



Food and Agriculture
Organization of the
United Nations



International
Plant Protection
Convention

REPORT

Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG)

Rome, Italy

25–28 November 2024

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, 2025



Some rights reserved. This work is made available under the Creative Commons Attribution- 4.0 International licence (CC BY 4.0:<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/legalcode.en>).

Under the terms of this licence, this work may be copied, redistributed and adapted, 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 a translation or adaptation of this work is created, it must include the following disclaimer along with the required citation: “This translation [or adaptation] 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 [or adaptation]. The original English edition shall be the authoritative edition.”

Any dispute arising under this licence that cannot be settled amicably shall be referred to arbitration in accordance with the Arbitration Rules of the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL). The parties shall be bound by any arbitration award rendered as a result of such arbitration as the final adjudication of such a dispute.

Third-party materials. This Creative Commons licence CC BY 4.0 does not apply to non-FAO copyright materials included in this publication. 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.

FAO photographs. FAO photographs that may appear in this work are not subject to the above-mentioned Creative Commons licence. Queries for the use of any FAO photographs should be submitted to: photo-library@fao.org.

Sales, rights and licensing. FAO information products are available on the FAO website (<https://www.fao.org/publications>) and print copies can be purchased through the distributors listed there. For general enquiries about FAO publications please contact:publications@fao.org. Queries regarding rights and licensing of publications should be submitted to: copyright@fao.org.

CONTENTS

1.	Opening of the meeting	5
1.1	Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat	5
2.	Meeting arrangements	5
2.1	Election of the chairperson.....	5
2.2	Election of the rapporteur.....	5
2.3	Adoption of the agenda	5
3.	Administrative matters	5
4.	Updates and reports	5
4.1	Previous meeting report of the TPG (December 2023).....	5
4.2	Extracts from other meeting reports of relevance to the TPG.....	5
4.3	Updates from the IPPC Secretariat to the TPG	6
5.	Addressing TPG-related comments on draft ISPMs submitted to the first consultation in 2024 (1 July–30 September).....	7
5.1	Draft annex <i>Field inspection</i> (2021-018) to ISPM 23 (<i>Guidelines for inspection</i>).....	7
5.2	Draft revision of ISPM 26 (<i>Establishment and maintenance of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)</i>) (2021-010).....	10
5.3	Draft annex <i>Design and use of systems approaches for phytosanitary certification of seeds</i> (2018-009) to ISPM 38 (<i>International movement of seeds</i>)	14
5.4	Draft phytosanitary treatments (annexes to ISPM 28 (<i>Phytosanitary treatments for regulated pests</i>)).....	16
5.4.1	Combination of irradiation and modified atmosphere treatment for <i>Trogoderma granarium</i> (2023-032).....	16
5.4.2	Irradiation treatment for <i>Pseudococcus baliteus</i> (2023-033)	17
5.4.3	Irradiation treatment for <i>Paracoccus marginatus</i> (2023-034)	17
5.4.4	Irradiation treatment for <i>Planococcus lilacinus</i> (2023-035)	17
6.	Subjects on the TPG work programme.....	18
6.1	Review of the use of “and/or” in adopted ISPMs	18
7.	Review of adopted ISPMs for consistency of terms and style.....	18
7.1	Consistency of adopted ISPMs	18
7.2	Proposal of ink amendment to the Spanish version of ISPM 15 regarding the translation of “remanufactured”	18
7.3	Proposal of deletion of the term “plant protection organization (national)” from the glossary	19
8.	Explanation of glossary terms	19
8.1	Annotated glossary: 2025 intermediate version	19
8.2	Proposals for amendments to section 7.2 “General recommendations on use of terms in ISPMs” of the <i>IPPC style guide</i> and to the <i>TPG tools and guidance</i> document... 21	
9.	TPG workplan.....	22
9.1	TPG workplan for 2025–2026.....	22
10.	Any other business.....	22
10.1	Guidelines on the standing TPG task on “Addressing TPG-related comments on draft ISPMs submitted for first consultation”	22

- 10.2 Membership renewal 23
- 10.3 Translation issues arising from the meeting with FAO Translation groups 23
 - 10.3.1 Temperature treatment, heat treatment and cold treatment 23
 - 10.3.2 “Monitoring” and “surveillance” in Chinese and inclusion of English terms in language versions of ISPM 5 24
- 11. Date and type of the next TPG meeting 24
- 12. Evaluation of the meeting 24
- 13. Close of the meeting 24
- Appendix 1: Agenda 25
- Appendix 2: Documents list 28
- Appendix 3: Participants list 30
- Appendix 4: Translation consistency changes as ink amendments to the Spanish translation of ISPM 15 (*Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade*) 32
- Appendix 5: TPG workplan 2025–2026 35

1. Opening of the meeting

1.1 Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat

- [1] Avetik NERSISYAN, lead of the Standard Setting Unit of the IPPC Secretariat (hereafter referred to as “the secretariat”) welcomed the participants to the annual face-to-face meeting of the Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG), emphasized the valuable contributions of the TPG to the IPPC community and wished all a fruitful meeting.

2. Meeting arrangements

2.1 Election of the chairperson

- [2] The TPG elected Beatriz MELCHO (Uruguay) as chairperson.

2.2 Election of the rapporteur

- [3] The TPG elected Ebbe NORDBO (Denmark) as rapporteur.

2.3 Adoption of the agenda

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

3. Administrative matters

- [5] The documents list (Appendix 2) had been made available to the TPG before the meeting.
- [6] The participants list (Appendix 3) had been made available to the TPG before the meeting. The secretariat invited participants to notify them of any information that required updating in the latter.

4. Updates and reports

4.1 Previous meeting report of the TPG (December 2023)

- [7] The TPG steward, André Felipe C.P. da SILVA (Brazil), recalled that one of the topics discussed at the 2023 TPG meeting had been the review of the definition of “pest free area”. He reported that the Standards Committee (SC), at its meeting in November 2024, had deferred the matter until a future SC meeting whilst the SC further considered consultation comments regarding the difference between “pest free area” and “pest absence”.

4.2 Extracts from other meeting reports of relevance to the TPG

- [8] The secretariat presented a paper providing extracts from other meeting reports of relevance to the TPG that had taken place in 2024.¹
- [9] “ePhyto”. One TPG member asked the secretariat who would draft the definition for “ePhyto” if a definition were required. The secretariat replied that the SC had referred to a recommendation from the ePhyto Steering Group that a definition for “ePhyto” be included in ISPM 5 because the usage of the term was not consistent. The SC, noting that the ISPM 5 definition of “phytosanitary certificate” already covered electronic certificates, had instead suggested that, if the ePhyto Steering Group considered a definition of “ePhyto” be required, the Steering Group could provide a draft definition and a rationale explaining the wording, for consideration by the SC for inclusion into the TPG’s work programme in the *List of topics for IPPC standards*.
- [10] **Potential review of ISPMs, in particular of ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*).** One TPG member asked the secretariat whether there were any updates on the discussion held at the September 2024 meeting of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) Bureau regarding the potential

¹ 05_TPG_2024_Nov.

review of ISPMs to improve accessibility (i.e. understanding and implementation) by contracting parties (CPs). This discussion included the potential review of ISPM 5, because ISPM 5 affects how ISPMs are written. The secretariat explained that the bureau had included it in the agenda for the 2024 meeting of the Strategic Planning Group (SPG), where the issue had been discussed, but the meeting report had not been published yet. The secretariat emphasized, however, that the SPG provides strategic advice to the CPM and therefore is not an executive body.

[11] **Draft ISPMs recommended by the SC to CPM for adoption.** The TPG steward updated the TPG regarding the outcomes of the November 2024 meeting of the SC, confirming in particular that the following two draft ISPMs had been recommended to the CPM for adoption:

- draft annex *International movement of fresh Mangifera indica fruit* (2021-011) to ISPM 46 (*Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures*); and
- draft annex *Use of systems approaches in managing the pest risk associated with the movement of wood* (2015-004) to ISPM 39 (*International movement of wood*).

[12] **Specification on Revision of the draft reorganized pest risk analysis ISPM (2023-037) approved by the SC.** The TPG steward reported that the SC had revised and approved the specification on *Revision of the draft reorganized pest risk analysis ISPM* (2023-037), which would lead to a call for experts to form the expert working group (EWG) to elaborate the draft ISPM. The TPG queried whether the TPG recommendations on the draft ISPM on the *Reorganization of pest risk analysis standards* (2020-001), drafted at the TPG meeting in December 2023, had been taken into consideration. The TPG steward replied that they had been taken into account by the steward of that topic during the revision of the draft ISPM and that the SC had agreed that the compiled comments from the first consultation on the *Reorganization of pest risk analysis standards* (2020-001), and the steward's responses to those comments, would be provided to the EWG.

[13] The TPG:

- (1) *noted* this paper.

4.3 Updates from the IPPC Secretariat to the TPG

[14] The secretariat presented a paper on updates from the IPPC Secretariat to the TPG, in particular following the decisions taken by the TPG in December 2023.

[15] **Potential typographical change to the definition of “plants”.** The secretariat noted that, in the definition of “plants” contained in ISPM 5, the term “plants” did not appear in bold whereas it did in a few related documents. One TPG member pointed out that the term “plants” contained in the definition was meant in its common sense and it was used to define the term “plants” in ISPM 5. Some TPG members reported that, in other definitions in ISPM 5 such as for “seeds”, the term “seeds” contained in the definition was meant in the botanical sense, thus not appearing in bold, while for “treatment schedule” the term “treatment” appeared in bold because it referred to another definition. The TPG concluded not to apply bold to the instance of “plants” contained in the definition of the glossary term “plants”.

[16] **Addressing translation issues.** The secretariat informed the TPG of additional conditions in the Service Level Agreement between the secretariat and FAO Translation Services, which were intended to ensure that translators were familiar with ISPM terminology and, in particular, glossary terms in all FAO languages (as provided in the instructions and references). This was to ensure a consistent and correct use of terms, given that standards are legal instruments recognized by the World Trade Organization's Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS Agreement). The secretariat also took the opportunity to remind the TPG of their meeting with the FAO Translation groups, scheduled for later in the week.

[17] **Guidance for new TPG members.** The secretariat informed the TPG that, following the outcomes of the Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats analysis done at the December 2023 TPG

meeting, a one-hour mentoring session for the new TPG members would take place on the first day of this meeting, involving the lead steward and assistant steward of the TPG and the secretariat.

- [18] **Outcomes of the call for the third expert for the English language for the TPG for a five-year period beginning in 2025.** The secretariat informed the TPG that Stephanie M. DUBON (United States of America) had been selected by the SC as a new expert for the English language for the TPG, starting a five-year period in 2025.
- [19] **“Emergency pathway” and draft specification on *Safe provision of food and other humanitarian aid*.** One TPG member asked the secretariat whether there were any updates on the proposed definition of the term “emergency pathway”, which had been discussed at CPM-18 (2024). The secretariat replied that, at the October 2024 meeting of the CPM Focus Group on the Safe Provision of Food and Other Humanitarian Aid, it had been decided that the term “emergency pathway” would be referred to as a concept description rather than a definition and therefore it did not need to be included in the glossary.
- [20] Regarding the draft specification on *Safe provision of food and other humanitarian aid*, the secretariat recalled that CPM-18 (2024) had approved it for consultation and had agreed that the focus group would review the consultation comments first and then present a revised draft specification, and responses to the comments, to the SC. In November 2024, the SC had reviewed the draft specification on *Safe provision of food and other humanitarian aid* and agreed to present it to CPM-19 (2025), with a request for the CPM to decide whether the development of an ISPM should proceed and, if proceeding, to approve this specification, add it as a topic to the *IPPC list of IPPC standards* and assign a priority to the topic.
- [21] The TPG:
- (2) *noted* this paper; and
 - (3) *agreed* not to apply bold to the word “plants” contained in the ISPM 5 definition of the term “plants”.

