Dec; 2025-004.

## 5.4 Revision of CPM Recommendation on *Sea containers* (R-06)

[75] Asenath Abigael KOECH (Kenya) presented the draft TPG responses<sup>6</sup> for TPG consideration.

[76] **Pest contamination vs contamination.** Based on a consultation comment, the TPG discussed the meaning of “pest contamination”. A TPG member explained that the definition of “contamination” in ISPM 5 implied the presence of a pest, making the term “pest” that preceded it redundant, but suggested that the term “pest contamination” be retained if considered useful to convey to a wider audience the understanding of the CPM recommendation. The member also suggested that the CPM recommendation clarify that the term “pest contamination” was used with the same meaning as the term “contamination” defined in ISPM 5. Another TPG member replied that “pest contamination” might not have the same meaning as the term “contamination”, as the latter referred not only to “contaminating pest” but also the presence of a regulated article, which may carry pests. The other TPG member explained that it was assumed that the term “pest contamination” used in the CPM recommendation referred to “contamination”. Eventually, the TPG agreed that this comment fell outside the scope of the TPG and recommended that, to avoid confusion, the CPM recommendation clarify that “pest contamination” had the same meaning as the term “contamination” defined in ISPM 5.

[77] **Plant pest vs pest.** A TPG member proposed that the CPM recommendation also clarify that the term “plant pest” had the same meaning as the term “pest” defined in ISPM 5.

[78] The TPG:

- (16) *agreed* its responses to the first consultation comments on the draft CPM Recommendation on *Sea containers* (R-06); and
- (17) *noted* that the TPG comments would be transmitted to the CPM Focus Group on Sea Containers for consideration.

## 6. Subjects on the TPG work programme

### 6.1 Proposal for deletion of the term “fresh” from the glossary

[79] Beatriz MELCHO (Uruguay) introduced the paper<sup>7</sup> proposing the deletion of the term “fresh” from the glossary. She explained that the term, which was used in five adopted ISPMs, should be deleted because it did not have any specific meaning in the phytosanitary context and its common-sense meaning was appropriate and well understood in all ISPM contexts.

[80] Some TPG members agreed with the proposal of deletion, highlighting that the draft mango standard clearly stated that it referred to fresh mango and therefore there was no need to define the term “fresh” and that the definition given in ISPM 5 narrowed down the meaning of “fresh”, as it made the term quite specific. However, some other TPG members disagreed with the proposal and suggested that the term “fresh” be retained. They explained that the importance of the definition lay in the word “living”, which had been the reason why the definition had been developed: a particular item is regulated because it is still fresh, still living and therefore it can be infested. They also noted that the impact of the term would increase as the number of ISPMs increased. Eventually, the TPG agreed that the term “fresh” should be retained in the glossary.

[81] The TPG:

- (18) *considered* the proposal and *agreed* to not propose the deletion of the term “fresh” from the glossary.

---

<sup>6</sup> 08\_TPG\_2023\_Dec; R-06.

<sup>7</sup> 09\_TPG\_2023\_Dec

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

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

[82] The secretariat introduced the list of proposed or approved ink amendments to ISPMs, the latest addition to the list being the ink amendment to “entry (of a consignment)” in ISPM 5, which had been presented at the SC in May 2023 and was pending noting by CPM-18 (2024).

[83] The secretariat reported to the TPG that the SC, in November 2023, had approved the translation consistency changes proposed by the language review group coordinators for Arabic and Chinese and had agreed that these translation consistency changes would be applied as ink amendments to be submitted to CPM-18 (2024) for noting. The secretariat informed the TPG that these ink amendments would be included in the main part of the table once the CPM-18 had noted them.

[84] The TPG:

(19) *noted* the list of proposed or approved ink amendments to ISPMs; and

(20) *noted* that the translation consistency changes proposed by the language review group coordinators for Arabic and Chinese would be applied as ink amendments to be submitted to CPM-18 (2024) for noting and then included in the list of proposed or approved ink amendments to ISPMs.

### 7.2 Proposed ink amendments to ISPM 5

[85] Beatriz MELCHO (Uruguay) introduced a paper<sup>8</sup> detailing some minor amendments to ISPM 5 that she had identified that could be addressed as ink amendments.

[86] The TPG supported the proposed ink amendments to the following terms:

- “area of low pest prevalence”;
- “contaminating pest”;
- “corrective action plan (in an area)”;
- “debarked wood”;
- “host pest list”; and
- “IPPC”.

[87] The TPG also agreed that the term “plant protection organization (national)” should be deleted.

[88] **Habitat.** The proposal was to apply bold to the term “establish” contained in the definition. A TPG member pointed out that the term “establish”, referring to the term “establishment (of a pest)” defined in ISPM 5, referred to a pest and not to organisms and recalled that a pest is an organism and not vice versa. Another TPG member agreed and added that it depended on the context and the application of bold may cause confusion. Eventually, the TPG agreed not to recommend that the term “establish” be presented in bold in the definition of “habitat”.

[89] **Treatment schedule.** The proposal included the following changes to the term “treatment schedule”, following the definition of “treatment” in ISPM 5:

The critical parameters of a treatment which need to be met to achieve the intended outcome (i.e. ~~the~~ killing, ~~inactivation~~inactivating ~~or removing~~ of pests, ~~or rendering pests~~ infertile, or ~~devitalization~~devitalizing regulated pests) at a stated efficacy [ISPM 28, 2007]

[90] The first amendment proposed was to replace “intended outcome” with “required response” since the latter was a glossary term. Other TPG members discussed the two terms, stating first that “intended outcome” was a broader concept with a scientific connotation while “required response” was linked more to a legal context. They argued that using the term “required response” would make the term

---

<sup>8</sup> 10\_TPG\_2023\_Dec.

“treatment schedule” official – as “required response” referred to “treatment” which was a phytosanitary measure and therefore official – while retaining “intended outcome” would keep the definition more general. The secretariat pointed out to the TPG that such changes might go beyond the purpose of ink amendments and suggested that the TPG invite the SC to request that the Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments (TPPT) consider the need to revise the term “treatment schedule” and, if recommended by the TPPT, add the term to the TPG’s work programme. Regarding the phrase in parentheses, the TPG discussed whether it could be considered an outcome or it specifically referred to “required response”. Eventually, the TPG agreed to propose the editorial changes as ink amendments.

[91] The TPG:

- (21) *recommended* the proposed ink amendments to the terms “area of low pest prevalence”, “contaminating pest”, “corrective action plan (in an area)”, “debarked wood”, “host pest list”, “IPPC”, “plant protection organization (national)” and “treatment schedule” (Appendix 5) to the SC for consideration and *invited* the SC to approve the ink amendments and submit them to the CPM for noting; and
- (22) *invited* the SC to request that the TPPT consider the need for revision of the term “treatment schedule”.

### 7.3 Applying bold to the term “treatment” in ISPM 5

[92] Ebbe NORDBO (Denmark) introduced the paper for this agenda item<sup>9</sup> and explained the history of the term “treatment” in the glossary. The assistant steward highlighted that the term was used within the definitions of several glossary terms, where it appeared in bold typography.

[93] **Sterile insect.** During the proofreading of ISPM 5, the copyeditor had queried whether, in the definition of “sterile insect”, “treatment” should not be presented in bold type. The assistant steward had stated that the term “treatment” should not be presented in bold in the definition of “sterile insect”, as a sterile insect was not necessarily a pest. The assistant steward therefore invited the TPG to discuss and evaluate whether the application of bold to the term “treatment” in the glossary seemed appropriate.

[94] The TPG first considered the “sterile insect” definition, followed by the other definitions where the term “treatment” occurred.

[95] **Chemical pressure impregnation.** The TPG agreed to retain the bold for the term “treatment”.

[96] **Efficacy (of a treatment).** A TPG member pointed out that the definition of the term “treatment” referred to an official procedure. Another TPG member replied that the addition of “(as a phytosanitary measure)” to the glossary term “treatment” had been made so that the term “treatment” could be used in non-official contexts and proposed that the term “treatment” be retained as bold in the definition of “efficacy” since it referred to ISPM 18 (*Requirements for the use of irradiation as a phytosanitary measure*). The other TPG member suggested that no changes be made, since efficacy was strictly linked to the term “treatment”.

