



Food and Agriculture  
Organization of the  
United Nations



International  
Plant Protection  
Convention

## REPORT

# Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG)

Virtual

27–31 October 2025

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.

© 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](mailto: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](mailto:publications@fao.org). Queries regarding rights and licensing of publications should be submitted to: [copyright@fao.org](mailto:copyright@fao.org).

## CONTENTS

1. Opening of the meeting .....	5
1.1 Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat.....	5
2. Meeting arrangements .....	5
2.1    Election of the chairperson.....	5
2.2    Election of the rapporteur.....	5
2.3    Adoption of the agenda .....	5
2.4    Current specification TP 5 (Technical Panel for the Glossary).....	5
3. Administrative matters .....	5
4. Updates and reports .....	5
4.1    Previous meeting report of the TPG (November 2024) .....	5
4.2    Extracts from other meeting reports of relevance to the TPG.....	6
5. Addressing TPG-related comments on draft ISPMs submitted to the first consultation in 2025 (1 July–30 September).....	7
5.1    Draft annex <i>International movement of fresh Colocasia esculenta corms</i> (2023-023) to ISPM 46 ( <i>Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures</i> ) .....	7
5.2    Draft annex <i>International movement of fresh Musa spp. fruit</i> (2023-028) to ISPM 46 ( <i>Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures</i> ).....	9
5.3    TPG activities and timing for providing recommendations and translation on consultation comments.....	12
6. Subjects on the TPG work programme.....	12
6.1    Terms related to wood packaging material .....	12
6.2    Review of the use of <i>and/or</i> in adopted ISPMs.....	14
7. Review of adopted ISPMs for consistency of terms and style.....	14
7.1    Consistency of adopted ISPMs (standard by standard): list of proposed or approved ink amendments for ISPMs .....	14
7.2    Translation consistency changes to the French and Spanish translations of the terms “temperature treatment” and “heat treatment” in ISPMs .....	15
8. Explanation of glossary terms .....	15
8.1    Explanatory document on ISPM 5 (annotated glossary): 2026 intermediate version .....	15
9. TPG workplan.....	15
9.1    TPG workplan for 2026–2027.....	15
10. TPG membership review .....	16
11. Any other business.....	16
12. Date and venue of the next meeting .....	16
13. Evaluation of the meeting.....	16
14. Close of the meeting .....	16
Appendix 1: Agenda.....	17
Appendix 2: Documents list .....	19
Appendix 3: Participants list .....	21

Appendix 4: TPG activities and timing for providing recommendations and translation on consultation comments .....	24
Appendix 5: Options for addressing the Canadian request on developing definitions related to ISPM 15 .....	27
Appendix 6: TPG workplan for 2026–2027 .....	29

## 1. Opening of the meeting

### 1.1 Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat

[1] Daniel TORELLA, phytosanitary standard setting support specialist of the Standard Setting Unit of the IPPC Secretariat (hereafter referred to as “the secretariat), welcomed the participants to the annual meeting of the Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG). Avetik NERSISYAN, lead of the Standard Setting Unit, had sent his regards. Mr TORELLA also extended a warm welcome to the new members of the TPG and invited them to introduce themselves.

[2] Mr TORELLA explained that this year’s meeting was being held virtually, reflecting the reduced workload for 2025 as there were no draft amendments to International Standard for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPM) No. 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*). He also noted that the meeting was being convened earlier than usual to enable the TPG to provide the Standards Committee (SC) with useful input ahead of its discussions in November 2025 and to allow the stewards of the draft standards under first consultation to receive the TPG recommendations ahead of the Technical Panel on Commodity Standards meeting scheduled for December 2025, should the draft ISPMs be revised. Moreover, he considered this meeting an opportunity to test the feasibility of holding the TPG meeting before the SC November session. Mr TORELLA concluded by wishing all participants a productive and successful meeting.

## 2. Meeting arrangements

### 2.1 Election of the chairperson

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

### 2.2 Election of the rapporteur

[4] The TPG elected Stephanie DUBON (United States of America) as rapporteur.