5. Addressing TPG-related comments on draft ISPMs submitted to the first consultation in 2024 (1 July–30 September)

- [22] **Guidelines for addressing TPG-related consultation comments on draft ISPMs submitted to first consultation.** The TPG agreed to discuss the first part of the paper provided for agenda item 10.1 by the TPG Assistant Steward, Ebbe NORDBO (Denmark),² as the outcomes of the discussion would further improve the method to address the consultation comments and to elaborate the corresponding TPG recommendations on phytosanitary terminology and consistency, including the ones related to the translation of phytosanitary terms.
- [23] The TPG asked the secretariat whether it would be possible to include sequential numbers in the compiled comment tables to navigate them more easily. The secretariat replied that the sequential numbering of the comments was being applied manually as this was not yet a feature of the IPPC Online Comment System. The TPG was invited to submit to the secretariat any proposals on how to resolve this, as the discussion held by the SC on how to improve the Online Comment System was still ongoing.

5.1 Draft annex *Field inspection (2021-018)* to ISPM 23 (*Guidelines for inspection*)

- [24] Ebbe NORDBO (Denmark) presented the draft TPG recommendations in English for TPG consideration; Beatriz MELCHO (Uruguay), TPG member for the Spanish language, and Laurence BOUHOT-DELDUC (France), TPG member for the French language, presented the draft TPG recommendations to consultation comments in Spanish and French, respectively, and the recommendations on translation of phytosanitary terms.³

²23_TPG_2024_Nov.

³ 07_TPG_2024_Nov; 08_TPG_2024_Nov.

- [25] **Annex to ISPM 23 or stand-alone ISPM.** The TPG noted that several consultation comments considered this draft annex not suitable to be placed in ISPM 23 and suggested that it should be developed as a stand-alone standard or that the scope of ISPM 23 should be revised to cover field inspection; currently, the standard refers solely to consignments whereas the draft annex refers to plants not necessarily forming a consignment. The TPG noted that this issue had already been considered by the EWG on Field Inspection (2021-018),⁴ as task 8 of Specification 74 (*Field inspection*) requested the EWG to identify potential consequential changes to the text of ISPM 23, and the EWG had agreed that “the standard should be more general in scope, covering both consignments and fields, with field inspection addressed in the annex”. The TPG steward added that a topic for the revision of ISPM 23 had been submitted in response to the 2023 Call for Topics: Standards and Implementation, that CPM-18 (2024) had agreed to add it to the *List of topics for IPPC standards*, and the SC, in May 2025, would finalize the review of the draft specification to address the issue and cover field inspection as an annex to ISPM 23. The TPG recalled that, at the request of the SC, it had identified and submitted to the SC a list of inconsistencies within the current ISPM 23, in particular on the wording conflicting with the definition of “inspection”. Eventually, the TPG agreed to simply point out that some inconsistencies between the standard and the draft annex would appear if they were merged into one standard, unless consequential changes to the standard were applied.
- [26] **Broadening the scope of field inspection.** The TPG discussed a consultation comment on the need to clarify what was being inspected: the plants only or also their growing media. The TPG pointed out that, as “inspection” was defined as an “official visual examination of plants, plant products or other regulated articles ...”, then field inspection would cover not just plants but also “plant products and other regulated articles”. The TPG considered that, when field inspection is conducted in real-life situations, some plant products or regulated articles may be inspected as well for example wood logs growing media, respectively. Although it was not the role of the TPG to recommend what the draft annex should cover, the TPG recommended the steward of the draft annex consider the issue, and noted that, if the scope of field inspection were broadened to include plant products and other regulated articles, then the text of the draft annex should be reviewed, taking this into account.
- [27] **Field inspection as a phytosanitary action or phytosanitary measure.** The TPG discussed a consultation comment proposing that field inspection be considered a phytosanitary action rather than a phytosanitary measure, because inspection was an official operation undertaken to implement phytosanitary measures. One TPG member stated that field inspection may be a phytosanitary measure when it is set out in regulations, but it may also be a phytosanitary action. Another TPG member pointed out that field inspection may be a phytosanitary action when a specific field is inspected, but field inspection in general is a phytosanitary measure and the section being discussed was on the concept of field inspection and therefore there was no need to refer to phytosanitary action. Eventually, the TPG recommended to retain “phytosanitary measure” rather than “phytosanitary action” because field inspection in general is a phytosanitary measure.
- [28] **Define “field inspection” in the glossary.** The TPG considered a consultation proposal that the term “field inspection” be defined in the glossary but concluded that there might not be the need to do this as “field” and “inspection” were already defined; however, the CP may consider submitting the term “field inspection” as a topic to the Call for Topics: Standards and Implementation.
- [29] **Single species or multiple species.** One TPG member queried the need for the draft annex to clarify that the term “pest” was used to refer to single or multiple species. The TPG member added that the definition of “inspection” referred to “pests”. The TPG noted that terms in standards were generally stated in the singular with the understanding that this covered also the same term in plural wherever appropriate. Therefore, the TPG recommended that the steward reconsider the sentence “The term “pest” may refer to a single species or multiple species”.
- [30] **Section on the difference between field inspection and specific surveillance.** The TPG discussed the consultation comment proposing to delete the section on Difference between field inspection and

⁴<https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/92993/>

specific surveillance, as the first part was a repetition of the concept of field inspection and the second part was the definition of “surveillance”, thus not explaining the difference between the two concepts.

- [31] **Field inspection as part of specific surveillance.** The TPG discussed whether field inspection could be part of specific surveillance. The TPG considered whether there was a geographical difference between field inspection and specific surveillance, where the former was bound to a specific field and the latter to a geographically larger scale than a specific field and aiming to investigate on a national level. A TPG member pointed out that specific surveillance was an “official process whereby information on pests in an area is obtained through surveys” and that “survey” was defined as an “official procedure conducted over a defined period to determine the presence or absence of pests, or the boundaries or characteristics of a pest population, in an area, place of production or production site”, meaning that a survey was conducted not only in one field but potentially in several fields, beyond fields and at country level. Another TPG member pointed out that, within this draft annex, field inspection was explicitly narrowed to export purposes only, which was another difference in comparison to the concept of survey. Moreover, a survey was used to determine the presence or absence of pests or the boundaries or characteristics of a pest population while inspection aimed to determine if pests were present or to verify conformity with phytosanitary requirements. On this point, the secretariat reported that the EWG during the drafting of the draft annex, had “agreed that inspection focuses on plants while surveillance focuses on an area”, considering that the definition of “surveillance” referred to pests in an area.
- [32] Eventually, the TPG agreed with the proposal to delete the section on Difference between field inspection and specific surveillance. Therefore, the question whether field inspection could be a part of specific surveillance was not considered any further.
- [33] **Incidence vs prevalence.** Whilst considering a consultation comment proposing to replace “incidence” with “prevalence”, the TPG noted “prevalence” and “incidence” were not defined in the glossary as the latter had recently been deleted.
- [34] **Possibility of authorizing third entities.** The TPG considered a consultation comment proposing not to highlight the possibility of using authorized entities, as ISPM 45 (*Requirements for national plant protection organizations if authorizing entities to perform phytosanitary actions*) was sufficient. The TPG noted that, even before the adoption of ISPM 45, the general practice of the SC had been to not mention in ISPMs the possibility of authorizing entities to carry out tasks on behalf of national plant protection organizations (NPPOs) unless there was a particular reason. Therefore, the TPG agreed with the proposal.
- [35] **Regulated pest vs target pest vs pest.** The TPG discussed a consultation comment proposing the use of “target regulated pest”, instead of “target pest” and “pest”, throughout the text for consistency. A TPG member considered whether it would be appropriate to refer to “target regulated pests” once field inspection was being performed in a specific field with produce for export for which regulated pests had been selected as objectives of the field inspection. However, at a conceptual level, field inspection should refer to “regulated pests”, with target regulated pests being a subset of regulated pests. The TPG member reported other cases where the replacement of “pest” with “target regulated pest” might not be feasible, for example when terms such as “pest status”, “pest prevalence”, “pest biology” or “pest of concern” were used. The TPG steward suggested that “target pest” should be avoided in the draft. The TPG concluded that a global change was not recommended: “target regulated pest” should be used when referring to the target of a specific field inspection, but not at a conceptual and scope level where reference should be to regulated pests, and “target pest” should be avoided altogether. The TPG recommended that the steward of the annex review the use of these terms throughout to that effect.
- [36] **Phytosanitary import requirements of an importing country or phytosanitary import requirements.** The TPG discussed a consultation comment proposing that one of the specific objectives of field inspection be modified from “to meet phytosanitary import requirements of an importing country” to “to meet phytosanitary import requirements”, as the reference to an importing country was considered redundant. Some TPG members pointed out that, by not referring to a specific importing

country, the sentence could give the impression that there were phytosanitary import requirements common to all countries whereas, to export to a specific country, the phytosanitary import requirements of that country needed to be met. The TPG steward noted that the reference to an importing country might be redundant as phytosanitary import requirements were prescribed by importing countries only, not by exporting countries. The TPG eventually recommended not to implement the proposal, because field inspection had to ensure that the commodity met the phytosanitary import requirements of the specific importing country to which it would be exported.

[37] **Field inspection as a pest risk management option to detect pests and inform decisions on pest risk management.** The TPG discussed a consultation comment proposing to review the statement “field inspection may be carried out when it is selected as a pest risk management option to detect the target pest and inform decisions on pest risk management”, because the last part “...and inform decisions on pest risk management” was considered confusing. While some TPG members agreed with the proposal, one member considered field inspection only as the first measure to be applied and then, if a pest is detected, other measures could be implemented, whereby the field inspection outcome would inform decisions on how to manage the pest risk of the detected pest. Eventually, the TPG decided that this proposal fell outside the scope of the panel.

[38] **Field inspection vs standing plant inspection.** One TPG member pointed out that replacing “field inspection” with “standing plant inspection” would exclude some plants, plant products and other regulated articles, for example logs that were not harvested yet, whereas the glossary term “field” would not be exclusive in that sense. The TPG member added that, while the term “field inspection” appeared in some ISPMs, for example ISPM 38 (*International movement of seeds*) and ISPM 23, the term “standing plant inspection” did not. Therefore, the TPG recommended not to replace “field inspection” with “standing plant inspection”.

[39] The TPG:

- (4) *agreed* its recommendations to the first consultation comments on the draft annex *Field inspection* (2021-018) to ISPM 23 (*Guidelines for inspection*); and
- (5) *noted* that the TPG recommendations would be transmitted to the steward and SC-7 for consideration.

5.2 Draft revision of ISPM 26 (*Establishment and maintenance of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)*) (2021-010)

[40] Xuemei JI (Australia) presented the draft TPG recommendations in English for TPG consideration; Beatriz MELCHO (Uruguay), TPG member for the Spanish language, and Laurence BOUHOT-DELDUC (France), TPG member for the French language, presented the draft TPG recommendations to consultation comments in Spanish and French, respectively, and the recommendations on translation of phytosanitary terms.⁵

[41] **Consistency with ISPM 4 (*Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas*).** The TPG discussed some consultation proposals on the alignment of this draft ISPM with the revised ISPM 4 as recently adopted by the CPM. One of the proposals was to simplify the title from “Establishment and maintenance of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)” to “Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)” to be aligned with ISPM 4. One TPG member, considering the tendency of the SC to simplify ISPM titles, proposed that the title be further simplified to “Pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)”; however, some other TPG members noted this would not be consistent with the title of ISPM 4. The TPG steward pointed out that this draft standard was not an annex to ISPM 4 and therefore questioned whether the draft ISPM had to remain consistent with it. The chairperson suggested such consistency was needed, because the draft standard stated that “ISPM 4 provides general guidance on the establishment of pest free areas” and “when initiating, establishing or maintaining an FF-PFA, NPPOs should follow the requirements outlined in ISPM 4 and this standard”. Eventually, the TPG

⁵ 09_TPG_2024_Nov.

concluded that the draft ISPM should be consistent with ISPM 4 but also recommended that the ISPM steward consider the further simplification of the title to read “Pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)”.