[97] **Fumigation.** A TPG member pointed out that, while the definitions of “chemical pressure impregnation” and “heat treatment” referred to an official technical specification, the definitions of fumigation and irrigation did not and questioned whether the latter two definitions needed to be rewritten. For example, the TPG member proposed the rewording of the definition of “irradiation” as “the process in which a commodity is exposed to any type of ionizing radiation according to an official technical specification” while “fumigation” could be reworded as “the process in which a commodity is exposed to a chemical agent that reaches the commodity wholly or primarily in a gaseous state according to an official technical specification”.

---

<sup>9</sup> 11\_TPG\_2023\_Dec.

[98] The secretariat pointed out that both ISPM 18 and ISPM 43 (*Requirements for the use of fumigation as a phytosanitary measure*) stated that definitions were used according to ISPM 5.

[99] **Irradiation and sterile insect.** Two TPG members found the definitions of “sterile insect” and “irradiation” problematic, as the term “treatment” should be presented in bold, because it referred to a phytosanitary measure, but it was not clear from the definition of the term “sterile insect” that the treatment was a phytosanitary measure. They said that it would also be confusing having the term “treatment” presented in bold in the definition of “irradiation” but not in the definition of “sterile insect”, because a sterile insect would refer to a pest in a phytosanitary context. The proposal was then to keep the term “treatment” in bold in the definition of “sterile insect”.

[100] Eventually, the TPG agreed that the term “treatment” should be presented in bold in all definitions in ISPM 5, including the definition of “sterile insect”. The secretariat added that, when the term “treatment” appeared in an ISPM, it referred to the definition contained in ISPM 5.

[101] Moreover, the TPG agreed to request that the SC revise the definitions of “irradiation” and “fumigation” to align with the definitions of “chemical pressure impregnation” and “heat treatment”.

[102] The TPG:

- (23) *agreed* that the term “treatment” should be presented in bold in all definitions in ISPM 5 and *requested* that the secretariat apply this typographical change; and
- (24) *invited* the SC to add to the TPG’s work programme the revision of the definitions of “irradiation” and “fumigation” to align them with the definitions of “chemical pressure impregnation” and “heat treatment”.

## 8. Explanation of glossary terms

### 8.1 Annotated glossary: 2024 version

[103] Beatriz MELCHO (Uruguay) introduced the proposed amendments to the *Explanatory document on ISPM 5* (otherwise known as the “annotated glossary”).<sup>10</sup>

[104] The TPG reviewed the annotated glossary and the secretariat clarified the procedure for its approval and publication.

[105] **Note 9 (Treatment).** The TPG slightly amended the note to clarify that several terms referred to the “type of treatment” instead of “the active agent of the treatment” and that only “treatment schedule”, “efficacy (of a treatment)” and “required response” were defined in the glossary.

[106] The TPG:

- (25) *agreed* to submit the 2024 annotated glossary for publication.

## 9. TPG workplan 2024–2025

[107] The TPG updated its workplan for 2024–2025 (Appendix 6) to be presented to the SC meeting in May 2024.

[108] The secretariat reminded the TPG to review adopted ISPMs for consistency and propose potential terms to be considered by the SC for inclusion in the TPG’s work programme.

[109] The TPG:

- (26) *agreed* to the TPG workplan 2024–2025 as modified during this meeting; and
- (27) *invited* the SC to note the TPG workplan for 2024–2025 (Appendix 6).

---

<sup>10</sup> 15\_TPG\_2023\_Dec.

## 10. Any other business

[110] The secretariat showed the TPG the draft brochure *Introduction to international phytosanitary terminology*<sup>11</sup> for review and explained that, once approved, the brochure would be sent for publication.

[111] The TPG suggested amendments to improve clarity and consistency, reduce repetition, and provide a better logical flow to the text. Since the example given in the brochure regarding the Glossary term “introduction” is not applicable in Spanish and French, it was proposed to the secretariat to use instead the term “official” as an example. The secretariat explained that they would transmit these changes to the graphic designer to implement.

[112] The secretariat confirmed that, if resources are available, the brochure would be translated in all the FAO languages.

[113] The TPG:

(28) *agreed* to the draft brochure *Introduction to international phytosanitary terminology* as modified during this meeting, and *requested* that the secretariat proceed with its publication.

## 11. SWOT analysis of the TPG

### 11.1 SWOT analysis

[114] The secretariat introduced the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats (SWOT) analysis and explained that this was an initiative of the Standard Setting Unit to identify ways to improve the work of the technical panels.<sup>12</sup>

[115] The TPG agreed to include in the analysis the connection between the TPG steward and the secretariat.

[116] The secretariat guided the TPG through the SWOT analysis and the panel identified several opportunities to improve the efficiency of the work and streamline it.

[117] The TPG:

(29) *requested* that the secretariat analyse the outcomes of the SWOT analysis and inform the SC.

### 11.2 Current specification: TP 5 (*Technical Panel for the Glossary*)

[118] The TPG considered Specification TP 5,<sup>13</sup> in particular the fourth task, and noted that the task was not clear about whether the TPG was allowed to review portions of text, other than terms and definitions, which were not the subject of consultation comments.

[119] The TPG:

(30) *agreed* to include in the TPG update to the SC the possibility of the TPG reviewing portions of text, other than terms and definitions, which are not the subject of consultation comments.

## 12. Date and type of next meetings

[120] The next meeting of the TPG is provisionally scheduled for 25–29 November 2024, with the venue tentatively agreed as being Mombasa, Kenya. The secretariat thanked Asenath Abigael KOECH and the NPPO of Kenya for the offer of hosting the next face-to-face meeting in Kenya.

---

<sup>11</sup> 12\_TPG\_2023\_Dec.

<sup>12</sup> 14\_TPG\_2023\_Dec.

<sup>13</sup> TP 5: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/1300>

### **13. Close of the meeting**

- [121] The secretariat raised the issue of submitting additional documents once the posting deadline is passed. The TPG agreed that this should be an exception but that when it does happen all TPG members shall be promptly informed.
- [122] The secretariat thanked the TPG members and the Brazilian NPPO for their contributions to the work of the TPG and invited them to respond to the evaluation survey, a link for which would be circulated after the meeting. The secretariat also thanked the local host for hosting the meeting.
- [123] The chairperson thanked everyone and closed the meeting.

**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 Welcome by Host Country	–	SHAMILOV C. P. DA SILVA
<b>2.</b>	<b>Meeting Arrangements</b>		
2.1.	Selection of the Chairperson	–	SHAMILOV
2.2.	Election of the Rapporteur	–	<b>Chairperson</b>
2.3.	Adoption of the Agenda	01_TPG_2023_Dec	<b>Chairperson</b>
<b>3.</b>	<b>Administrative Matters</b>		
3.1.	Documents list	02_TPG_2023_Dec	TORELLA
3.2.	Participants list	03_TPG_2023_Dec <a href="#">TPG membership list</a>	TORELLA
3.3.	Local information	04_TPG_2023_Dec	C. P. DA SILVA
<b>4.</b>	<b>Updates / reports</b>		
4.1.	Previous meeting reports of the TPG (December 2022 and March 2023)	<a href="#">2022 December TPG Meeting Report</a>  <a href="#">2023 March TPG Meeting Report (virtual)</a>	<b>SEPÚLVEDA/ NORDBO</b>
4.2.	Extracts from other meeting reports of relevance to the TPG	16_TPG_2023_Dec	Secretariat
4.3.	Updates from the IPPC Secretariat to the TPG	13_TPG_2023_Dec	Secretariat
<b>5.</b>	<b>Addressing TPG-related comments on draft ISPMs submitted to the first consultation in 2023 (1 July-30 September).</b> The TPG will review member comments on terms and definitions and will review the drafts for consistency in the use of terms. Recommendations will be transmitted to stewards and the SC-7 (May 2024). Draft answers to compiled comments proposed by the TPG members		
5.1.	Reorganization and revision of pest risk analysis standards (2020-001), priority 1 - Review of TPG-related compiled comments (2020-001)	<a href="#">2020-001</a> 05_TPG_2023_Dec	<b>NORDBO</b>
5.2.	Draft Annex: International movement of mango ( <i>Mangifera indica</i> ) fruit to ISPM 46 (Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures) (2021-011), priority 1 - Review of TPG-related compiled comments (2021-011)	<a href="#">2021-011</a> 06_TPG_2023_Dec	<b>JI</b>
5.3.	Draft Annex: Use of systems approaches in managing the pest risks associated with the movement of wood to ISPM 39 (International movement of wood) (2015-004), priority 3 - Review of TPG-related compiled comments (2015-004)	<a href="#">2015-004</a> 07_TPG_2023_Dec	<b>GREBENNIKOV</b>