### 2.3 Adoption of the agenda

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

### 2.4 Current specification TP 5 (Technical Panel for the Glossary)

[6] A link to the current specification for the TPG (TP 5), which summarizes the tasks of the TPG, had been circulated to the TPG as part of the agenda for the meeting.<sup>1</sup>

## 3. Administrative matters

[7] The documents list (Appendix 2) and the participants list (Appendix 3) had been made available to the TPG before the meeting. The secretariat invited TPG members to provide any updates to the participants list.

[8] The TPG noted that Alan MCLEOD (United Kingdom) and Laurence BOUHOT-DELDUC (France) had sent their regrets for being unable to attend the meeting.

## 4. Updates and reports

### 4.1 Previous meeting report of the TPG (November 2024)

[9] The TPG steward, André Felipe C.P. da SILVA (Brazil), provided a detailed report of the main outcomes of the last TPG meeting,<sup>2</sup> including updates from the May 2025 SC meeting.

---

<sup>1</sup> Specification TP 5 - Technical Panel for the Glossary: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/1300/>

<sup>2</sup> November 2024 TPG meeting report: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/94333/>

[10] The TPG noted that their comments in response to first consultation comments on draft ISPMs had been forwarded to the stewards of the respective draft ISPMs and the May 2025 Standards Committee Working Group (SC-7).

[11] Only those issues for which there was an update are included in this report.

[12] **Definition of “pest free area”.** The TPG steward reported that, in May 2025, the SC had established a small working group to consider the distinction between a pest free area (PFA) and pest absence. The small working group was expected to present its conclusion at the SC meeting in November 2025. The key point of the discussion concerned the PFA definition in ISPM 5, because the phrase “where appropriate” has led to confusion and inconsistent interpretations. In addition, there is ongoing debate as to whether an entire country can be designated as a PFA, or whether such a situation should instead be regarded as a case of pest absence.

[13] **Draft annex *Design and use of systems approaches for phytosanitary certification of seeds (2018-009)* to ISPM 38 (*International movement of seeds*).** The TPG steward reported that the May 2025 SC-7 had requested that the SC pause work on the draft ISPM and agree on the way forward.<sup>3</sup>

[14] **Review of the use of *and/or* in adopted ISPMs.** See agenda item 6.2 for updates.

[15] **Ink amendment to the Spanish version of ISPM 15 regarding the translation of “remanufactured”.** The TPG steward referred to the translation consistency change proposed by the TPG in November 2024, which the TPG had proposed be applied as an ink amendment to the Spanish translation of ISPM 15 (*Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade*). This related to a discrepancy between the English version of ISPM 15, which used the word “remanufactured” throughout, and the Spanish version, which used “reciclado” rather than “reconstruido” (i.e. “recycled” rather than “remanufactured”). The TPG steward reported that, in May 2025, the SC had agreed to the TPG recommendation and the ink amendment would be presented to the Twentieth Session of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) in 2026 for noting.

[16] **Deletion of the term “plant protection organization (national)” from ISPM 5.** The TPG steward referred to the TPG’s recommendation, in November 2024, that the term “plant protection organization (national)” be deleted from ISPM 5 by means of an ink amendment. He reported that, in May 2025, the SC had agreed to the TPG’s recommendation and the ink amendment would be presented to CPM-20 (2026) for noting.

[17] **Explanatory document on ISPM 5 (also known as “annotated glossary”).** The TPG reported that the updated annotated glossary, agreed by the TPG in November 2024, had been approved by the SC in May 2025 for publication.

[18] **Temperature treatment, heat treatment and cold treatment.** See agenda item 7.2.

[19] **Inclusion of index and English column in language versions of ISPM 5.** The secretariat reported that they were still investigating options for including the index and the English column in the language versions of ISPM 5. The English column, which indicated the corresponding English translation of each term, had already been implemented in the Arabic version of ISPM 5, but the other language versions did not yet include it. The secretariat explained that they were working with the FAO translation service and would provide an update at the next TPG meeting.

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

[20] The secretariat presented a paper providing extracts from other meeting reports of relevance to the TPG that had taken place from 2024 to 2025, in chronological order.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>3</sup> SC-7 2025-05, agenda item 4.3.