[42] **Guidance vs requirements.** The TPG considered a consultation comment proposing to state in the standard that ISPMs provide requirements and not just guidance. The TPG steward stated that this would be in line with the intention of the SC to differentiate the requirements from the guidance as done with the recently approved specification on *Revision of the draft reorganized pest risk analysis ISPM (2023-037)*, where the future EWG had been tasked by the SC to formulate recommendations to the SC on which material should be moved from the draft reorganized ISPM into implementation material. One TPG member stated that ISPMs were considered guidance documents and not requirement documents, as they allowed some flexibility, while another TPG member recalled that several ISPMs included general requirements as well as specific requirements and therefore proposed that the revised ISPM refer to “requirements” only. In conclusion, the TPG recommended that the text be amended to clarify that ISPMs provide requirements whereas implementation resources provide guidance.

[43] **Host sampling vs fruit sampling.** The chairperson pointed out a consultation comment proposing that “host sampling” be replaced with “fruit sampling”. The chairperson agreed with the proposal, because when fruit fly trapping was not sufficient, fruit sampling may be required, not host sampling; she explained that the fruit was cut to see whether immature life stages of the target fruit flies could be detected. Other TPG members and the TPG steward agreed to that explanation. The TPG questioned the rationale behind the use of “host sampling” and one TPG member replied that it might have been because the fruit fly could be found not only in the fruit but also in or on leaves, stems or other tissues of the host. The secretariat referred to the meeting report of the EWG on the revision of ISPM 26 (*Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)*) (2021-010):

The EWG decided to modify the title of new Annex 1 to “fruit fly host sampling” instead of “fruit sampling” as e.g., *Bactrocera cucurbitae* infests leaves and stems as well, not only the fruit. The EWG requested a global change to replace “fruit” with “host” (as fruit includes, vegetables and plant parts).
[EWG, agenda item 6.2]

[44] Therefore, the TPG considered this matter a technical issue, falling outside the scope of the TPG.

[45] **Host plants vs host commodities.** The TPG considered a consultation comment proposing that the revised standard refer to “host commodities” rather than “host plants” when the text explained that “fruit flies are a very important group of pests for many countries because of their potential to cause damage in fruits and the potential for restrictions to be placed on access to international markets for host plants of fruit flies”. The TPG recommended to replace “plants” with “commodities” because the glossary term “commodity” was more encompassing than the glossary term “plants” because “commodity” referred to “a type of plant, plant product or other article being moved for trade or other purpose” and fitted better in the context of trade and market access.

[46] **Fruits as plants or plant products.** The TPG noted that some consultation comments considered fruits as plant products while, according to ISPM 5, fruits were “plants” as they were fresh and therefore living and not, for example, dried.

[47] **Markets vs trade.** The TPG agreed with the consultation comment proposing to replace “markets” with “trade” in the Background section, for consistency within this draft standard and with other ISPMs.

[48] **Fruit flies vs insects.** One TPG member raised a query regarding a consultation comment proposing to refer to target fruit flies rather than target insects in the text: “The measures in this standard target insects of the economically important species of the order Diptera, family Tephritidae, such as the genera *Anastrepha*, *Bactrocera*, *Ceratitis*, *Dacus*, *Rhagoletis* and *Zeugodacus*.” The TPG considered this matter a technical issue and therefore outside of the scope of the panel.

[49] **Reference to natural host, non-host and conditional host.** The TPG considered a consultation comment proposing that the draft ISPM should refer to “natural host, non-host and conditional host” to adhere to the terminology of ISPM 37 (*Determination of host status of fruit to fruit flies (Tephritidae)*). One member stated that this draft standard and ISPM 37 should be consistent with each other, as both

were on fruit flies. Other members pointed out that it had been explicitly agreed that the terms “natural host”, “non-host” and “conditional host” were terms used in and defined for ISPM 37 only. Therefore, the TPG disagreed with the proposal to use the terms in this draft ISPM.

- [50] **Supervision vs monitoring.** The TPG noted that “monitoring” was defined in ISPM 5, but one member considered “supervision” as correct in this context. The TPG concluded that this proposal fell outside the scope of the panel.
- [51] **NPPO (without a qualifier) vs NPPO of the exporting country.** The TPG discussed how to best express the roles of the NPPO in monitoring the effectiveness of the fruit fly pest free area (FF-PFA) programme. The current text stated that the effectiveness of the programme should be monitored periodically by the NPPO of the exporting country, which, implicitly in this standard, referred to the NPPO of the country in which the FF-PFA was situated. The TPG assistant steward proposed not to refer to the “NPPO of the exporting country”, for two reasons: one being, that without the qualifier the NPPO in question would per default be the NPPO in which the FF-PFA was established; the other reason being that the establishment of a pest free area (PFA) may not be done for export purposes only but may also be used to maintain an area free from regulated pests as a phytosanitary measure to protect plants against pests regulated in that country. The TPG assistant steward noted that, in contrast, references to the “NPPO of the importing country” should obviously be retained for the clear distinction. Another TPG member suggested that the reference to the NPPO of the exporting country be retained, to make clear which of the two parties was responsible for the monitoring of the effectiveness of the FF-PFA programme, while another member, considering the significant costs of establishing and maintaining a PFA, questioned the need to establish a PFA if there was no intention of exporting, given that an area could be an entire country. The TPG assistant steward pointed out that this issue should be considered not only from an export-related perspective but also from an import-related one and so suggested that the standard state that “the effectiveness of the programme should be monitored periodically by the NPPO of the country in which the FF-PFA is situated”, thus without referring to importing or exporting countries.
- [52] In conclusion, the TPG recommended that the ISPM steward consider whether it would be appropriate and sufficiently clear to refer to the NPPO of the country where the FF-PFA was being established simply as the “NPPO” (without any qualifier) for consistency with other ISPMs, where “NPPO” referred by default to the NPPO of the country where the phytosanitary measures or phytosanitary actions were established or carried out. Furthermore, the TPG recommended that explicit reference to the “NPPO of the importing country” should be retained, wherever relevant.
- [53] **Outbreak vs incursion.** The chairperson questioned the inclusion of “(including incursion)” within the phrase “outbreak (including incursion)”, as the ISPM 5 definition of “outbreak” included incursions; she added that, in most of the draft standard, “incursion” was used and not “outbreak”. One TPG member pointed out that the use of “incursion” on its own, rather than “outbreak”, would not refer to an established population, which was a worse situation than an incursion; in contrast, “outbreak” referred not only to the “incursion” but also to “a sudden significant increase of an established pest population in an area”. Considering the issue was not simply about the term but about what the draft standard should cover, the TPG concluded that this matter fell outside the scope of the panel.
- [54] **Entrance point vs point of entry.** The TPG considered a consultation comment proposing to replace “entrance point” with “point of entry”. One TPG member disagreed as the ISPM 5 definition of the latter referred to “airport, seaport, land border point or any other location officially designated for the importation of consignments, or the entrance of persons”; thus, “point of entry” should not be used in relation to entrance points into a PFA. In conclusion, the TPG recommended not to replace “entrance point” with “point of entry”.
- [55] **Population density of target fruit fly vs pressure from target fruit fly.** The TPG discussed a consultation comment proposing to refer to “population density of the target fruit fly” rather than the “pressure from the target fruit fly” within the context of factors that should be considered when determining the boundaries of a buffer zone. The TPG discussed several possible terms such as: “pest

population”, “pest incidence”, “pressure” and “population density”. The TPG eventually concluded that this issue fell outside the scope of the panel.

- [56] **Natural spread and identified pathways.** The TPG considered some consultation comments proposing another factor that should be considered when determining the boundaries of a buffer zone: the capacity for natural spread through identified pathways. The TPG agreed with a proposal to simply refer to “natural spread”, as “natural spread” was considered a pathway in pest risk analyses and hence referring to “natural spread through identified pathways” would be contradictory.
- [57] **General surveillance and FF-PFA.** The TPG discussed the consultation comment proposing that, within the section on Surveillance activities for the establishment of the FF-PFA, “FF-PFA” should be replaced by “area” because the section referred to the surveillance activities before the establishment of the FF-PFA. The TPG disagreed with the proposal to replace FF-PFA with “area” and recommended that “proposed FF-PFA” be used.
- [58] **Testing regulated articles.** One consultation comment had pointed out that regulated articles were not “tested”: they could be inspected and, if fruit flies were found, these would be sent to the laboratory to identify the species. The TPG considered this issue as being outside the scope of the panel.
- [59] **Rejection vs refusal.** The TPG agreed with the consultation comment proposing that “rejection” be replaced with the glossary term “refusal”, as one of the appropriate measures to be applied in case of non-compliance.
- [60] **Pest status and pest free area.** The TPG considered a consultation comment proposing to refer to “pest free area” instead of “absent” as the pest status in the context of official declaration of the FF-PFA, but rejected it because “pest free area” is not a recognized pest status according to ISPM 8 (*Determination of pest status in an area*).
- [61] **Declaration of the FF-PFA and management procedures and measures to maintain the FF-PFA.** The TPG queried whether the text “internal management procedures and measures to maintain the FF-PFA (see ISPM 4 and section 6) should be in place before any declaration is made” was inconsistent with the preceding text stating that “when the pest status is determined as absent in accordance with ISPM 8 (including when the pest has been eradicated in accordance with ISPM 9), the NPPO of the exporting country should make an official declaration that the area is free from the target fruit fly”. Some TPG members considered it to be inconsistent, because no procedures to maintain the FF-PFA would be implemented if the pest status was declared absent; inconsistent with the section title, which simply referred to the declaration of the FF-PFA; and conflicting with the requirement currently stated in the scope section, that “if a country has declared a fruit fly to be absent in an area in accordance with ISPM 8, then establishing and maintaining a PFA in accordance with this standard should not be required by importing countries unless there is technical justification”. Therefore, the TPG recommended that the ISPM steward consider whether the paragraph in question was inconsistent within the section and with the scope of the draft standard.
- [62] **Fruit fly specific surveillance vs fruit fly surveys.** The TPG considered a consultation comment proposing to rename Annex 1 to the draft standard, either referring to specific surveillance for consistency, as the draft standard referred to general surveillance and specific surveillance, or referring to “surveys” with the consequential change of the title of Annex 1 to “Fruit fly surveys (trapping and host sampling)”. The TPG recommended to refer to specific surveillance.
- [63] **Efficiency vs efficacy.** The TPG discussed a consultation comment proposing to replace “efficiency” with “efficacy” when referring to the trap efficiency as a factor that may affect survey’s effectiveness. The TPG disagreed because “efficacy” was a concept linked to treatments and referred to measurable results and not to the efficiency of the traps.
- [64] **Eradicate vs eliminate.** The TPG agreed with a consultation comment proposing to use the term “eliminate” instead of “eradicate” for consistency with ISPM 5 in the context of “application of appropriate control measures to eradicate the target fruit fly from facilities when it is detected”.