5.4.	CPM Recommendation on Sea containers (R-06) - Review of TPG-related compiled comments (R-06)	<a href="#">R-06</a> 08_TPG_2023_Dec	<b>KOECH</b>
<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 2024.		
6.1.	Proposal for deletion of the term “fresh” from the Glossary	09_TPG_2023_Dec	<b>MELCHO</b>
<b>7.</b>	<b>Review of adopted ISPMs for consistency of terms and style</b>		
7.1.	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>	TORELLA
7.2.	Proposed ink amendments to ISPM 5	10_TPG_2023_Dec	<b>MELCHO</b>
7.3.	Bolding of the term “treatment” in ISPM 5	11_TPG_2023_Dec	<b>NORDBO</b>
<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.		
8.1	Annotated glossary: 2024 version <i>[The annotated glossary was finalized at TPG 2021 and published in July 2022. The next version should be finalized for publication in 2024. The TPG considers yearly which amendments need to be made and produces an intermediate version]</i>	<a href="#">Link to the 2023 intermediate version</a> (restricted work area; log in required)  15_TPG_2023_Dec	<b>MELCHO</b>
<b>9.</b>	<b>TPG work plan</b>		
9.1.	TPG work plan for 2024-2025 <i>[The TPG will update its work plan for the coming year, based on discussions at the meeting, to be presented to the SC May 2024 for noting]</i>	To be prepared during the meeting <a href="#">TPG work plan 2023-2024</a>	Secretariat
<b>10.</b>	<b>Any other business</b>		<b>Chairperson</b>
10.1.	Review of the IPPC brochure “Introduction to phytosanitary terminology”	12_TPG_2023_Dec	Secretariat
<b>11.</b>	<b>SWOT Analysis</b>		Secretariat
11.1	Background document - Undertaking of the SWOT analysis	14_TPG_2023_Dec	TORELLA
11.2	Discussion on the current specification: TP 5 <i>(Technical Panel for the Glossary) (2016)</i>	<a href="#">Link to TP 5</a>	SHAMILOV
<b>12.</b>	<b>Next meetings dates</b>		<b>Secretariat / Chairperson</b>
<b>13.</b>	<b>Close of the meeting</b>		<b>Chairperson</b>
	Evaluation	<a href="#">Survey link</a>	

**Appendix 2: Documents list**

<b>DOCUMENT NO.</b>	<b>AGENDA ITEM</b>	<b>DOCUMENT TITLE</b>	<b>DATE POSTED / UPDATED</b>
<b>Draft ISPMs</b>			
2020-001	5.1	Reorganization and revision of pest risk analysis standards (2020-001), priority 1	2023-11-20
2021-011	5.2	Draft Annex: International movement of mango ( <i>Mangifera indica</i> ) fruit to ISPM 46 (Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures) (2021-011), priority 1	2023-11-20
2015-004	5.3	Draft Annex: Use of systems approaches in managing the pest risks associated with the movement of wood to ISPM 39 (International movement of wood) (2015-004), priority 3	2023-11-20
<b>Draft CPM Recommendations</b>			
R-06	5.4	CPM Recommendation on Sea containers (R-06)	2023-11-20
<b>Meeting documents</b>			
01_TPG_2023_Dec	2.3	Provisional agenda	2023-11-20
02_TPG_2023_Dec	3.1	Documents list	2023-11-20
03_TPG_2023_Dec	3.2	Participants list	2023-11-20
04_TPG_2023_Dec	3.3	Local information	2023-11-20
05_TPG_2023_Dec	5.1	PRA - Review of TPG-related compiled comments (2020-001)	2023-11-20
06_TPG_2023_Dec	5.2	Draft annex to ISPM 46 - Review of TPG-related compiled comments (2021-011)	2023-11-20
07_TPG_2023_Dec	5.3	Draft annex to ISPM 39 - Review of TPG-related compiled comments (2015-004)	2023-11-20
08_TPG_2023_Dec	5.4	CPM Recommendation on Sea containers - Review of TPG-related compiled comments (R-06)	2023-11-20
09_TPG_2023_Dec	6.1	Proposal for deletion of the term “fresh” from the Glossary	2023-11-20
10_TPG_2023_Dec	7.2	Proposed ink amendments to ISPM 5	2023-11-20
11_TPG_2023_Dec	7.3	Bolding of the term “treatment” in ISPM 5	2023-11-20
12_TPG_2023_Dec	10.1	IPPC brochure “Introduction to phytosanitary terminology”	2023-11-20
13_TPG_2023_Dec	4.3	Updates from the IPPC Secretariat to the TPG	2023-11-20
14_TPG_2023_Dec	11.1	SWOT analysis - Background document	2023-11-20
15_TPG_2023_Dec	8.1	Annotated glossary: 2024 version	2023-11-20
16_TPG_2023_Dec	4.2	Extracts from other meeting reports of relevance to the TPG	2023-11-20

**Appendix 3: Participants list**

Participants details			
	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Participant role	Email address
✓	<b>Mr Álvaro SEPÚLVEDA LUQUE</b> Servicio Agrícola y Ganadero División de Protección Agrícola y Forestal Av. Presidente Bulnes 140, 4 <sup>th</sup> floor, Santiago, <b>CHILE</b> Tel: + 56-2 234 5120	Steward	<a href="mailto:alvaro.sepulveda@sag.gob.cl">alvaro.sepulveda@sag.gob.cl</a>
✓	<b>Ms Laurence BOUHOT-DELDUC</b> Ministry of Agriculture and Food, General directorate for food Europe, international and integrated risk management division 251 rue de Vaugirard 75732 Paris Cedex 15 <b>FRANCE</b> Tel: (+33) 149558437	French	<a href="mailto:laurence.bouhot-delduc@agriculture.gouv.fr">laurence.bouhot-delduc@agriculture.gouv.fr</a>
✓	<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>
✓	<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>
✓	<b>Ms Xuemei JI</b> Assistant Director, Tropical Horticulture   Plant Sciences and Risk Assessment   Biosecurity Plant Division Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry <b>AUSTRALIA</b> Tel: +61 2 6272 5906 Mob: +61 412 418 490	Chinese	<a href="mailto:Xuemei.Ji@aff.gov.au">Xuemei.Ji@aff.gov.au</a>
✓	<b>Mr Ebbe NORDBO</b> <b>DENMARK</b> Mobile: (+45) 28740095	Assistant Steward English	<a href="mailto:ebbenordbo@outlook.com">ebbenordbo@outlook.com</a>
	<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.roshdy@gmail.com">shaza.roshdy@gmail.com</a>

Participants details			
	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Participant role	Email address
✓	<b>Mr Konstantin GREBENNIKOV</b> Senior researcher, deputy head of the scientific-methodological and experimental center of FGBU “VNIKR” 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>
✓	<b>Mr Rajesh RAMARATHNAM</b> Senior Specialist (International Phytosanitary Standards): International Phytosanitary Standards Section Plant Protection Division, CFIA-ACIA 59 Camelot Drive, Ottawa ON K1A 0Y9 <b>CANADA</b> Tel: (+1) 343-549-9944	English	<a href="mailto:rajesh.ramarathnam@inspection.gc.ca">rajesh.ramarathnam@inspection.gc.ca</a>
✓	<b>Ms Patricia Raquel CARUA GUAIGUA</b> Analista de manejo y control de plagas específicas Agencia de Regulación y Control Fito y Zoonosanitario – Agrocalidad Eloy Alfaro y Federico González Suárez. Av. Interoceánica Km. 14 1/2, Sector La Granja, CP: 170903, 170184 <b>ECUADOR</b> Tel. +593984637218	Spanish	<a href="mailto:patriciaraquelc8@gmail.com">patriciaraquelc8@gmail.com</a>

Others			
	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Role	Email address
✓	<b>Mr André Felipe C. P. da SILVA</b> Federal Inspector Quarantine Division Ministry of Agriculture, Live Stock and Food Supply <b>BRAZIL</b> Tel: (61) 3218-2925	Host representative	<a href="mailto:andre.peralta@agro.gov.br">andre.peralta@agro.gov.br</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 Daniel Lorenzo TORELLA</b> Phytosanitary Standard Setting Support Specialist	<a href="mailto:Daniel.torella@fao.org">Daniel.torella@fao.org</a>

## Appendix 4: Supplementary TPG paper on consistency recommendations on the draft revised PRA ISPMs for quarantine pests

### Introduction

- [1] Based on its December 2023 meeting in Brazil, the TPG has provided, to the steward of that draft and to the SC, its recommendations on terminology and consistency in the draft “Reorganization and revision of pest risk analysis standards: Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests” for 1<sup>st</sup> consultation, including its considerations on countries’ comments.
- [2] TPG furthermore has identified certain major consistency issues, as outlined in this paper, that the Panel feels warrant particular consideration by the SC, the steward and other prospective forums that may deal with the draft. The issues dealt with here are:
- Theme 1: On the use of the terms “injury”, “consequence”, “effect” and similar terms
  - Theme 2: On avoiding the use of the terms “direct effect” and “indirect effect”
  - Theme 3: On the use of “environmental consequences” instead of “environmental risk”.
- [3] TPG suggests that the proposed changes, although quite numerous, are in fact each rather simple, being in most cases a matter of exchanging one word with another or deleting unnecessary words or sentences. The proposed changes do **not** change any substance or omit any information from the text, but only intend to provide consistency, thereby contributing to a “clear, simple and focused” ISPM.