<sup>4</sup> 10\_TPG\_2025\_Oct.

[21] **Definition of “treatment schedule”.** The chairperson asked the secretariat for more information on the revision of the ISPM 5 definition of “treatment schedule”. The secretariat reported that the SC, at its meeting in 2025 May, had noted the agreement of the Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments (TPPT) to recommend to the TPG that the term “intended outcome” be replaced with “required response” in the definition of “treatment schedule”. However, the SC had also noted that the change may have implications for requirements in adopted ISPMs, including phytosanitary treatments, because it would be changing an *intended* outcome to a *required* one. Therefore, the SC had invited the TPPT to develop a paper to the SC on the rationale for the proposed change, the context, and the potential impacts (positive and negative) from their perspective. In June 2025, the TPPT had agreed that a TPPT member would develop a paper to be reviewed by the panel for submission to the SC.

[22] The TPG:

- (1) *noted* the paper providing extracts from other meeting reports of relevance to the TPG.

## 5. Addressing TPG-related comments on draft ISPMs submitted to the first consultation in 2025 (1 July–30 September)

[23] Both the draft ISPMs considered in this agenda item were annexes to ISPM 46 (*Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures*), the annexes of ISPM 46 also being known as “commodity standards”.

### 5.1 Draft annex *International movement of fresh Colocasia esculenta corms (2023-023)* to ISPM 46 (*Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures*)

[24] Xuemei JI (Australia) and 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 TPG recommendations to consultation comments submitted in Spanish. As chairperson, she also presented the draft TPG recommendations to consultation comments submitted in French, on behalf of the TPG member for the French language who could not join the meeting, and the recommendations on translation of phytosanitary terms.<sup>5</sup>

[25] **Commodity and its intended use (consumption or processing).** The TPG discussed a proposal to clarify in the Scope section that the use of fresh *C. esculenta* corms is intended for consumption or processing, as described in the section on Description of the commodity and its intended use. The chairperson noted that similar wording appeared in the draft commodity standard on fresh *Musa* spp. fruit (2023-028). However, the TPG observed that including this clarification in the section was unnecessary and would be inconsistent with Commodity Standard (CS) No. 1 (International movement of fresh *Mangifera indica* fruit), where the more specific wording “intended for consumption or processing” is used only in section 2 (Description of the commodity and intended use), not in the Scope section. Consequently, the TPG recommended deleting the phrase “for consumption or processing” from the Scope section.

[26] **Technical justification vs technically justified.** The TPG discussed the suggestion to reword the following text to simplify its structure: “When determining whether to regulate a pest listed in this commodity standard, the NPPO of the importing country should base its decision on technical justification using either a pest risk analysis or, where applicable, another comparable examination and evaluation of available scientific information.” It was noted that the original wording more accurately reflected the ISPM 5 definition of the term “technically justified”; however, the TPG questioned the need to reiterate this partial definition in the text. The TPG therefore considered whether to disagree with the proposal, on the understanding that the existing description of “technical justification” was consistent with the ISPM 5 definition of “technically justified”, or alternatively to reword the text to explicitly include the term, as follows: “...the NPPO of the importing country should ensure its decision is technically justified.” After discussion, the TPG expressed a preference for the first option.

<sup>5</sup> 2023-023; 06\_TPG\_2025\_Oct.

[27] **Pest-specific options and Table 3 (Pest-specific options for phytosanitary measures).** The TPG considered a proposal to clarify in the Options for phytosanitary measures section that Table 3 listed pest-specific options for phytosanitary measures, and not just specific options, for consistency with the title of Table 3 and the wording used in the draft commodity standard on *Musa* spp. fruit. After discussion, the TPG agreed that the word “pest” should be added to “specific options” for consistency with the title of Table 3, noting that in CS 1 the paragraph was not consistent with the table title.