- [65] **Fruit bagging.** The TPG discussed a consultation comment proposing that fruit bagging be moved to another part of the draft standard than in the section on Treatment and treatment facilities. The TPG agreed that fruit bagging was not a treatment but a measure and that it was implemented not at the treatment facility but in the field as a pre-harvest measure.
- [66] **Termination vs discontinuation.** In the context of the termination of control measures in an eradication area, the TPG disagreed with the consultation comment proposing that “termination” be replaced with “discontinuation”, as the former meant to bring to an end while the latter meant to suspend an activity.
- [67] **Breeding population.** The TPG considered consultation comment proposing to define the term “breeding population” considering that ISPM 8 defined “transient population” but not “breeding population”. One TPG member stated that there was no need to define “breeding population”, because it was meant in its common sense. Another TPG member questioned whether the proponent’s intent was to define “breeding population” within the draft standard. The TPG concluded that this proposal fell outside the scope of the panel.
- [68] **FF-PFA as a phytosanitary measure or as a phytosanitary status of an area after the application of measures.** The TPG considered a consultation comment proposing to state that an FF-PFA was “a phytosanitary status of an area after the application of measures” instead of “a phytosanitary measure” that may be used to facilitate safe trade and protect plant resources. The TPG acknowledged that a PFA was an area in which the pest status of the target pest had been determined and maintained as “absent”, and that it would also be appropriate to refer to the a “PFA status” in accordance with ISPM 4; however, the TPG noted that a PFA was foremost considered a phytosanitary measure as outlined in ISPM 4 and consequently in this draft standard. Therefore, the TPG recommended not to apply the proposed change.
- [69] The TPG:
- (6) *agreed* its recommendations to the first consultation comments on the draft revision of ISPM 26 (*Establishment and maintenance of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)*) (2021-010); and
 - (7) *noted* that the TPG recommendations would be transmitted to the steward and SC-7 for consideration.

5.3 Draft annex *Design and use of systems approaches for phytosanitary certification of seeds (2018-009) to ISPM 38 (International movement of seeds)*

- [70] Beatriz MELCHO (Uruguay) presented the draft TPG recommendations in English for TPG consideration on behalf of Asenath Abigael KOECH (Kenya); Beatriz MELCHO (Uruguay), TPG member for the Spanish language, and Laurence BOUHOT-DELDUC (France), TPG member for the French language, presented the draft TPG recommendations to consultation comments in Spanish and French, respectively, and the TPG recommendations on translation of phytosanitary terms.⁶
- [71] **Practices and measures.** The TPG agreed with a proposal from an RPPO to use the term “practices” when referring to production practices applied by participating entities in a systems approach and “measures” when these practices were integrated in a systems approach.
- [72] **Multi-system approach.** The TPG considered a consultation comment proposing to define “multi-system approach” in the draft text. The TPG concluded that this proposal fell outside the scope of the panel but agreed that the concept of a “multi-system approach” should be clarified in the draft text rather than a glossary definition be created.
- [73] **Systems approaches as a pest risk management option in support of phytosanitary certification.** The TPG considered and agreed with a consultation comment proposing that systems approaches for seeds be considered as a pest risk management option in support of phytosanitary certification.
- [74] **Evaluate vs determine.** The TPG discussed a consultation comment proposing to replace “evaluate” with “determine” in the scenario of NPPOs evaluating components of production practices and quality

⁶ 09_TPG_2024_Nov.

systems that could be effective at reducing pest risk sufficiently to meet phytosanitary import requirements. One TPG member proposed that “evaluate” be replaced with “establish” for consistency with ISPM 5. Another TPG member questioned whether the NPPO was evaluating the “phytosanitary import requirements” or the components. In conclusion, the TPG recommended that the sentence be rephrased to read: “These components, as evaluated by NPPOs, may be effective at reducing pest risk to a level that is sufficient to meet phytosanitary import requirements”.

- [75] **Seeds (as a commodity) and seeds moved internationally for any purpose.** The TPG considered a consultation comment proposing to clarify in the Scope section that the draft annex referred to seeds as a commodity, to align with ISPM 38, and another consultation comment proposing to delete the entire paragraph to avoid redundancy with the Introduction section. One TPG member disagreed with the former suggestion, because the scope was already given by ISPM 38, while another TPG member pointed out that the phrase “seeds being moved internationally for any purpose” was not very clear and that “for any purpose” could be deleted. Eventually, the TPG considered the proposals as falling outside the scope of the panel.
- [76] **Seed species vs seed commodity and seed trade vs international movement of seeds.** The TPG discussed a consultation comment proposing to revise the scope of the draft annex by moving some text from the Background section and modifying it to refer to “seed species” rather than “seed commodity” and “international movement of seeds” rather than “seed trade”. The text proposed was: “This annex does not focus on any particular seed species but does address specific characteristics of the international movement of seeds, such as the potentially long periods over which seeds can be stored and delivered to many different customers in different countries”. The rationale was that, although the definition of “commodity” in ISPM 5 referred to “a type of plant, plant product or other article being moved for trade or other purpose”, in the seed industry commodities were associated only with trade. However, the TPG disagreed with the use of “seed species” and suggested that the wording should refer to ISPM 5, but agreed with the use of “international movement of seeds”, which would cover purposes other than trade in line with the definition of “commodity” defined in ISPM 5.
- [77] Furthermore, the TPG recommended to clarify in the Scope section that the pest risk management options described in the annex may apply to individual or groups of pests *with the objective of* meeting phytosanitary import requirements, rather than stating that the pest risk management options *should be considered as sufficient* to meet the phytosanitary import requirements, as requirements should not be included in the Scope section.
- [78] **Equivalent measures.** The TPG agreed with a country consultation statement that the paragraph “Recognition of the equivalence of measures, which may include pest testing methods and diagnostic protocols, by NPPOs can lead to more efficient implementation of systems approaches” was confusing and conflicting with the glossary definition of equivalence of phytosanitary measures.
- [79] **Seeds as a pathway vs seed commodity vs seeds.** In the section on Identification of individual pests or pest groups, the TPG considered a consultation comment proposing to refer to “seed commodity” instead of “seeds as a pathway”. Although noting that the phrase “seeds as pathways” was used in ISPM 38, the TPG recommended to refer simply to “seeds”, as “pathway” was considered redundant.
- [80] **Regulatory actions vs phytosanitary actions.** Following a consultation comment considering the term “regulatory actions” ambiguous, the TPG recommended that “regulatory actions” be replaced with the glossary term “phytosanitary actions” in the section on Measures and critical control points.
- [81] **Growing sites vs places of production vs production sites.** The TPG agreed with the consultation comment proposing to use the glossary term “production site” instead of “growing site”.
- [82] **Certification vs approval.** In the context of “pre-planting – seeds and plant inputs” critical control point (CCP), the TPG agreed to a consultation comment considering “certification of transplant facilities” confusing and suggesting “certification” be replaced by “approval” of transplant facilities.

- [83] **Growing season vs growing period.** The TPG discussed whether, in the context of the “production – pre-harvest” CCP, “growing season” should be replaced by the glossary term “growing period”. One TPG member pointed out that the terms “growing season” and “growing season inspection” were used frequently in ISPM 12 (*Phytosanitary certificates*) and that the term “growing season” had been deleted from the glossary as it did not have a particular meaning in the phytosanitary context. Some other TPG members agreed that “growing period” was a more precise term, as “growing season” did not suit tropical countries and greenhouses. Eventually, the TPG recommended replacing “growing season” with the glossary term “growing period” throughout the draft annex.
- [84] **Potential pests vs regulated pests.** In the context of the responsibility of NPPOs to verify the effectiveness of the measures comprising a systems approach at reducing the pest risk posed by potential pests, the TPG agreed with the consultation comment proposing that “potential pests” be replaced with “regulated pests”.
- [85] **Monitoring vs supervision.** The TPG considered a consultation comment proposing to rename the section on “Monitoring” to “Supervision” as a more accurate heading given the section’s content on verification at several levels of the seed supply chain. However, one TPG member pointed out that, while the term “supervision” could apply to various entities, the glossary term “monitoring” referred solely to NPPOs, which were in fact the bodies monitoring the systems approach to ensure that it was functioning satisfactorily, and NPPOs would not supervise themselves. Moreover, the TPG recalled that ISPMs address NPPOs. Therefore, the TPG disagreed with the proposal of replacing “monitoring” with “supervision”.
- [86] **Parties vs stakeholders vs entities.** The TPG disagreed with a consultation comment proposing that “entities” be replaced with “stakeholders”, as the term “entities”, in this draft annex, referred to the parties authorized to participate in the systems approach and the term was also used in other ISPMs, especially in relation to authorization by NPPOs. The TPG agreed with consultation comment proposing also that “parties” be replaced by “entities” in the section on Reporting and addressing non conformities.
- [87] **Test as a phytosanitary measure and seed quality testing.** The TPG noted that the Spanish translation of the glossary term “test” was “prueba”. However, the term “testing” in “seed quality testing” was not intended as a phytosanitary measure but as an analysis of the quality. One TPG member pointed out that one consultation comment proposed that “quality” be replaced with “health”, as the seed health was linked to the quality of the seed. The TPG concluded that this matter fell outside the scope of the panel, but would consider adding a note in the annotated glossary on this case.
- [88] The TPG:
- (8) *agreed* its recommendations to the first consultation comments on the draft annex *Design and use of systems approaches for phytosanitary certification of seeds* (2018-009) to ISPM 38 (*International movement of seeds*); and
 - (9) *noted* that the TPG recommendations would be transmitted to the steward and SC-7 for consideration.

5.4 Draft phytosanitary treatments (annexes to ISPM 28 (*Phytosanitary treatments for regulated pests*))

5.4.1 Combination of irradiation and modified atmosphere treatment for *Trogoderma granarium* (2023-032)

- [89] Konstantin GREBENNIKOV (Russian Federation) presented the draft TPG recommendations in English for TPG consideration; Beatriz MELCHO (Uruguay), TPG member for the Spanish language, presented the draft recommendations to consultation comments in Spanish and the recommendations on translation of phytosanitary terms.⁷

⁷11_TPG_2024_Nov.

[90] Following the review of the consultation comments on this draft phytosanitary treatment (PT), the TPG agreed that none of them came within the scope of the panel. However, the TPG provided an informal translation of the consultation comments in Spanish for the Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments (TPPT).

[91] The TPG:

- (10) *agreed* that the consultation comments on the draft PT Combination of irradiation and modified atmosphere treatment for *Trogoderma granarium* (2023-032) were outside the scope of the TPG; and
- (11) *requested* that the secretariat transmit the informal translation of consultation comments in Spanish, prepared by the TPG, to the TPPT for consideration.

5.4.2 Irradiation treatment for *Pseudococcus baliteus* (2023-033)

[92] Konstantin GREBENNIKOV (Russian Federation) presented the draft TPG recommendations in English for TPG consideration; Beatriz MELCHO (Uruguay), TPG member for the Spanish language, presented the draft recommendations to consultation comments in Spanish and the recommendations on translation of phytosanitary terms.⁸

[93] Following the review of the consultation comments on this draft PT, the TPG concluded that none of them came within the scope of the panel. However, the TPG provided an informal translation of the consultation comments in Spanish for the TPPT.

[94] The TPG:

- (12) *agreed* that the consultation comments on the draft PT Irradiation treatment for *Pseudococcus baliteus* (2023-033) were outside the scope of the TPG; and
- (13) *requested* that the secretariat transmit the informal translation of consultation comments in Spanish, prepared by the TPG, to the TPPT for consideration.

5.4.3 Irradiation treatment for *Paracoccus marginatus* (2023-034)

[95] Shaza Roushdy OMAR (Egypt) presented the draft TPG recommendations in English for TPG consideration; Beatriz MELCHO (Uruguay), TPG member for the Spanish language presented the draft recommendations to consultation comments in Spanish, and the recommendations on translation of phytosanitary terms.⁹

[96] Following the review of the consultation comments on this draft PT, the TPG concluded that none of them came within the scope of the panel. However, the TPG provided an informal translation of the consultation comments in Spanish for the TPPT.

[97] The TPG:

- (14) *agreed* that the consultation comments on the draft PT Irradiation treatment for *Paracoccus marginatus* (2023-034) were outside the scope of the TPG; and
- (15) *requested* that the secretariat transmit the informal translation of consultation comments in Spanish, prepared by the TPG, to the TPPT for consideration.

5.4.4 Irradiation treatment for *Planococcus lilacinus* (2023-035)

[98] Shaza Roushdy OMAR (Egypt) presented the draft TPG recommendations in English for TPG consideration; Beatriz MELCHO (Uruguay), TPG member for the Spanish language, presented the draft

⁸12_TPG_2024_Nov.