### Theme 1: On the use of the terms “injury”, “consequence”, “effect” and similar terms.

- [4] The terms “injury”, “(economic) consequence”, “effect”, “impact”, “economic importance” and “economic loss” are used frequently throughout the text. In some cases, the meaning is clear and consistent, but in other cases several terms are used synonymously for the same concept, or differing concepts are named by the same term. The inconsistency gives rise to confusion and makes the text unnecessarily difficult to read.
- [5] The noun “injury” for the effect of a pest to a plant may be understood as restricted to only physical damage and may therefore seem inadequate for describing some harmful effects, e.g. competition or hybridization by a plant as pest. However, the adjective “injurious” has a far wider meaning *not* restricted to physical damage; thus, the definition of “pest” is fully adequate for all types of pests. Similarly, the wider meaning (not restricted to physical damage) pertains to the verb “injure” and the noun “injuriousness”.
- [6] Striving for consistency to overcome confusion, TPG recommends the following general “rules” be applied for this text:
- Noting that “injurious” is the term used in the definition of a pest (whether being a plant, animal or pathogenic agent), use the adjective “**injurious**”, or the combined adjective + noun “**injurious effect**” to characterize *the effect of a pest to a plant*; if relevant, also the verb “**injure**” or the noun “**injuriousness**” could be used. In some contexts, the verb “**affect**” (as in “pest affecting plants”) is simpler and more suitable.
  - Noting that “economic consequences” is the term used in the definition of pest risk (and pest risk assessment) for quarantine pests, use “**economic consequences**” for *the ramifications to economy, production, environment and the society at large*, following the pest injury towards plants. As agreed and explained in Supplement 2 to ISPM 5, “economic consequences” in the IPPC context includes “**environmental consequences**” and “**social consequences**”, and those subcategorical terms may also be used in the text where specifically necessary. Furthermore, noting that “potential economic importance” is used in the definition of a quarantine pest, and “economically important loss” is used in the definition of endangered area, the phrasing “**potential economic importance**” or “**economically important loss**” may also be used where appropriate.

- In *all other cases*, for ramifications or relations that are not covered by the above two categories, use the unspecific term “**effect**”.

[7] TPG provides concrete text proposals to that effect in the Table below.

## Theme 2: On avoiding the use of the terms “direct effect” and “indirect effect”

[8] As a legacy from the core text of ISPM 11 of 2005, various “effects” (as used in a wide sense) of pests are currently categorized as being either “direct” or “indirect”. As explained above, TPG discourages the excessive use of the unspecific term “effect” for what in the context could more consistently be termed as either “injurious effect” or “economic consequence”. On top of that, TPG also suggests that the current use and distinction between “direct effects” and “indirect effects” (and likewise the phrasing “directly affecting” and “indirectly affecting”) is inconsistent, confusing, unnecessarily complex and in fact unnecessary for this standard on the PRA process.

[9] In the text, “indirect effect” is used in (at least) four differing meanings as described below (A to D) with text examples:

[10] (A) “Indirect effect” explained as **competition**: i.e., the effect of pests that “...*affect plants primarily by other processes such as competition. Examples includes most plants as pests...*” (quote of § 806). In contrast to this explanation, “direct effect” presumably is intended to mean pests affecting plants by infestation, although this is not explicit from the text.

[11] The Convention’s definition of “pest” is: “*any species...of plant, animal or pathogenic agent injurious to plants...*”. Notably, the definition does not make any distinction between various modes of being injurious, whether by physical, chemical, genetical damage or competition. Neither does this or other definitions distinguish between “direct” or “indirect” effect.

[12] TPG suggests that the Convention’s definition of a pest suffices and that the particular means by which plants as pest affect other plants is sufficiently and well explained (without any detour to “indirect effect”) in the draft Annex 6, § 988, as follows:

“Plants as pests may affect other plants through competition for space and resources, such as light, nutrients and water, or through parasitism or allelopathy. Plants introduced to a new area may also become pests by hybridizing with cultivated plants or wild plants.”

[13] TPG therefore suggests that the type-A uses of “indirect effect” is confusing and unnecessary. TPG suggests that “direct/indirect effect” in all type-A cases be replaced with wording consistent with the definition of pest or with the draft Annex 6, § 988, and provides concrete text proposals to that effect in the Table below.

[14] (B) “Indirect effect” explained as an **effect through an adverse effect on a beneficial organism**: i.e., the effect of pests that “...*primarily affect other organisms but thereby cause deleterious effects on plant species or on plant health in habitats or ecosystems. Examples include parasites of beneficial organisms, such as biological control agents*” (quote of § 807).

[15] In these type-B cases, describing a (secondary) adverse effect to plants through a (primary) adverse effect on some intermediate, beneficial organism as being “indirect” is conceptually less problematic. Yet, the word “indirect” is still unnecessary, as the concept is well explained without using that word. TPG additionally notes, that adverse effects on organisms beneficial to plants is very seldomly considered a phytosanitary issue.

[16] TPG suggests that the type-B uses of “indirect effect” be avoided throughout and provides concrete text proposals to that effect in the Table below.

[17] (C) “Indirect effect” in the sense of “**economic consequences**”. In the following, long quote of §§ 532-545, “indirect effect” is unexplained and therefore quite obscure, but the description points to “factors” that are indeed relevant for evaluating “economic consequences”:

#### 4.1.3 Indirect pest effects

For identification and characterization of the indirect effects of the pest in the PRA area, or those effects that are not host-specific, the following are examples of factors that may be considered:

- effects on domestic and export markets, including in particular effects on export-market access;
- changes to producer costs or input demands, including control costs;
- changes to domestic or foreign consumer demand for a product resulting from quality changes;
- environmental and other undesired effects of control measures;
- feasibility and cost of eradication or containment;
- capacity to act as a vector for other pests;
- resources needed for additional research and advice; and
- social and other effects (e.g. on tourism).

When considering effects on domestic and export markets, the potential consequences for market access that may result if the pest becomes established should be estimated. This involves considering the extent of any phytosanitary regulations imposed (or likely to be imposed) by importing countries.

Effects on human and animal health (e.g. toxicity, allergenicity), water tables, tourism and so on could also be considered, as appropriate, by other agencies or authorities.”

[18] TPG suggests that the type-C uses of “indirect effect” for what are really “economic consequences” is highly inconsistent, confusing and unnecessary. TPG therefore suggests the type-C use of “indirect effect” be avoided throughout and replaced by “economic consequence” as appropriate. TPG provides concrete text proposals to that effect in the Table below.

[19] (D) “Indirect effect” in the sense of “**environmental consequences**” (as a subset of “economic consequences”). In the following quote of §§ 819-824, “indirect effects” is unexplained and therefore quite obscure, but the description points to examples that are indeed relevant for evaluating “environmental consequences” (and thereby “economic consequences”):

“In the case of the analysis of environmental risks, examples of **indirect pest** effects on plants or their environmental consequences that may be considered include:

- significant effects on plant communities;
- significant effects on designated environmentally sensitive or protected areas;
- significant change in ecological processes and the structure, stability or processes of an ecosystem (including further effects on plant species, increased erosion, water-table changes, increased risk of fire, changes to nutrient cycling);
- effects on human use of plant communities and the environment (e.g. effects on water quality, recreational uses, tourism, animal grazing, hunting, fishing); and
- costs of environmental restoration.”

[20] TPG suggests that the type-D uses of “indirect effect” for what are really “environmental consequences” (as a subset of “economic consequences”) is highly inconsistent, confusing and unnecessary. TPG therefore suggests the type-D use of “indirect effect” be avoided throughout and replaced by “environmental consequences” as appropriate. TPG provides concrete text proposals to that effect in the Table below.