[28] **Text box of abbreviations.** The TPG considered a proposal from some contracting parties to remove the text box that outlined the abbreviations used in this commodity standard for options for phytosanitary measures. The TPG discussed the necessity of retaining the box. The TPG steward explained that the inclusion of the abbreviations box had been discussed during the SC meeting in May 2025 and had been included in CS 1 following consultation comments requesting that the abbreviations used in the tables be more prominent as they were considered difficult to locate when placed below the tables without clear indication of their meanings. The steward also reported that some contracting parties considered the box unnecessary, given that abbreviations were listed below each table. After discussion, the TPG did not agree with the proposal to remove the box to maintain consistency with CS 1.

[29] **Importing country NPPOs vs the NPPO of importing country.** In considering a proposal to reword “importing country NPPOs” as “the NPPO of importing country”, the chairperson noted that the existing phrasing was consistent with CS 1, although expressed agreement with the proposed change. After discussion, the TPG agreed with the proposal for reasons of clarity, adherence to the *IPPC style guide*, translation across languages, and consistency with other ISPMs. The TPG therefore suggested revising the proposed text by adding the definite article “the”, so that it read “the NPPO of the importing country”, and further recommended that the wording in CS 1 be adjusted accordingly.

[30] **Risk vs likelihood vs chance vs probability.** The TPG considered and agreed with a proposal from one consultation comment suggesting the replacement of the term “risk” with “likelihood”, “chance” or “probability”, to avoid confusion with the glossary term “pest risk”. The TPG did not express a preference among these alternative terms in order to allow flexibility in wording.

[31] **Inspection vs phytosanitary inspection.** The TPG discussed a proposal to clarify that inspection, as an option for phytosanitary measures, referred specifically to a phytosanitary inspection. In presenting the paper, Konstantin GREBENNIKOV noted that adding the term “phytosanitary” would be redundant as the term “inspection” was mentioned in the ISPM 5 definition of a “phytosanitary action”, which was defined as “an official operation, such as inspection, testing, surveillance or treatment, undertaken to implement phytosanitary measures”. Therefore, there were no inspections other than phytosanitary ones in this context. The TPG disagreed with the proposal, noting that “inspection” in this context was an option for a phytosanitary measure and that the addition of “phytosanitary” would therefore be redundant. The TPG also agreed that the original wording should be maintained for consistency with CS 1.

[32] **Phytosanitary certification and ISPM 12.** The TPG discussed the proposal from a consultation comment to remove the reference to ISPM 12 (*Phytosanitary certificates*) from the list of references associated with “phytosanitary certification” as an option for phytosanitary measures in Table 2 (General options for phytosanitary measures), on the basis that certification is not, in itself, a measure to manage pest risk. The TPG discussed whether “phytosanitary certification” was a phytosanitary measure. One TPG member noted that the certification involved the application of procedures (as methods rather than actions) and therefore appeared to be broader than a “procedure”, which was identified as a measure. The chairperson acknowledged that this issue may fall outside the scope of the TPG, given its potentially broader and more complex nature, and the TPG steward shared this view. Following the discussion, the TPG agreed that the comment fell outside the scope of the TPG, while noting that the reference to ISPM 12 (*Phytosanitary certificates*) had been retained in the equivalent table of CS 1.

[33] **Post-harvest operations vs post-harvest measures.** In regard to post-harvest operations included in Table 2 as options for phytosanitary measures, the TPG considered a proposal to replace the term “operations” with “measures”, as the examples included, such as brushing and washing, were considered measures. One TPG member considered the replacement not necessary but suggested that, if a change were to be made, the term “operations” could be replaced with “management” or “intervention”. The TPG steward observed that brushing and washing were activities or practices carried out before or after harvesting and prior to inspection, rather than phytosanitary measures. Another TPG member regarded them as commercial standard practices or operations, not measures. The chairperson expressed support for retaining “operations”, noting that the term was clear. The TPG steward added that, for activities to be considered measures, they should form part of a systems approach. He recalled that, during development of the draft commodity standard on fresh *Musa* spp. fruit (2023-028), washing and brushing had been suggested as measures to remove scales from banana fruit but were not included as independent measures within a systems approach. The steward questioned whether such activities should be regarded as independent measures within a systems approach or as stand-alone measures. After discussion, the TPG recognized that the issue concerned technical aspects of the standard and therefore fell outside its mandate.