⁹13_TPG_2024_Nov.

recommendations to consultation comments in Spanish and the recommendations on translation of phytosanitary terms.¹⁰

[99] Following the review of the consultation comments on this draft PT, the TPG concluded that none of them came within the scope of the panel. However, the TPG provided an informal translation of the consultation comments in Spanish for the TPPT.

[100] The TPG:

- (16) *agreed* that the consultation comments on the draft PT Irradiation treatment for *Planococcus lilacinus* (2023-035) were outside the scope of the TPG; and
- (17) *requested* that the secretariat transmit the informal translation of consultation comments in Spanish, prepared by the TPG, to the TPPT for consideration.

6. Subjects on the TPG work programme

6.1 Review of the use of “and/or” in adopted ISPMs

[101] The secretariat explained that this was a standard agenda item, being also one of the two current subjects in the TPG’s list of topics. The TPG assistant steward stated that this task had most likely already been carried out for all adopted ISPMs in the past. The TPG steward pointed out that, being included in the *IPPC style guide*, this check should be carried out during the review and editing of draft ISPMs by the copy editor. For these reasons, the TPG noted that there may no longer be a need for it to be on the TPG’s work programme, but concluded a final scrutiny of adopted ISPMs should be carried out.

[102] The TPG:

- (18) *agreed* to carry out a final scrutiny of adopted ISPMs regarding the use of “and/or” before inviting the SC to consider deleting the subject *Review of the use of and/or in adopted ISPMs*” (2010-030) from the *IPPC list of topics for standards*.

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

7.1 Consistency of adopted ISPMs

[103] The secretariat explained that this was a standard agenda item, being one of the tasks of the TPG. This also included the list of proposed or approved ink amendments for ISPMs.

7.2 Proposal of ink amendment to the Spanish version of ISPM 15 regarding the translation of “remanufactured”

[104] Beatriz MELCHO, as one of the TPG members for the Spanish language, had been asked by the secretariat to consider a potential discrepancy in the Spanish translation of ISPM 15 (*Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade*). The discrepancy had come to light during the translation of the IPPC guide *Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade* to Spanish, as the English version of ISPM 15¹¹ used the word “remanufactured” throughout whereas the Spanish version of ISPM 15¹² used “reciclado” rather than “reconstruido” (i.e. “recycled” rather than “remanufactured”). She therefore presented the potential ink amendments to the Spanish version of ISPM 15 that would correct this discrepancy.¹³

¹⁰ 14_TPG_2024_Nov.

¹¹ ISPM 15. *Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade*.

<https://openknowledge.fao.org/server/api/core/bitstreams/1c3586f8-1433-4239-a997-cf8e8d34fb97/content>

¹² NIMF 15. *Reglamentación del embalaje de madera utilizado en el comercio internacional*.

<https://openknowledge.fao.org/server/api/core/bitstreams/4abe51d1-bc23-4905-a06a-77e5091b1295/content>

¹³ 15_TPG_2024_Nov.

[105] Furthermore, the TPG member for the Spanish language proposed that “punto de ingreso” be replaced with the appropriate translation of “point of entry” in Spanish as defined in ISPM 5, which is “punto de entrada”.

[106] The TPG:

- (19) *agreed* with the proposed translation consistency changes to be applied as ink amendments to the Spanish version of ISPM 15 (*Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade*) (Appendix 4); and
- (20) *agreed* to submit these translation consistency changes as ink amendments (Appendix 4) to the SC for approval for submission to CPM-20 (2026) for noting.

7.3 Proposal of deletion of the term “plant protection organization (national)” from the glossary

[107] The TPG assistant steward presented the paper on the proposed deletion of the term “plant protection organization (national)”.¹⁴ The TPG noted that the SC, in May 2024, had agreed in principle with the deletion of this term, as the definition was simply a cross-reference to the term “national plant protection organization” and hence did not add any value. However, the SC had recognized that it would first be necessary to confirm whether the term appeared in any adopted ISPM and, subsequently, the SC would consider whether the deletion would need to proceed through the usual process (i.e. being submitted for consultation) or whether it could be implemented as an ink amendment given that the definition was only a cross-reference.

[108] The TPG confirmed that the term “plant protection organization (national)” did not appear in the text of the IPPC nor in any ISPM, with no prospect of ever being used in future; only the synonymous term “national plant protection organization” (or its abbreviation “NPPO”) was used. Moreover, the definition of “plant protection organization (national)” simply referred to the definition of “national plant protection organization”. Therefore, the TPG recommended that the term “plant protection organization (national)” be deleted through an ink amendment in order to save time and resources.

[109] The TPG:

- (21) *recommended* to the SC that the term “plant protection organization (national)” be deleted by means of an ink amendment and that this proposed deletion be presented to CPM-20 (2026) for noting.

8. Explanation of glossary terms

8.1 Annotated glossary: 2025 intermediate version

[110] The lead, Beatriz MELCHO (Uruguay), presented the draft of the updated *Explanatory document on ISPM 5* (also known as the “annotated glossary”) as the 2025 intermediate version,¹⁵ following the decisions taken by CPM-18 (2024). In particular, the updates included the addition of the definitions of “general surveillance” and “specific surveillance”, and the revision of the definitions of “surveillance”, “phytosanitary action”, “phytosanitary procedure”, “release (of a consignment)”, “inspection” and “test”.

[111] The TPG assistant steward presented some proposals for amendments to the annotated glossary.¹⁶ The TPG reviewed these proposals, together with suggestions made in the meeting, and agreed on the following changes to the annotated glossary.

[112] **Inspection.** With the revision of the definition of the term “inspection” adopted by CPM-18 (2024), the TPG revised the existing note to mention that the term “conformity”, included with the revision, allowed

¹⁴ 16_TPG_2024_Nov.

¹⁵ 17_TPG_2024_Nov.

¹⁶ 18_TPG_2024_Nov.

for a broader scope than “compliance”, which related to consignments only. Yet, inspection may be an element of a compliance procedure, as spelled out in the definition of that term.

- [113] **Pest record.** The TPG agreed to add a note to clarify that a pest record was not necessarily official (i.e. it may derive from various non-official or official sources) and that the wording “within an area” excluded information on pest interceptions with imported consignments from the definition.
- [114] **Pest risk management (for quarantine pests).** The TPG agreed to a proposal to clarify that pest risk management did not refer to implementation of phytosanitary measures and neither to agricultural practices with which pest risk management might sometimes be confused. However, one TPG member proposed that the text refer to “pest management practices”, whereas the TPG eventually agreed that “pest management” was the appropriate term instead of “agricultural practices”.
- [115] **Release (of a consignment).** The TPG agreed to add a note that “release” (of a consignment) had a meaning specific to the IPPC domain and distinct from other possible uses by other authorities and entities, being linked to a consignment and being an action subsequent to the completion of a compliance procedure (which was an official process). Moreover, although “(of a consignment)” was redundant, it differentiated the term from the other glossary-defined term “release (into the environment)”.
- [116] **Surveillance.** Although the TPG noted the challenge in providing a sufficiently explanatory definition of “surveillance” being an encompassing, complex and mandatory activity for NPPOs, they agreed to add a note to clarify that the revised definition of surveillance primarily referred to the surveillance components of “general surveillance” and “specific surveillance”, both recently defined in ISPM 5, and their relationship.
- [117] **Test.** The TPG agreed to add a note that the revised definition of “test” used the wording “other than inspection” (replacing the former “other than visual”) to highlight the distinction between the concepts of “test” and “inspection”. This difference was underlined in the definition by the inclusion of a list of non-exhaustive examples of types of methods (e.g. chemical, molecular or serological characterization) that could be used for tests. Moreover, the use of the term “conformity” allowed for a broader scope than the previously used term “compliance”, which related only to consignments. Lastly, “test” may be an element of a compliance procedure.
- [118] **Note 10.** The TPG considered a proposal to revise Note 10, currently on “actions and measures”, to encompass “phytosanitary action, phytosanitary measure, phytosanitary procedure, emergency action and emergency measure”, taking into account the added and revised terms contained in the 2022 amendments to ISPM 5 adopted by CPM-18 (2024). The TPG agreed to add notes to explain the terms listed above, their differences and relationships, and to clarify the role of the NPPOs of importing and exporting countries as well as the obligations under the SPS Agreement, in particular for emergency cases.
- [119] **Note 12.** The TPG agreed to include the term “test” in the note to explain the difference between “inspection” and “test”.
- [120] **Note 16.** The TPG agreed to revise the note to explain the difference between “pest record”, “pest report” and “pest status”. Referring to ISPM 8 and ISPM 17 (*Pest reporting*), the TPG underlined the importance of proper documentation and verification of the information contained in pest records by NPPOs, as they derived from official and non-official sources, and that the determination of pest status (presence or absence) in an area had to be based on a properly conducted evaluation by the NPPO; both activities were mandatory for NPPOs.
- [121] **Phytosanitary legislation.** The TPG assistant steward presented a discussion paper on phytosanitary legislation and related terms¹⁷ to raise the question of whether further explanation on these terms was needed in the annotated glossary.

¹⁷19_TPG_2024_Nov.

- [122] The TPG assistant steward underlined the importance of the concept of “phytosanitary legislation”, which was defined in ISPM 5 as “basic laws granting legal authority to a national plant protection organization from which phytosanitary regulations may be drafted” and was mentioned in the text of the IPPC. At the same time, the TPG assistant steward pointed out that the term “phytosanitary legislation” was not an illustrative term itself. For these reasons, the TPG agreed to review the current note to clarify the rationale for having a definition of “phytosanitary legislation” and added that the term was clearly distinct from, and linked to, phytosanitary regulation.
- [123] Then, the TPG assistant steward analysed the relationship between “phytosanitary measure” and “phytosanitary regulation” and pointed out that the difference and relation between the two concepts was rather unclear considering their definitions in ISPM 5. The term “phytosanitary measure” had probably been chosen in 1997 with the review of the text of the IPPC to reflect the terminology of the SPS Agreement, which frequently used the term “measure”. The current definition of “phytosanitary measure” in ISPM 5, which was an agreed interpretation of the Interim Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (ICPM) in 2002, referred to any “legislation, regulation or official procedure having the purpose to prevent the introduction or spread of quarantine pests, or to limit the economic impact of regulated non-quarantine pests”, notably without qualifying the three terms as “phytosanitary” and thus not linking to the glossary terms “phytosanitary legislation” nor to “phytosanitary regulation”. Therefore, while the term itself was clear, the concept and the definition were not. On the other hand, although the concept and the term “phytosanitary regulation” were clear, its definition still lacked the wording to clarify the distinction and relation with “phytosanitary measures”. The TPG assistant steward noted that such unclarity with the existing definitions could not be thoroughly considered or resolved without a revision of the text of the IPPC. The TPG assistant steward concluded that the revision of “phytosanitary action” – and “phytosanitary procedure” being linked to it – had helped to improve clarification of those two terms, as the definition provided a clear distinction and relation to phytosanitary measure. The TPG agreed to amend the note related to the term “phytosanitary legislation” in the annotated glossary as a consequence of the TPG assistant steward’s analysis.
- [124] The secretariat confirmed that they would provide the lead, Beatriz MELCHO (Uruguay), with the version of the annotated glossary as modified at this meeting, to be updated as and when relevant changes occurred (e.g. decisions of the CPM or SC).
- [125] The TPG discussed when the new annotated glossary should be published given the significant volume of changes and updates. The secretariat explained that usually the annotated glossary was published every two to three years, with an intermediate version reviewed every year for internal use. The TPG agreed that the version as modified during this TPG meeting be submitted for approval to the SC in May 2025 for publication.
- [126] The TPG:
- (22) *agreed* to submit the 2025 intermediate version of the annotated glossary for approval to the SC in May 2025 for publication, given the significant volume of changes implemented.