### Theme 3: On the use of “environmental consequences” instead of “environmental risk”

[21] The term “Environmental risk” is used in various parts of the draft standard, in particular in the draft Annex 4 bearing that name.

[22] TPG suggests the use of that term is inconsistent and imprecise, blurring the facts that IPPC is concerned with “pest risk” and that this draft standard deals with “pest risk analysis”. As CPM has recognized that “economic consequences” includes “environmental consequences”, it is obviously pertinent that this PRA standard elaborates on how to evaluate possible environmental consequences as part of the pest risk assessment. However, this is a differing issue than an “environmental risk assessment” typically

carried out by other authorities than an NPPO. TPG therefore suggests that “environmental risk” be replaced by “environmental consequences” throughout the text.

[23] TPG provides concrete text proposals to that effect in the Table below.

**Table 1: Proposals for amended text in regard to Themes 1, 2 and 3**

§	Proposed text amendment	Theme. Further note
76	Less commonly, the commodity itself may pose a pest risk. When organisms imported as commodities (such as plants for planting, biological control agents and other beneficial organisms, and LMOs) are deliberately introduced and established in intended habitats in new areas, there is a risk that they may accidentally spread to unintended habitats, <del>being injurious causing injury to plants or plant products.</del> Such risks may also be analysed using the PRA process.	Theme 1.
93	General requirements for the PRA process and aspects common to all PRA stages (e.g. information, gathering, documentation, pest risk communication) are provided in the core text of this standard and detailed guidance on each stage of PRA is given in Annexes 1, 2 and 3, respectively. Detailed guidance on environmental <del>risks-consequences</del> , LMOs and plants as pests is given in Annexes 4, 5 and 6, respectively.	Theme 3
128	biological attributes of the organism and evidence of ability to <del>be injurious cause injury;</del>	Theme 1.
133	- evidence of economic <del>consequences impact</del> , which includes environmental <del>consequences impact;</del>	Theme 1.
171	The range of pests covered by the IPPC extends beyond pests <del>directly</del> affecting cultivated plants. <del>Pests may also and include pests indirectly affecting cultivated plants, pests-affecting non-cultivated plants, LMOs as pests,</del> and plants as pests.	Theme 2. Furthermore, the qualifier 'as pests' added to LMO.
173 + 174	3.1 Environmental <del>consequences risks</del>  The IPPC applies to the protection of wild and cultivated plants. Therefore, pests affecting all types of plants, <del>directly or indirectly</del> , are within the scope of the IPPC. Information on the scope of the IPPC with regard to environmental <del>consequences risks</del> is provided in Annex 4.	Themes 2 and 3.
206	At this stage, information is necessary to identify the organism and its potential economic <del>consequences impact</del> , which includes environmental <del>consequences impact</del> . Other useful information on the organism may include its geographical distribution, host plants, habitats and association with commodities. For pathways, information about the commodity, including modes of transport, and its intended use, is essential.	Theme 1.
272	<del>The initiation points frequently refer to "pests". The IPPC defines a pest as "any species, strain or biotype of plant, animal or pathogenic agent, injurious to plants or plant products". When applying these initiation points to the specific case of plants as pests, it is important to note that the plants concerned should satisfy this definition. Pests directly affecting plants satisfy this definition. In addition, many organisms indirectly affecting plants also satisfy this definition (e.g. plants as pests, such as weeds or non-indigenous plants). The fact that they are injurious to plants may be based on evidence of their impact obtained in an area in which they are present. In cases where there is insufficient evidence that they affect plants indirectly, it may nevertheless be appropriate to assess — on the basis of available pertinent information — whether they are potentially injurious in the PRA area by using a clearly documented, consistently applied and transparent system. This is particularly important for plant species or cultivars that are imported for planting.</del>	Theme 2. As a legacy of the core ISPM 11 text of 2003, this paragraph was written long before the Annex on PRA for Plants as Quarantine Pests (now draft Annex 6) was created and adopted in 2013. The TPG recommends the entire paragraph be deleted because it is obsolete and redundant, and the fundamental issues on PRA for plants as quarantine pests are clearly and sufficiently described in the draft Annex 6, Section 2. There, wordings like 'direct/indirect', 'weed', 'non-indigenous plants' had been consciously avoided by 2013.
276	The taxonomic identity of the organism should be defined because any biological and other information used should be relevant to the organism in question. If the organism has not yet been fully named or described, then, to be determined as a pest, it should at least have been shown to be identifiable, consistently to <del>be injurious produce injury</del> to plants or plant products	Theme 1.

	(e.g. symptoms, reduced growth rate, yield loss or any other damage) and to be transmissible or able to disperse.	
287	presence detected in connection with observations of <u>injurious effects</u> <del>injury</del> to plants or to beneficial organisms before any clear causal link has been established;	Theme 1.
294	Biological control agents and other beneficial organisms are intended to be beneficial to plants. Thus, when performing a PRA, the main concern is to look for potential <u>injurious effects</u> <del>injury</del> to non-target organisms. Other concerns may include:	Theme 1.
306	The area to which the PRA refers should be clearly defined. It may be the whole or part of a country or several countries. Whereas information may be gathered from a wider geographical area, the analysis of establishment, spread and economic <del>impact</del> <u>consequences</u> should relate only to the defined PRA area	Theme 1
351	has the potential to <del>be injurious</del> <u>cause injury</u> to plants or plant products in the PRA area; and	Theme 1.
388	There should be clear indications that the pest is likely to have an unacceptable <u>economic consequences</u> <del>impact</del> in the PRA area.	Theme 1.
390	Unacceptable economic <u>consequences</u> <del>impact</del> is described in Supplement 2 (Guidelines on the understanding of “potential economic importance” and related terms including reference to environmental considerations) to ISPM 5.	Theme 1.
496	4. Assessment of potential <u>economic consequences</u>	Theme 1. TPG believes that the entire section 4 contains much repetitive and inconsistent text, where e.g. terms like ‘effect’, ‘consequence’, ‘importance’ have been used inconsistently. In the following (§§ 497-569), TPG provides some text proposals, but more generally would recommend a major overhaul of section 4 with a view to seeking consistency and simplification; the number of subsections could probably be reduced and be given more appropriate headings.
497	In PRA, consequences should not be interpreted to be only economic market effects. Goods and services not sold in commercial markets can have economic value, and economic analysis encompasses much more than the study of market goods and services. The use of the term “economic <u>consequences</u> <u>effects</u> ” provides a framework in which a wide variety of <u>consequences</u> <u>effects</u> (including environmental and social <u>consequences</u> <u>effects</u> ) may be analysed. Economic analysis uses a monetary value as a measure to allow policy makers to compare costs and benefits from different types of goods and services. This does not preclude the use of other tools, such as qualitative and environmental analyses, that may not use monetary terms. <u>Economic impact</u> “ <u>Potential economic importance</u> ” and related terms are described in Supplement 2 to ISPM 5.	Theme 1. TPG acknowledges that this (new) text had been copied (with modifications) from ISPM 5, Suppl. 2, Sect. 4.1. However, for consistency TPG recommends that ‘economic effects’ as yet another synonym should be avoided and replaced by ‘economic consequences’. In the last sentence, the phrasing “Potential economic importance” refers to the actual title of ISPM 5/Suppl 2.
499	4.1 <del>Consequences</del>	Theme 1. Subsection seems inconsistent and unnecessary.
501	Requirements described in this step indicate what information relative to the pest and its potential host plants should be assembled, and suggest levels of economic analysis that may be carried out using that information in order to assess all <del>the effects of the pest (i.e. the potential economic consequences of the pest.</del> Wherever appropriate, quantitative data that will provide	Theme 1. ‘Effects’ used as a synonym of ‘potential economic consequences’ is inconsistent and the phrasing unnecessary.