8.2 Proposals for amendments to section 7.2 “General recommendations on use of terms in ISPMs” of the *IPPC style guide* and to the *TPG tools and guidance document*

General recommendations on use of terms in ISPMs

- [127] The TPG assistant steward introduced the papers.¹⁸
- [128] **Pest incidence, pest prevalence, pest level and pest-population density.** The TPG assistant steward proposed to include in the “General recommendations on use of terms in ISPMs” contained in the *IPPC style guide* the following recommendation on the use of the terms “pest incidence”, “pest prevalence”, “pest level” and “pest-population density” that refer to the same concept. The TPG assistant steward

¹⁸ 20_TPG_2024_Nov; 21_TPG_2024_Nov; 22_TPG_2024_Nov.

suggested that, while “pest level” and “pest-population density” should be avoided, “pest incidence” and “pest prevalence” could be used in ISPMs, noting that “pest prevalence” was not defined in the glossary and “incidence (of a pest)” had been removed from ISPM 5 in 2022 because of a lack of consensus over whether “prevalence” would make a more appropriate term for the same concept. Although one TPG member proposed not to refer to “pest prevalence”, the TPG assistant steward pointed out that the term was still used and that the SC had discussed the matter and had not agreed with one term or the other and therefore both “pest incidence” and “pest prevalence” could be used.

[129] **Pest pressure and infestation rate.** The TPG assistant steward raised the use of the terms “pest pressure” and “infestation rate” in the draft ISPMs submitted for first consultation and proposed that the TPG consider “pest pressure” and “infestation rate” as terms that should be avoided as well. Following an intervention of one TPG member, stating that the term “pest pressure” was rarely used and might convey a slightly different meaning, the TPG agreed to add only “infestation rate” as a term that should be avoided alongside “pest level” and “pest-population density”.

[130] **Phytosanitary security and security.** The TPG agreed with the proposal of the TPG assistant steward to refer to the glossary-defined term “phytosanitary security” only when the matter was related to “consignment”. The full term should be used when appropriate.

[131] The TPG reviewed the “General recommendations on use of terms in ISPMs” and applied other minor amendments to improve clarity and consistency.

[132] **Document *TPG tools and guidance*.** The TPG updated the document *TPG tools and guidance*, which lists useful documents and links for TPG members, for internal use.

[133] The TPG:

- (23) *requested* that the secretariat include the updated “General recommendations on use of terms in ISPMs” in the next update of the *IPPC style guide*; and
- (24) *requested* that the secretariat upload the document *TPG tools and guidance* as modified at this meeting to the TPG’s restricted work area.

9. TPG workplan

9.1 TPG workplan for 2025–2026

[134] The TPG updated its workplan for 2025–2026 (Appendix 5) to be presented to the SC meeting in May 2025.

[135] The TPG:

- (25) *agreed* to the TPG workplan 2025–2026 as modified during this meeting; and
- (26) *invited* the SC to note the TPG workplan for 2025–2026 (Appendix 5).

10. Any other business

10.1 Guidelines on the standing TPG task on “Addressing TPG-related comments on draft ISPMs submitted for first consultation”

[136] The TPG assistant steward introduced the paper.¹⁹

[137] The TPG discussed how to further improve the internal method the TPG used to address the consultation comments on draft ISPMs submitted for first consultation that were relevant to TPG, in particular the preparation and the finalization of the output table with the TPG recommendations to the stewards and technical panels responsible for the said draft ISPM.

¹⁹23_TPG_2024_Nov.

10.2 Membership renewal

- [138] The secretariat informed the TPG that Ebbe NORDBO's term as English language expert for the TPG would finish at the end of 2024.
- [139] Ebbe NORDBO confirmed his willingness to continue as an English language expert for the TPG and informed the secretariat that his RPPO supported him.
- [140] The secretariat invited the TPG to discuss whether they would recommend to the SC that his term be renewed for a five-year period beginning from 2025 and they agreed.
- [141] The TPG:
- (27) *recommended* to the SC that the membership of Ebbe NORDBO (Denmark) as English language expert for the TPG be renewed for a five-year period beginning from 2025.

10.3 Translation issues arising from the meeting with FAO Translation groups

10.3.1 Temperature treatment, heat treatment and cold treatment

- [142] Following the meeting with the FAO Translation groups, Laurence BOUHOT-DELDUC (France), French language expert for the TPG, raised an issue around the translation of the term "temperature treatment", which was not included in the glossary and had been translated into French as "traitement thermique" in ISPM 42 (*Requirements for the use of temperature treatments as phytosanitary measures/Exigences pour l'utilisation de traitements thermiques com mesure phytosanitaire*). However, "traitement thermique" was the French translation of the glossary term "heat treatment", which had been translated as "traitement par la chaleur" in ISPM 42 with "cold treatment" being translated in parallel in ISPM 42 as "traitement par le froid". Hence, the French term "traitement thermique" was being used both for "heat treatment"(in ISPM 5 and annexes to ISPM 28, e.g. PT 21) and "temperature treatment" (in ISPM 42), which was inconsistent and confusing.
- [143] The TPG noted that the French translation of "temperature treatment" with "traitement thermique" was problematic, because "traitement thermique" was a French translation for "heat treatment" and temperature treatments included not only heat treatments but also cold treatments. The TPG agreed, therefore, that the French language expert for the TPG would propose, through a discussion paper at the 2025 TPG meeting, that the French translations of the term "temperature treatment" and the glossary term "heat treatment" be modified by means of ink amendments to avoid inconsistencies and ambiguities in the French versions of ISPMs.
- [144] One of the Spanish language experts for the TPG pointed out that the Spanish term "tratamiento térmico" was also being used both for "heat treatment" (in annexes to ISPM 28, e.g. PT 21) and for "temperature treatment" (in ISPM 42).
- [145] With regard to the English language, the TPG noted that only the term "heat treatment" was defined in the glossary, whereas the meaning of the term "temperature treatment" could benefit from clarification, as temperature treatments could be understood to cover heat treatments only and not cold treatments as well. Consequently, the TPG concluded it would be beneficial to discuss the terms "temperature treatment", "heat treatment" and "cold treatment" at its next meeting and therefore suggested that the SC consider adding these three terms to the TPG work programme.
- [146] The TPG:
- (28) *invited* the SC to consider the addition of the terms "temperature treatment" and "cold treatment" and the revision of the term "heat treatment" to the TPG's work programme to improve clarity and consistency among these terms.

10.3.2 “Monitoring” and “surveillance” in Chinese and inclusion of English terms in language versions of ISPM 5

[147] The Chinese language expert for the TPG, Xuemei JI (Australia), highlighted another translation issue following the meeting with the FAO Translation Group for Chinese: the terms “monitoring” and “surveillance” were currently covered by the same word in Chinese. The TPG noted some proposals, such as the inclusion of a footnote in the glossary to clarify the distinction between the definitions of the two terms, the addition of an example in the definitions and the addition of the respective terms translated in English in brackets. Based on the third proposal, the TPG discussed the inclusion of an additional column in the glossary in Chinese, French, Russian and Spanish to indicate the English translation of the term as was already done in the Arabic version of ISPM 5, where the terms followed the order of the English alphabet. The Chinese language expert for the TPG explained that the Chinese version of ISPM 5 followed the order of the English version as well, making it a potential viable solution. For the versions of ISPM 5 in French, Russian and Spanish, the alphabetical order of the language would be retained and the relative English term added next to it. The TPG requested that the secretariat investigate this solution.

[148] The TPG:

(29) *requested* that the secretariat investigate the possibility of including a column in the language versions of ISPM 5 indicating the respective term in English.

11. Date and type of the next TPG meeting

[149] The next meeting of the TPG is tentatively scheduled for 24–28 November 2025 with the venue tentatively agreed as FAO headquarters in Rome, Italy.

12. Evaluation of the meeting

[150] The chairperson encouraged all TPG members to complete the evaluation of the meeting via the link provided on the agenda for this meeting.

13. Close of the meeting

[151] On behalf of the secretariat, Avetik NERSISYAN thanked the participants for their commitment and work and reminded them of the importance of completing the feedback survey to suggest improvements.

[152] The TPG chairperson thanked all participants for their contributions and closed the meeting.

Appendix 1: Agenda

	Agenda Item	Document No.	Presenter
1.	Opening of the Meeting		Nersisyan
1.1	Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat		Nersisyan
2.	Meeting Arrangements		Nersisyan
2.1	Election of the Chairperson		Nersisyan
2.2	Election of the Rapporteur		Chairperson
2.3	Adoption of the Agenda	01_TPG_2024_Nov	Chairperson
2.4	Current specification: TP 5 (TPG) (2016) [Posted June 2016 in three languages]	Link to TP 5	Torella
3.	Administrative Matters		Chairperson
3.1	Documents list	02_TPG_2024_Nov	Torella
3.2	Participants list	03_TPG_2024_Nov TPG membership list	Torella
3.3	Local information	04_TPG_2024_Nov	Torella
4.	Updates and Reports		Chairperson
4.1	Previous meeting report of the TPG (December 2023)	December 2023 TPG Meeting Report	C.P. Da Silva / Nordbo
4.2	Extracts from other meeting reports of relevance to the TPG	05_TPG_2024_Nov	Torella
4.3	Updates from the IPPC Secretariat to the TPG	06_TPG_2024_Nov	Torella
5.	Addressing TPG-related comments on draft ISPMs submitted to the first consultation in 2024 (1 July-30 September). 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 SC-7 (May 2025). Draft answers to compiled comments proposed by the TPG members.		Chairperson
5.1	Draft annex Field inspection (2021-018) to ISPM 23 (Guidelines for inspection) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Review of TPG-related compiled comments (2021-018) - Corrigendum & addendum to the TPG-related compiled comments (2021-018) 	2021-018 07_TPG_2024_Nov 08_TPG_2024_Nov	Nordbo
5.2	Draft revision of ISPM 26 (Establishment and maintenance of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)) (2021-010) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Review of TPG-related compiled comments (2021-010) 	2021-010 09_TPG_2024_Nov	Ji
5.3	Draft annex Design and use of systems approaches for phytosanitary certification of seeds (2018-009) to ISPM 38 (International movement of seeds) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Review of TPG-related compiled comments (2018-009) 	2018-009 10_TPG_2024_Nov	Koech

	Agenda Item	Document No.	Presenter
5.4	Draft PTs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Draft annex to ISPM 28: Combination of Irradiation and Modified Atmosphere Treatment for <i>Trogoderma granarium</i> (2023-032) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Review of TPG-related compiled comments (2023-032) - Draft annex to ISPM 28: Irradiation treatment for <i>Pseudococcus baliteus</i> (2023-033) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Review of TPG-related compiled comments (2023-033) - Draft annex to ISPM 28: Irradiation treatment for <i>Paracoccus marginatus</i> (2023-034) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Review of TPG-related compiled comments (2023-034) - Draft annex to ISPM 28: Irradiation treatment for <i>Planococcus lilacinus</i> (2023-035) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Review of TPG-related compiled comments (2023-035) 	2023-032 11_TPG_2024_Nov 2023-033 12_TPG_2024_Nov 2023-034 13_TPG_2024_Nov 2023-035 14_TPG_2024_Nov	Grebennikov Grebennikov Omar Omar
6.	Subjects on the TPG work programme Proposals for new or revised terms/definitions will be compiled into new draft Amendments to ISPM 5 Glossary of phytosanitary terms, to be submitted to the SC in May 2025.		Chairperson
6.1	Review of the use of and/or in adopted ISPMs		All
7.	Review of adopted ISPMs for consistency of terms and style		Chairperson
7.1	Consistency of adopted ISPMs (standard by standard): List of proposed or approved ink amendments for ISPMs	List of proposed or approved ink amendments for ISPMs	Torella
7.2	Proposal of ink amendments to the Spanish version of ISPM 15 regarding the translation of the term “remanufactured”	15_TPG_2024_Nov	Melcho
7.3	Proposal of deletion of the term “Plant protection organization (national)” from the Glossary	16_TPG_2024_Nov	Nordbo
8	Explanation of Glossary terms Standing agenda item for TPG meetings. Members identify before the meeting some glossary terms/definitions requiring further explanations. These terms/definitions will be discussed during the TPG meeting and the need for additional explanations (e.g., in the annotated glossary) discussed.		Chairperson