	monetary values should be obtained. Qualitative data may also be used. Consultation with an economist may be useful.	
507	<del>4.1.1</del> <del>Pest effects</del>	Theme 1. Subsection seems inconsistent and unnecessary.
508	To estimate the potential economic importance of the pest, information should be obtained from areas where the pest is present naturally or has been introduced. This information should be compared with the situation in the PRA area. Case histories concerning comparable pests can usefully be considered. <del>The effects considered may be direct or indirect.</del>	Theme 2. The use of 'effect' here is inconsistent, and 'direct or indirect' inconsistent and obscure; for the following §§, TPG suggests using 'injurious effects to plants', and 'consequences', respectively. However, TPG also suggests it be considered whether the splitting into those subsections is really meaningful, logic and necessary.
515	The environmental <del>effects and consequences</del> considered should be those that result from the <u>injurious</u> effect of the pest on plants. Such effects on plants, however, may be less significant than the effects or consequences on other organisms or systems. For example, a plant as a pest that has only <u>slightly affects a minor impact</u> on other plants may be significantly allergenic <del>for to humans</del> , or a minor plant pathogen may produce toxins that seriously affect livestock. However, the regulation of plants solely on the basis of their effects on other organisms or systems (e.g. on human or animal health) is outside the scope of this standard. If the PRA process reveals evidence of a potential danger to other organisms or systems, this should be communicated to the appropriate authorities that have the legal responsibility to deal with the issue.	Themes 1 & 2 & 3. 'Environmental effects' is inconsistent and unnecessary, and 'environmental consequences' suffices. 'Impact' may be confused with 'economically unacceptable impact' as used in the definition of pest risk of RNQPs. TPG recommends this be avoided by using instead the verb 'affect' as in 'pest that affect' (consistent with several other text cases, e.g. §§ 512 and 514).
517	<del>4.1.2</del> <del>Direct pest effects</del> <u>Injurious effects on plants</u>	Theme 1 & 2. Furthermore, TPG suggests it may be considered whether the splitting of information into the subsections (in the draft numbered as 4.1.2 and 4.1.3) is really meaningful, logic and necessary.
518	For identification and characterization of the <u>direct injurious</u> effects of the pest on each potential host in the PRA area, <del>or those effects that are host-specific</del> , the following are examples of factors that may be considered:	Theme 1 & 2. Furthermore, the sub-sentence 'or those effects that are host-specific' is obscure, and TPG suggests it be deleted.
529	<del>-environmental effects</del> <u>consequences</u>	Theme 1
532	<del>4.2 1.3</del> <del>Indirect pest effects</del> <u>Economic consequences</u>	Theme 1 & 2. Furthermore, TPG suggests it may be considered whether the splitting of information into the subsections (in the draft numbered as 4.1.2 and 4.1.3) is really meaningful, logic and necessary.
533	For identification and characterization of the <u>indirect effects consequences</u> of the pest in the PRA area, <del>or those effects that are not host-specific</del> , the following are examples of factors that may be considered:	Theme 1 & 2. Furthermore, the sub-sentence 'or those effects that are not host-specific' is obscure, and TPG suggests it be deleted.
538	<del>-environmental and other undesired effects</del> <u>economic consequences</u> of control measures	Theme 1
542	<del>social and other effects</del> <u>consequences</u> (e.g. on tourism).	Theme 1.
548	Some of the <del>direct and indirect effects</del> <u>consequences</u> of the introduction of a pest determined in section 4.1.2 and section 4.2 1.3 will be of an economic nature, or affect some type of value, but not have an existing market which can be easily identified. As a result, the <del>effects</del>	Theme 1 & 2.

	<u>consequences</u> may not be adequately measured in terms of prices in established product or service markets. Examples include, in particular, environmental <u>effects consequences</u> (such as ecosystem stability, biodiversity) and social <u>effects consequences</u> (such as mental well-being or spiritual, religious and cultural connections) arising from a pest introduction. These <u>impacts consequences</u> may be approximated with an appropriate non-market valuation method. More details on environmental <u>effects consequences</u> are given below.	
559	As determined above, <del>most of the direct effects of a pest, and some of the indirect effects,</del> <u>consequences</u> will be of a commercial nature or have <del>consequences effects</del> for an identified market. These effects, which may be positive or negative, should be identified and quantified where possible. The following may usefully be considered:	Theme 1 & 2.
566	<i>Partial budgeting.</i> This may be used if the economic <u>effects consequences</u> , induced by the action of the pest, are generally limited to producers and are considered relatively minor.	Theme 1.
567	<i>Partial equilibrium.</i> This may be used if, under section 4.2.2, there is a significant change in producer profits, or if there is a significant change in consumer demand. Partial equilibrium analysis is necessary to measure welfare changes, or the net changes arising from the pest <del>impacts consequences</del> on producers and consumers	Theme 1.
568	<i>General equilibrium.</i> If the economic changes are significant to a national economy, and could cause changes to factors such as wages, interest rates or exchange rates, then general equilibrium analysis may be used to establish the full range of economic <u>effects consequences</u> .	Theme 1.
569	The use of analytical techniques is often limited by lack of data, by uncertainties in the data, and by the fact that for certain <u>economic consequences effects</u> only qualitative information can be provided.	Theme 1.
801	ANNEX 4; Environmental <del>risks</del> <u>consequences</u>	Theme 3
804	[Complete deletion recommended] [If not entirely deleted, then alternative wording recommended:] <del>The range of pests covered by the IPPC extends beyond pests directly affecting cultivated plants. The coverage of the IPPC definition of “pests” includes plants as pests and other species injurious to that have indirect effects on plants through effects on other organisms, and the convention applies not only to the protection of cultivated plants, but also to wild flora. Thus, the scope of the IPPC also extends to organisms that are pests because they fall into one or more of the following categories:</del>	Theme 2. TPG notes that messages on the wide scope of IPPC has been made quite clear already in §§ 77, 82, 86, 171, 174, 181 and 512-514. Therefore, §§ 804-807 are in fact redundant and overly complicated.  Furthermore, TPG queries the rationale for placing §§ 806-807 (and thereby also the last sentence of § 804) under this section of Environmental consequences of pest risk, because: Plants as pests, as well as pests affecting plants through effects on other organisms, are not only relevant to the environment (wild flora), but may be just as relevant with cultivated plants.  TPG therefore recommends to <i>completely delete</i> the entire block of §§ 804-807.

		In case such deletion is not deemed feasible, TPG provides recommendation for amended texts for those §§ 804-807, and recommend the substance of this text be transferred to the Background Section (or another generic section)
805	[Complete deletion recommended] [If not entirely deleted, then alternative wording recommended:] <i>They <del>directly</del> affect uncultivated or unmanaged plants.</i> Introduction of these pests may have few commercial consequences, and therefore they have been less likely to have been evaluated, regulated or placed under official control. <del>An example of this type of pest is Dutch elm disease (caused by <i>Ophiostoma novo-ulmi</i> Brasier, 1991).</del>	TPG recommends to <i>completely delete</i> §§ 804-807, see § 804. If not deemed feasible, amended text is provided here. Theme 2.  Furthermore, providing an example of a pest is inconsistent with other not pest-specific standards and the general SC decision to avoid such examples.
806	[Complete deletion recommended] [If not entirely deleted, then alternative wording recommended:] <i>They <del>indirectly</del> affect plants.</i> <del>In addition to pests that directly affect host plants, there are those that affect plants primarily by other processes such as competition or allelopathy, i.e. they are non-parasitic. Examples include most plants as pests (e.g. weeds, non-indigenous plants that establish or spread rapidly).</del>	TPG recommends to <i>completely delete</i> §§ 804-807, see § 804. If not deemed feasible, amended text is provided here. Theme 2. The proposed amendment by TPG is consistent with draft Annex 6, Sect. 2 (§988), the text of which was adopted in 2013.
807	[Complete deletion recommended] [If not entirely deleted, then alternative wording recommended:] <i>They <del>indirectly</del> affect plants through effects on other organisms.</i> Some pests may primarily affect other organisms but thereby cause deleterious effects on plant species or on plant health in habitats or ecosystems. Examples include parasites of beneficial organisms, such as biological control agents.	TPG recommends to <i>completely delete</i> §§ 804-807, see § 804. If not deemed feasible, amended text is provided here. Theme 2.
808	To protect the environment and biodiversity without creating disguised barriers to trade, environmental <del>consequences</del> risks, including <del>for risks to</del> biological diversity, should be analysed in a PRA.	Theme 3.
810	For environmental <del>consequences</del> risks, the variety of sources of information will generally be wider than traditionally used by NPPOs. Broader inputs may be required. These sources may include environmental impact assessments, but it should be recognized that such assessments usually do not have the same purpose as PRA and cannot substitute for PRA.	Theme 3.
812	Official control of pests <del>with posing an</del> environmental <del>consequences</del> risk may involve agencies other than the NPPO. However, it is recognized that Supplement 1 (Guidelines on the interpretation and application of the concepts of “official control” and “not widely distributed”) to ISPM 5 applies, and in particular its provisions regarding NPPO authority and involvement in official control.	Theme 3.
813	<b>4. Environmental consequences of pest effects</b>	Theme 1, and for simplification.

814	In the case of the analysis of environmental <del>consequences risks</del> , examples of <del>direct pest effects on injury to plants or their environmental consequences</del> that may be considered include:	Themes 2 & 3, and for simplification
819	In the case of the analysis of environmental risks, examples of <del>indirect pest effects on plants or their environmental consequences</del> that may be considered include:	Theme 2 (& 3). The distinction between 'direct' and 'indirect' is unnecessary, and similarly the conceptual difference between §§ 815-817 and §§ 820-824 seems obscure, so § 819 is confusing and unnecessary.
827	In considering the management of environmental <del>risks-consequences</del> , NPPOs should recognize that phytosanitary measures are intended to account for uncertainty and should be designed in proportion to the pest risk. Pest risk management options should be identified, taking account of the degree of uncertainty in the assessment of economic consequences, probability of introduction, and the respective technical justification of those options. In this respect, the management of <del>risks to the environment environmental consequences caused by pests</del> does not differ from the management of other pest risk.	Theme 3, and for simplification.
869	changes that have effects <del>of phytosanitary concern</del> on other organisms, such as biological control agents, beneficial organisms, soil fauna and microflora, or nitrogen-fixing bacteria, <del>that result in a phytosanitary impact (indirect effects)</del> .	Theme 1 and 2, and for simplification.
871	negative <del>direct or indirect</del> effects of plant-produced pesticides on non-target organisms beneficial to plants;	Theme 2.
907	In order to be categorized as a pest, an LMO has to be injurious or potentially injurious to plants or plant products under conditions in the PRA area. <del>This damage may be in the form of direct effects on plants or plant products, or indirect effects.</del> For guidance on the process of determining whether an LMO has the potential to be a pest, see section 2 of this annex.	Theme 2.
935	The economic <del>impact consequences</del> (including environmental <del>impact consequences</del> ) should relate to the pest nature (injurious to plants and plant products) of the LMO.	Theme 1.
954	The <del>consequences impact</del> being assessed should relate to the pest nature (injurious to plants and plant products) of the LMO.	Theme 1.
1024	<del>With respect to a plant being assessed as a pest with indirect effects, wherever a reference is made to a "host" or "host range", these terms should be understood to refer to a suitable habitat in the PRA area.</del>	This sentence (a legacy from ISPM 11, Sect. 2.2, § 4) is obsolete, confusing and unnecessary. TPG recommends it be deleted. The following § 1025 had been introduced into the Annex on plants as quarantine pests and adopted as a comprehensive explanation of the conceptual relation between 'host' and 'habitat'. Furthermore, sections 4.7 and 4.8 of the draft Annex 6 provides comprehensive guidance on establishment and spread issues.

## Appendix 5: Proposed ink amendments

Location	Current text	Proposal for revised text [additions; deletions]	Rationale
area of low pest prevalence	An <b>area</b> , whether all of a country, part of a country, or all or parts of several countries, as identified by the competent authorities, in which a specific <b>pest</b> is present at low levels and which is subject to effective <b>surveillance</b> or <b>control</b> [IPPC, 1997; revised CPM, 2015]	An <b>area</b> , <del>whether all of a country, part of a country, or all or parts of several countries,</del> as <del>identified</del> <u>defined</u> by the competent authorities, in which a specific <b>pest</b> is present at low levels and which is subject to effective <b>surveillance</b> or <b>control</b>	To avoid redundancy. Deleted text is the current definition of “area”. “Identified” replaced by “defined” for consistency with the definition or “area” which is officially defined.
contaminating pest	A <b>pest</b> that is carried by a <b>commodity</b> , <b>packaging</b> , conveyance or container, or present in a storage place and that, in the case of <b>plants</b> and <b>plant products</b> , does not infest them [CEPM, 1996; revised CEPM, 1999; CPM, 2018]	A <b>pest</b> that is carried by a <b>commodity</b> , <b>packaging</b> , conveyance or container, or present in a storage place and that, in the case of <b>plants</b> and <b>plant products</b> , does not <b>infest</b> them	“infest” should be bolded
corrective action plan (in an area)	Documented plan of <b>phytosanitary actions</b> to be implemented in an <b>area</b> officially delimited for phytosanitary purposes if a pest is detected or a <b>tolerance level</b> is exceeded or in the case of faulty implementation of officially established procedures [CPM, 2009]	Documented plan of <b>phytosanitary actions</b> to be implemented in an <b>area</b> <b>officially</b> delimited for phytosanitary purposes if a <b>pest</b> is detected or a <b>tolerance level</b> is exceeded or in the case of faulty implementation of <b>officially</b> established procedures	“officially” should be bolded
debarked wood	<b>Wood</b> that has been subjected to any process that results in the removal of <b>bark</b> . (Debarked wood is not necessarily <b>bark-free wood</b> .) [CPM, 2008; replacing “debarking”]	<b>Wood</b> that has been subjected to any process that results in the removal of <b>bark</b> . ( <b>Debarked wood</b> is not necessarily <b>bark-free wood</b> .)	“debarked wood” should be bolded
host pest list	A list of <b>pests</b> that infest a <b>plant</b> species, globally or in an <b>area</b> [CEPM, 1996; revised CEPM, 1999]	A list of <b>pests</b> that <b>infest</b> a <b>plant</b> species, globally or in an <b>area</b>	“infest” should be bolded
IPPC	<b>International Plant Protection Convention</b> , as deposited in 1951 with FAO in Rome and as subsequently amended [FAO, 1990; revised ICPM, 2001]	<b>International Plant Protection Convention</b> , <del>as deposited in 1951 with FAO in Rome and as subsequently amended</del>	There is no need to repeat the definition of the term. Consistency with other abbreviations in the

			Glossary (See PRA, LMO, etc)
<del>plant protection organization (national)</del>	See national plant protection organization	<del>See national plant protection organization</del>	Delete, in the definition of national plant protection organization it is mentioned that formerly was plant protection organization (national).
<b>treatment schedule</b>	The critical parameters of a <b>treatment</b> which need to be met to achieve the intended outcome (i.e. the killing, <b>inactivation</b> or removal of <b>pests</b> , or rendering <b>pests</b> infertile, or <b>devitalization</b> ) at a stated <b>efficacy</b> [ISPM 28, 2007]	The critical parameters of a <b>treatment</b> which need to be met to achieve the intended outcome (i.e. <del>the</del> killing, <del>inactivation</del> <del>ng</del> , <del>or</del> removing <del>of</del> <del>pests</del> , <del>or</del> rendering <b>pests</b> infertile, or <del>devitalization</del> <del>ng</del> regulated pests) at a stated <b>efficacy</b>	TPG agreed to the editorial changes to be in line with the definition of “treatment” in ISPM 5

**Appendix 6: TPG workplan 2024-2025****TABLE 1 - REGULAR TASKS**

<b>Regular tasks</b>		<b>Detailed task</b>	<b>Responsible</b>	<b>Deadline</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>1. Meeting reports: preparation and update to SC</b>	<b>January-February 2024</b>	Draft report to Steward, Chairperson and rapporteur	Secretariat	2023-12-29	
		Steward, Chairperson and rapporteur send back draft report	Steward, Chair & rapporteur	2024-01-12	
		Secretariat finalizes report and sends to editor	Secretariat	2024-01-17	
		Editor reviews report and send comments	Editor	2024-01-31	
		Final report	Secretariat	2024-02-02	(To allow review in Secretariat)
	<b>Update for SC May 2024</b>	Prepare update (incl. decisions) from TPG December 2023 meeting for SC May 2024	Secretariat with stewards	2024-03-25	Secretariat to draft; steward to respond by 25/03 tent. Deadline to post documents is 22/04
<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	2023-10-03	
		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	2024-02-15	Comments from TPG on these will not be solicited, documents will be finalized by Secretariat and Steward
		Review translation comments and provide suggestions to FAO Translation Services	French, Spanish	2024-02-15	These will be submitted to translation-services
<b>3. Terms and definitions (incl. Amendments to the Glossary)</b>	<b>2022 Amendments</b>	Volunteers sends draft meeting papers to Secretariat	ALL, as allocated in Table 3	2021-10-01	TPG Dec 2021

Regular tasks	Detailed task	Responsible	Deadline	Comments
	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 is 1 March
	Proposed translation of the terms going for 1 <sup>st</sup> consultation	French, Spanish	2022-05-01	These will be submitted to translation-services
	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	2022-12-06	Back to Secretariat by 2023-01-10
	TPG Virtual Meeting	ALL	2023-03-01	Approval of amendments by TPG
	Amendments and responses for TPG comments	ALL	2023-03-01	Draft Amendments and responses to compiled comments to be posted by 1 March for SC-7 / 2nd Cons.
	Review translation comments and provide suggestions to FAO Translation Services	French, Spanish	2023-03-01	These will be submitted to translation-services
	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