	Agenda Item	Document No.	Presenter
8.1	Annotated glossary: 2025 intermediate version [The annotated glossary was finalized and published in 2024. The TPG considers yearly which amendments need to be made and produces an intermediate version] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Proposals for amendments to the 2024 version of the Explanatory document on ISPM 5 (Annotated glossary) - Phytosanitary legislation and related terms 	17_TPG_2024_Nov Annotated glossary (2024 version) 18_TPG_2024_Nov 19_TPG_2024_Nov	Melcho Nordbo Nordbo
8.2	Proposals for amendments to section 7.2 “General recommendations on use of terms in ISPMs” of the IPPC Style guide and to “TPG Tools and guidance” document <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - IPPC Style guide’s section 7.2 “General recommendations on use of terms in ISPMs” - TPG Tools and guidance 	20_TPG_2024_Nov 21_TPG_2024_Nov 22_TPG_2024_Nov	Nordbo
9.	TPG Work Plan		Chairperson
9.1	TPG work plan for 2025-2026 <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 2025 for noting]</i>	To be prepared during the meeting TPG work plan 2024-2025 (restricted work area: login required)	Torella
10.	Any other business		Chairperson
10.1	Guidelines on the standing TPG task on “Addressing TPG-related comments on draft ISPMs submitted for first consultation”	23_TPG_2024_Nov	Nordbo
11.	Date and Venue of the Next Meeting		Chairperson
12.	Evaluation of the meeting	Survey link	Chairperson
13.	Close of the Meeting		Chairperson

Appendix 2: Documents list

Document no.	Agenda item	Document title	Date posted / updated
Meeting documents			
01_TPG_2024_Nov	2.3	Provisional agenda	1 st version: 2024-11-13 2 nd version: 2024-11-22
02_TPG_2024_Nov	3.1	Documents list	2024-11-22
03_TPG_2024_Nov	3.2	Participants list	2024-11-13
04_TPG_2024_Nov	3.3	Local information	2024-11-13
05_TPG_2024_Nov	4.2	Extracts from other meeting reports of relevance to the TPG	2024-11-13
06_TPG_2024_Nov	4.3	Updates from the IPPC Secretariat to the TPG	2024-11-13
07_TPG_2024_Nov	5.1	Draft annex to ISPM 23 - Review of TPG-related compiled comments (2021-018)	2024-11-13
08_TPG_2024_Nov	5.1	Corrigendum & addendum to the TPG-related compiled comments (2021-018)	2024-11-13
09_TPG_2024_Nov	5.2	Draft revision ISPM 26 - Review of TPG-related compiled comments (2021-010)	2024-11-13
10_TPG_2024_Nov	5.3	Draft annex to ISPM 38 - Review of TPG-related compiled comments (2018-009)	2024-11-13
11_TPG_2024_Nov	5.4	Draft annex to ISPM 28 - Review of TPG-related compiled comments (2023-032)	2024-11-13
12_TPG_2024_Nov	5.4	Draft annex to ISPM 28 - Review of TPG-related compiled comments (2023-033)	2024-11-13
13_TPG_2024_Nov	5.4	Draft annex to ISPM 28 - Review of TPG-related compiled comments (2023-034)	2024-11-13
14_TPG_2024_Nov	5.4	Draft annex to ISPM 28 - Review of TPG-related compiled comments (2023-035)	2024-11-13
15_TPG_2024_Nov	7.2	Proposal of ink amendment to the Spanish version of ISPM 15 regarding the translation of the term “remanufactured”	2024-11-13
16_TPG_2024_Nov	7.3	Proposal of deletion of the term “Plant protection organization (national)” from the Glossary	2024-11-13
17_TPG_2024_Nov	8.1	Annotated glossary: 2025 intermediate version	2024-11-13
18_TPG_2024_Nov	8.1	Proposals for amendments to the 2024 version of the Explanatory document on ISPM 5 (Annotated glossary)	2024-11-13
19_TPG_2024_Nov	8.1	Phytosanitary legislation and related terms	2024-11-13
20_TPG_2024_Nov	8.2	Proposals for amendments to section 7.2 “General recommendations on use of terms in ISPMs” of the IPPC Style guide and to “TPG Tools and guidance” document	2024-11-13
21_TPG_2024_Nov	8.2	IPPC Style guide’s section 7.2 “General recommendations on use of terms in ISPMs”	2024-11-13
22_TPG_2024_Nov	8.2	TPG Tools and guidance	2024-11-13
23_TPG_2024_Nov	10.1	Guidelines on the standing TPG task on “Addressing TPG-related comments on draft ISPMs submitted for first consultation”	2024-11-22

Document links (presented in the order of the agenda items)

Links	Agenda item	Document link
TP 5	2.4	Link to TP 5
TPG membership list	3.2	TPG membership list
Previous meeting report of the TPG	4.1	December 2023 TPG Meeting Report (Fortaleza, Brazil)
Draft annex <i>Field inspection</i> (2021-018) to ISPM 23 (<i>Guidelines for inspection</i>)	5.1	2021-018
Draft revision of ISPM 26 (<i>Establishment and maintenance of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)</i>) (2021-010)	5.2	2021-010
Draft annex <i>Design and use of systems approaches for phytosanitary certification of seeds</i> (2018-009) to ISPM 38 (<i>International movement of seeds</i>)	5.3	2018-009
Draft annex to ISPM 28: Combination of Irradiation and Modified Atmosphere Treatment for <i>Trogoderma granarium</i> (2023-032)	5.4	2023-032
Draft annex to ISPM 28: Irradiation treatment for <i>Pseudococcus baliteus</i> (2023-033)	5.4	2023-033
Draft annex to ISPM 28: Irradiation treatment for <i>Paracoccus marginatus</i> (2023-034)	5.4	2023-034
Draft annex to ISPM 28: Irradiation treatment for <i>Planococcus lilacinus</i> (2023-35)	5.4	2023-035
List of proposed or approved ink amendments for ISPMs	7.1	List of proposed or approved ink amendments for ISPMs
Annotated glossary: 2024 version	8.1	Annotated Glossary 2024 version
TPG work plan 2024-2025	9.1	TPG work plan 2024-2025
Evaluation of the meeting	12	Survey link

Appendix 3: Participants list

	Participants details			TPG member's term	
	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Participant role	Email address	begins	ends
✓	Mr André Felipe C. P. da SILVA Federal Inspector Quarantine Division Ministry of Agriculture, Live Stock and Food Supply BRAZIL Tel: (61) 3218-2925	Steward	andre.peralta@agro.gov.br	May 2024	
✓	Ms Laurence BOUHOT-DELDUC Ministry of Agriculture and Food, General directorate for food Europe, international and integrated risk management division 251 rue de Vaugirard 75732 Paris Cedex 15 FRANCE Mobile: +33 6 75 31 70 45	French	laurence.bouhot-delduc@agriculture.gouv.fr (active until September 2025) laurence.delduc@free.fr (send messages to both addresses until the end of September 2025)	2024	2028 (1 st term: 2014 - 2018) (2 nd term: 2019 - 2023)
✓	Ms Asenath Abigael KOECH Pest Risk Analysis expert/Plant health inspector Kenya Plant Health Inspectorate Service (KEPHIS) KEPHIS Headquarters OLOOLUA RIDGE, KAREN P.O. BOX 49592-00100, NAIROBI, KENYA Mobile: +254 -722973535 Office: +254 – 709891110 Fax: +254 -020 3536175	English	akoech@kephis.org ; abigakoecho@gmail.com	2022	2026 (1 st term: 2017 - 2021)
✓	Ms Beatriz MELCHO Ministry of Livestock, Agriculture and Fisheries, General Direction of Agricultural Services, Plant Protection Division Avda. Millan 4703 CP 12900 Montevideo, URUGUAY Tel: (+598) 2 309 8410 ext 267	Spanish	bmelcho@mgap.gub.uy beatrizmelcho@gmail.com bemelcho@hotmail.com	2021	2025 (1 st term: 2011 - 2015) (2 nd term: 2016 - 2020)
✓	Ms Xuemei JI Assistant Director, Tropical Horticulture Plant Sciences and Risk Assessment Biosecurity Plant Division Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry AUSTRALIA Tel: +61 2 6272 5906 Mob: +61 412 418 490	Chinese	xuemei.ji@aff.gov.au	2022	2026

	Participants details			TPG member's term	
	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Participant role	Email address	begins	ends
✓	Mr Ebbe NORDBO DENMARK Mobile: (+45) 28740095	English	ebbenordbo@outlook.com	2020	2024 (1 st term: 2009 - 2014) (2 nd term: 2015 - 2019)
✓	Ms Shaza Roushdy OMAR 8 Kamal El-Din Salah street Garden City, Cairo EGYPT Mobile: (+20) 227972454 Fax: (+20)227963989	Arabic	shaza.roshdy@gmail.com	2023	2027 (1 st term: 2012 - 2017) (2 nd term: 2018 - 2022)
✓	Mr Konstantin GREBENNIKOV Senior researcher, deputy head of the scientific- methodological and experimental center of FGBU "VNIKR" 140150, Moscow Region, Ramenskoye, Bykovo, Pogranichnaya str. 32 RUSSIAN FEDERATION Tel.: +74997072227 (ext.1669)	Russian	kgrebennikov@gmail.com	2021	2025
✓	Ms Patricia Raquel CARUA GUAIGUA 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 ECUADOR Tel. +593984637218	Spanish	patriciarauelc8@gmail.com	2023	2027

IPPC Secretariat		
	Name	Email address
✓	Mr Avetik NERSISYAN Standard Setting Unit Lead	Avetik.Nersisyan@fao.org
✓	Mr Daniel Lorenzo TORELLA Phytosanitary Standard Setting Support Specialist	Daniel.torella@fao.org
✓	Ms Colleen STIRLING Standard Setting Specialist	colleen.stirling@fao.org
✓	Ms Aixa DEL GRECO Standard Setting Associate	Aixa.DelGreco@fao.org

Appendix 4: Translation consistency changes as ink amendments to the Spanish translation of ISPM 15 (*Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade*)

Section / Para	ISPM 15 (English)	Current text (Spanish)	Proposed text	Rationale
Outline of Requirements / Perfil de los requisitos	[...] Specific requirements apply to wood packaging material that is repaired or remanufactured . [...]	[...] Al embalaje de madera que se repare o recicle se aplicarán requisitos específicos. [...]	[...] Al embalaje de madera que se repare o recicle reconstruya se aplicarán requisitos específicos. [...]	The appropriate translation in Spanish of the English term “remanufactured” is “reconstruido” rather than “reciclado”.
1. Basis for Regulation / 1. Fundamento para la reglamentación	[...] Furthermore, wood packaging material is very often reused, repaired or remanufactured (as described in section 4.3). [...]	[...] Además, el embalaje de madera es muy a menudo reutilizado, reparado o reciclado (según se describe en el apartado 4.3). [...]	[...] Además, el embalaje de madera es muy a menudo reutilizado, reparado o reciclado reconstruido (según se describe en el apartado 4.3). [...]	The appropriate translation in Spanish of the English term “remanufactured” is “reconstruido” rather than “reciclado”.
3.1 Approved phytosanitary measures / 3.1 Medidas fitosanitarias aprobadas	[...]The internationally recognized, non-language-specific mark facilitates identification of treated wood packaging material during inspection prior to export, at the point of entry, or elsewhere. [...]	[...]Una marca reconocida internacionalmente e igual para todos los idiomas facilita la identificación del embalaje de madera tratado durante la inspección previa a la exportación, en el punto de ingreso o en cualquier otro lugar. [...]	[...]Una marca reconocida internacionalmente e igual para todos los idiomas facilita la identificación del embalaje de madera tratado durante la inspección previa a la exportación, en el punto de ingreso entrada o en cualquier otro lugar. [...]	“Punto de entrada” is the Spanish translation for the Glossary term “point of entry”.
4.3 Treatment and marking requirements for wood packaging material that is reused, repaired or remanufactured	4.3 Treatment and marking requirements for wood packaging material that is reused, repaired or remanufactured	4.3 Requisitos de tratamiento y marcado para el embalaje de madera que se reutiliza, repara o recicla	4.3 Requisitos de tratamiento y marcado para el embalaje de madera que se reutiliza, repara o reciclareconstruye	The appropriate translation in Spanish of the English term “remanufactured” is “reconstruido” rather than “reciclado”.
4.3 Treatment and marking requirements for wood packaging material that is reused, repaired or remanufactured /	NPPOs of countries where wood packaging material that bears the mark described in Annex 2 is repaired or remanufactured have responsibility for ensuring and verifying that systems	Las ONPF de países donde se haya reparado o reciclado embalaje de madera que lleve la marca descrita en el Anexo 2 tienen la obligación de asegurar y verificar que los sistemas relacionados con la exportación de dicho embalaje de	Las ONPF de países donde se haya reparado o reciclado reconstruido embalaje de madera que lleve la marca descrita en el Anexo 2 tienen la obligación de asegurar y verificar que los sistemas relacionados con la	The appropriate translation in Spanish of the English term “remanufactured” is “reconstruido” rather than “reciclado”.