Regular tasks	Detailed task	Responsible	Deadline	Comments
	Check of translations of draft Amendments going for adoption (i.e. after SC November and when it has been revised/translated into all languages)	French, Spanish, Russian, Arabic, Chinese	TBD, in 2024-02-22	The translations will be ready for review around mid-February and must be posted by 1 March for CPM.
<b>2025 Amendments</b>	Volunteers sends draft meeting papers to Secretariat	ALL, as allocated in Table 3	2024-10-01	TPG Dec 2024
	Draft 2025 Amendments compiled based on discussions at TPG 2024-12	Secretariat and steward	2024-12-08	Back to Secretariat by 2025-01-10
	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 2025 Amendments finalized	ALL	2025-02-15	Back to Secretariat
	Amendments processed for SC	Secretariat	2025-03-01	Posting deadline for SC May 2025 is 1 March
	Proposed translation of the terms going for 1 <sup>st</sup> consultation	French, Spanish	2025-05-01	These will be submitted to translation-services
	Draft amendments to 1 <sup>st</sup> Consultation		2025-07 to 09	
	Draft amendments and 1 <sup>st</sup> Cons. comments reviewed		TPG 2025	
	Finalize amendments and responses	Secretariat and steward	2025-12-21	Back to Secretariat by 2026-01-08
	Amendments and responses for TPG comments	ALL	2026-01-28	Draft Amendments and responses to compiled comments to be posted by 1 March for SC-7 / 2 <sup>nd</sup> Cons.
	Review translation comments and provide suggestions to FAO Translation Services	French, Spanish	2026-01-28	These will be submitted to translation-services
	Draft amendments in 2 <sup>nd</sup> Consultation		2026-07 to 09	

Regular tasks	Detailed task		Responsible	Deadline	Comments
	Consultation by email on 2 <sup>nd</sup> Cons. comments		ALL	in 2026-10	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)		French, Spanish, Russian, Arabic, Chinese	TBD, in 2027-01	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 July 2022)</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 2021-05	All to review / provide comments by end June 2021
	2022 (for publishing)	To prepare update based on TPG comments, outcomes of TPG 2021, including updates from SC Nov. 2021.	Beatriz Melcho	2022-02-15	All to review / provide comments during TPG 2021 meeting
		To review update	All	TPG meeting	Approved by SC via e-decision in 2022
	2023 (intermediate)	To prepare intermediate update based on TPG comments, outcomes of TPG 2022, including updates from SC Nov. 2022, CPM-17 (2023), SC May 2023	Beatriz Melcho	After SC 2023-05	All to review / provide comments by end October 2023
2024 (for publishing)	To prepare update based on TPG comments, outcomes of TPG 2023, including updates from SC Nov. 2023 and CPM-18 (2024), SC May and SC-7.	Beatriz Melcho	After SC 2024-05	All to review / provide comments during TPG 2024 meeting.	

Regular tasks	Detailed task	Responsible	Deadline	Comments
2024 (for publishing)	Annotated glossary is updated and sent for publication	Secretariat	After SC 2024-05	Before TPG 2024
2025 (intermediate)	To prepare intermediate update based on TPG comments, outcomes of SC November 2024	Beatriz Melcho	TPG 2024	All to review / provide comments by end October 2024
<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	2023-10-01	
<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
	Development of position papers, explanation, recommendations etc			
<b>8. Other tasks</b>	General recommendations on consistency: yearly updates as needed	Secretariat with stewards	2024-01-07	
	General recommendations on consistency	ALL	2024-01-28	Appended to TPG report
	Development of position papers, explanation, recommendations etc			

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

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

N	Term	Status	Lead	Comments & next steps
1.	general surveillance (2018-046)	To CPM-18	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> </ul>

N	Term	Status	Lead	Comments & next steps
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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 recommended a revised definition as slightly changed in comparison to the version sent for the 1<sup>st</sup> consultation</li> <li>- SC 2022-11: sent to SC-7 2023 for additional work</li> <li>- TPG 2022-12: provided suggestions for sending for 3<sup>rd</sup> consultation</li> <li>- SC-7 2023-05: approved for 3<sup>rd</sup> consultation as modified during the meeting</li> <li>- SC 2023-11: recommended for adoption</li> </ul>
2.	inspection (2017-005)	To CPM-18	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: recommended the revised definition be retained exactly as worded in the version sent for the 1<sup>st</sup> consultation</li> <li>- SC 2022-11: returned to TPG after 2<sup>nd</sup> consultation asking for additional work</li> <li>- TPG 2022-12: reviewed and made recommendation for adoption with no change</li> <li>- SC-7 2023-05: recommended to the SC for approval for adoption by the CPM (no changes from 2<sup>nd</sup> consultation)</li> <li>- SC 2023-11: recommended for adoption</li> </ul>
3.	phytosanitary action (2020-006)	To CPM-18	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> </ul>

N	Term	Status	Lead	Comments & next steps
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- TPG 2021-12: revised and agreed to propose the amended definition to SC May 2022 for 1<sup>st</sup> consultation</li> <li>- TPG 2022-12: recommended to SC-7 for second consultation with no changes</li> <li>- SC-7 2023-05: Approved for 2<sup>nd</sup> consultation with changes as modified during the meeting</li> <li>- SC 2023-11: recommended for adoption</li> </ul>
4.	phytosanitary procedure (2020-007)	To CPM-18	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 for 1<sup>st</sup> consultation</li> <li>- TPG 2022-12: recommended to SC-7 for second consultation linking it to the definition of phytosanitary action</li> <li>- SC-7 2023-05: Approved for 2<sup>nd</sup> consultation without changes</li> <li>- SC 2023-11: recommended for adoption</li> </ul>
5.	release (of a consignment) (2021-007)	To CPM-18	Ebbe Nordbo	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- TPG 2020-12: discussed 1<sup>st</sup> 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 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: recommended a revised definition as slightly changed in comparison to the version sent for the 1<sup>st</sup> consultation</li> <li>- SC 2022-11: sent it to SC-7 for additional work</li> <li>- TPG 2022-12: provided recommendations for adoption with no changes.</li> <li>- SC-7 2023-05: recommended to the SC for approval for adoption by the CPM (no changes from 2<sup>nd</sup> consultation)</li> <li>- SC 2023-11: recommended for adoption</li> </ul>
6.	specific surveillance (2018-047)	To CPM-18	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: recommended the revised definition be retained exactly as worded in the version sent for the 1<sup>st</sup> consultation</li> </ul>

N	Term	Status	Lead	Comments & next steps
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- SC 2022-11: sent to SC-7 2023 for additional work</li> <li>- TPG 2022-12: provided suggestions for sending for 3<sup>rd</sup> consultation</li> <li>- SC-7 2023-05: recommended to the SC for approval for adoption by the CPM (no changes from 2<sup>nd</sup> consultation)</li> <li>- SC 2023-11: recommended for adoption</li> </ul>
7.	surveillance (2020-009)	To CPM-18	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> <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: recommended a revised definition as slightly changed in comparison to the version sent for the 1<sup>st</sup> consultation</li> <li>- SC 2022-11: sent to SC-7 2023 for additional work</li> <li>- TPG 2022-12: provided suggestions for sending for 3<sup>rd</sup> consultation</li> <li>- SC-7 2023-05: approved for 3<sup>rd</sup> consultation without changes</li> <li>- SC 2023-11: recommended for adoption</li> </ul>
8.	test (consequential to “inspection”) (2021-005)	To CPM-18	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: recommended a revised definition as slightly changed in comparison to the version sent for the 1<sup>st</sup> consultation</li> <li>- SC 2022-11: sent to back to TPG for additional work</li> <li>- TPG 2022-12: made recommendation to SC-7 for 3<sup>rd</sup> consultation</li> <li>- SC-7 2023-05: approved for 3<sup>rd</sup> consultation with changes as modified during the meeting</li> <li>- SC 2023-11: recommended for adoption (Solution A as proposed by the stewards)</li> </ul>
<b>Related to consistency</b>				
9.	Review of the use of and/or in adopted ISPMs (2010-030)	Ongoing	Stays on the work programme to be implemented during the	<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>

N	Term	Status	Lead	Comments & next steps
			consistency review	