<p>4.3 Requisitos de tratamiento y marcado para el embalaje de madera que se reutiliza, repara o recicla</p>	<p>related to export of such wood packaging material comply fully with this standard.</p>	<p>madera cumplan plenamente con esta norma.</p>	<p>exportación de dicho embalaje de madera cumplan plenamente con esta norma.</p>	
<p>4.3.1 Reuse of wood packaging material / 4.3.1 Reutilización del embalaje de madera</p>	<p>A unit of wood packaging material that has been treated and marked in accordance with this standard and that has not been repaired, remanufactured or otherwise altered does not require re-treatment or reapplication of the mark throughout the service life of the unit.</p>	<p>Si una unidad de embalaje de madera que ha recibido tratamiento y se ha marcado en conformidad con esta norma no ha sido reparada, reciclada o alterada de alguna otra forma, no será necesario que reciba nuevo tratamiento o marcado durante la vida útil de la unidad.</p>	<p>Si una unidad de embalaje de madera que ha recibido tratamiento y se ha marcado en conformidad con esta norma no ha sido reparada, recicladareconstruida o alterada de alguna otra forma, no será necesario que reciba nuevo tratamiento o marcado durante la vida útil de la unidad.</p>	<p>The appropriate translation in Spanish of the English term “remanufactured” is “reconstruido” rather than “reciclado”.</p>
<p>4.3.3 Remanufactured wood packaging material</p>	<p>4.3.3 Remanufactured wood packaging material</p>	<p>4.3.3 Embalaje de madera reciclado</p>	<p>4.3.3 Embalaje de madera recicladoreconstruido</p>	<p>The appropriate translation in Spanish of the English term “remanufactured” is “reconstruido” rather than “reciclado”.</p>
<p>4.3.3 Remanufactured wood packaging material / 4.3.3 Embalaje de madera reciclado</p>	<p>If a unit of wood packaging material has had more than approximately one third of its components replaced, the unit is considered to be remanufactured. In this process, various components (with additional reworking if necessary) may be combined and then reassembled into further wood packaging material. Remanufactured wood packaging material may therefore incorporate both new and previously used components. Remanufactured wood packaging material must have</p>	<p>Si se reemplaza más de un tercio, aproximadamente, de los componentes de una unidad de embalaje de madera se considerará que la unidad se ha reciclado. En este proceso se podrán combinar y volver a armar varios elementos (con adaptaciones adicionales, de ser necesario) para formar otro embalaje de madera. El reciclado del embalaje de madera podrá, por consiguiente, incluir tanto elementos nuevos como utilizados anteriormente. En el embalaje de madera reciclado debe obliterarse en forma permanente toda aplicación anterior de la marca (por ejemplo, cubriéndola con pintura o esmerilándola).</p>	<p>Si se reemplaza más de un tercio, aproximadamente, de los componentes de una unidad de embalaje de madera se considerará que la unidad se ha recicladoreconstruido. En este proceso se podrán combinar y volver a armar varios elementos (con adaptaciones adicionales, de ser necesario) para formar otro embalaje de madera. El recicladomaterial del embalaje de madera reconstruido podrá, por consiguiente, incluir tanto elementos nuevos como utilizados anteriormente. En el embalaje de madera recicladoreconstruido se deben obliterarse en forma permanente todas las aplicaciones en anteriores de la marca (por</p>	<p>The appropriate translation in Spanish of the English term “remanufactured” is “reconstruido” rather than “reciclado”.</p>

	<p>any previous applications of the mark permanently obliterated (e.g. by covering with paint or grinding).</p> <p>Remanufactured wood packaging material must be re-treated and the mark must then be applied anew in accordance with this standard.</p>	<p>El embalaje de madera reciclado debe recibir tratamiento nuevamente y luego debe aplicarse otra vez la marca en conformidad con esta norma.</p>	<p>ejemplo, cubriéndola<u>s</u> con pintura o esmerilándola).</p> <p>El embalaje de madera recicladoreconstruido debe recibir tratamiento nuevamente y luego se debe aplicarse<u>se</u> otra vez la marca en conformidad con esta norma.</p>	
4.6 Phytosanitary measures for non-compliance at point of entry	4.6 Phytosanitary measures for non-compliance at point of entry	4.6 Medidas fitosanitarias en caso de incumplimiento en el punto de ingreso	4.6 Medidas fitosanitarias en caso de incumplimiento en el punto de ingreso entrada	“Punto de entrada” is the Spanish translation for the Glossary term “point of entry”.
4.6 Phytosanitary measures for non-compliance at point of entry / 4.6 Medidas fitosanitarias en caso de incumplimiento en el punto de ingreso	[...] Taking into account the frequent re-use of wood packaging material, NPPOs should consider that the non-compliance identified may have arisen in the country of production, repair or remanufacture , rather than in the country of export or transit.	[...] Tomando en cuenta la frecuente reutilización del embalaje de madera, las ONPF deberían considerar que el incumplimiento detectado puede no haberse producido en el país de exportación o en el de tránsito sino en el de producción, reparación o reciclado.	[...] Tomando en cuenta la frecuente reutilización del embalaje de madera, las ONPF deberían considerar que el incumplimiento detectado puede no haberse producido en el país de exportación o en el de tránsito sino en el de producción, reparación o reciclado reconstrucción .	The appropriate translation in Spanish of the English term “remanufactured” is “reconstruido” rather than “reciclado”.

Appendix 5: TPG workplan 2025–2026**(Last update: 2024-11-28)****TABLE 1 - REGULAR TASKS**

Regular tasks	Detailed task	Responsible	Deadline	Comments	
1. Meeting reports: preparation and update to SC January-February 2025	Draft report to editor	Secretariat	2024-12-19		
	Editor reviews report and send comments	Editor	2025-01-06	tentative	
	Secretariat finalizes report and sends it to steward, chairperson and rapporteur	Secretariat	2025-01-06	tentative	
	Steward, chairperson and rapporteur send back draft report	Steward, Chairperson, Rapporteur	2025-01-20		
	Final report	Secretariat	2025-01-23	(To allow review in Secretariat)	
	Update for SC May 2025	Prepare update (including decisions) from TPG November 2024 meeting for SC May 2025	Secretariat with stewards	2025-03-25	Secretariat to draft; steward to respond by 25/03 tent. Deadline to post documents is 28/04
2. Draft ISPMs in 1st consultation (except Amendments, see 3)	Going to SC-7 / 2nd consultation	Terms and consistency comments extracted.	Secretariat	2024-10-03	
		Review for possible inconsistencies and consideration of comments	All	At the TPG meeting	
		Recommendations to comments/consistency review integrated in tables: send all drafts to stewards via Secretariat	Secretariat with stewards	After the TPG meeting	TPG recommendations to be sent to the ISPM stewards/TPs as soon as possible
		Review and provide translation comments to the secretariat	French, Spanish	At the TPG meeting	These will be submitted to FAO translation services in due time

Regular tasks	Detailed task	Responsible	Deadline	Comments
3. Terms and definitions (incl. Amendments to the Glossary)				
2026 Amendments	Volunteers sends draft meeting papers to Secretariat	ALL, as allocated in Table 3	2025-10-21	TPG Nov 2025
	Draft 2026 Amendments compiled based on discussions at TPG 2025-11	Secretariat and steward	2025-11-28	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 2026 Amendments finalized	ALL	2026-02-15	Back to Secretariat
	Amendments processed for SC	Secretariat	2026-03-01	Posting deadline for SC May 2026 is 1 March
	Proposed translation of the terms going for 1 st consultation	French, Spanish	2026-05-01	These will be submitted to translation-services
	Draft amendments to 1 st Consultation		2026-07 to 09	
	Draft amendments and 1 st Cons. comments reviewed		TPG 2026	
	Finalize amendments and responses	Secretariat and steward	2026-12-21	Back to Secretariat by 2027-01-08
	Amendments and responses for TPG comments	ALL	2027-01-28	Draft Amendments and responses to compiled comments to be posted by 1 March for SC-7 / 2 nd Cons.
	Review translation comments and provide suggestions to FAO Translation Services	French, Spanish	2027-01-28	These will be submitted to translation-services
	Draft amendments in 2 nd Consultation		2027-07 to 09	

Regular tasks	Detailed task		Responsible	Deadline	Comments
	Consultation by email on 2 nd Cons. comments		ALL	in 2027-10	If Steward feels consultation is needed. The draft Amendments and responses to 2 nd 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 2028-01	The translations will be ready for review around the beginning of January and must be posted by 1 March for CPM.
4. Annotated Glossary – (to be published every 3 years, last published in July 2022)	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	
2024 (for publishing)	Annotated glossary is updated and sent for publication	Secretariat	After SC 2024-05	Before TPG 2024 (published in April 2024)	

Regular tasks	Detailed task	Responsible	Deadline	Comments
2025 (intermediate)	To prepare intermediate update based on TPG comments, outcomes of CPM-18 and SC November 2024	Beatriz Melcho	TPG 2024	All to review / provide comments by end October 2024
2025 (for publishing)	To prepare update based on TPG comments, outcomes of CPM-19	Beatriz Melcho	SC 2025-05	To be approved by SC
2025 (for publishing)	Annotated glossary is updated and sent for publication	Secretariat	After SC 2025-05	Before TPG 2025
5. Explanation of Glossary terms	Members to identify before the meeting some Glossary terms/definitions requiring further explanations (and not already explained in other places, such as the Annotated Glossary)	All	2024-10-21	
6. Review of membership	Annual review of membership to make recommendations to SC on new members needed		TPG meeting	

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

One-off tasks	Detailed task	Responsible	Deadline	Comments
7. Review of ISPMs for consistency and style (other than in draft ISPMs)	Ongoing consistency review	All during TPG meeting		TPG meeting
	Present all ink amendments / proposals for revision made so far	Secretariat	Ongoing	TPG meeting
	Development of position papers, explanation, recommendations etc			
8. Other tasks	General recommendations on consistency: yearly updates as needed	Secretariat with stewards	2025-01-07	
	General recommendations on consistency	ALL	2025-01-28	Appended to TPG report
	Development of position papers, explanation, recommendations etc			

TABLE 3 - TERMS AND SUBJECTS ON THE TPG WORK PROGRAMME

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

N	Term	Status	Lead	Comments & next steps
Related to consistency				
1.	Review of the use of and/or in adopted ISPMs (2010-030)	Ongoing	Stays on the work programme to be implemented during the consistency review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - TPG discussion 2009 - Modified SC November 2010 - Consistent with general recommendations on consistency but require a review of every occurrence. Will be considered during consistency study