[34] **Potential proposal of ink amendments to CS 1.** Later in the meeting, the TPG discussed whether to propose ink amendments to CS 1, considering the recommendations made on this draft commodity standard, but recognized that such a proposal would be premature (see agenda item 5.2).

[35] The TPG:

- (2) *agreed* its recommendations to the first consultation comments on the draft annex *International movement of fresh Colocasia esculenta corms* (2023-023) to ISPM 46 (*Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures*); and
- (3) *noted* that the TPG recommendations would be transmitted to the steward, the Technical Panel on Commodity Standards and the SC-7 for consideration.

## 5.2 Draft annex *International movement of fresh Musa spp. fruit (2023-028)* to ISPM 46 (*Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures*)

[36] Asenath Abigael KOECH (Kenya) and Stephanie M. DUBON (United States of America) presented the draft TPG recommendations in English for TPG consideration. Beatriz MELCHO (Uruguay), TPG member for the Spanish language, presented the draft TPG recommendations to consultation comments submitted in Spanish. As chairperson, she also presented the draft TPG recommendations to consultation comments submitted in French, on behalf of the TPG member for the French language who could not join the meeting, and the recommendations on translation of phytosanitary terms.<sup>6</sup>

[37] **Options for phytosanitary measures for international movement of fresh *Musa* spp. fruit vs options for phytosanitary measures to manage pests [associated with the fresh fruit of *Musa* spp.] in international trade.** The TPG considered a proposal to revise the Scope section to clarify that the options for phytosanitary measures were meant to manage the pests associated with the fresh fruit of *Musa* spp. in international trade rather than referring to international trade, as per the current wording. The TPG steward noted that such options aim to manage not the pests themselves but rather the pest risk in international trade. The TPG disagreed with the proposal, noting that the current wording was consistent with CS 1.

[38] **Fresh fruit of *Musa* spp. vs fresh *Musa* spp. fruit.** The TPG considered a proposal from a consultation comment to refer to fresh *Musa* spp. fruit rather than fresh fruit of *Musa* spp. to be aligned with CS 1. The TPG discussed whether this change would affect the translation in other languages or whether it would be preferable to retain the current wording and suggest an ink amendment to CS 1 instead. The TPG ultimately disagreed with the proposal, noting the inconsistency

<sup>6</sup> 2023-028; 07\_TPG\_2025\_Oct.

with CS 1, the need for consistency across language versions, and the importance of clarity, as it was more appropriate to retain “fresh” close to “fruit”.

[39] **Bunches, hands, clusters (parts of hands) and fingers.** The TPG considered a consultation comment proposing to replace “clusters” with “parts of hands”. The TPG steward noted that, in some consultation comments, the term “clusters” was used synonymously with “bunches”, while in others it was used as a synonym for “part of hands”. To avoid any misinterpretation, the TPG agreed with the proposal to replace “clusters” with “parts of hands”, because “clusters” could be interpreted as “bunches”, which were outside the scope of this standard. In addition, to make clear that the standard applied to hands and clusters only, the TPG agreed with the proposal to remove “e.g.” and the parentheses from the phrase: “This commodity standard applies to the fresh fruit of *Musa* spp. (e.g. in hands or in clusters).” Regarding a proposal to include “fingers”, the TPG steward, who was also the steward of this subject, noted that fingers should not be mentioned because the SC had recognized in May 2025 that although units (i.e. the individual fingers of a cluster) may be transported by travellers, units were unlikely to be traded.

[40] **Fresh fruit vs fruit.** For consistency with CS 1 and to avoid duplication, the TPG disagreed with a proposal to refer to “fresh fruit” throughout the draft ISPM, noting that CS 1 referred to “fresh *Mangifera indica* fruit” throughout the text and not to “fresh fruit” alone. In addition, the TPG disagreed with a proposal to use “fresh fruit” in place of “*Musa* spp.”, because this would not be consistent with CS 1.

[41] **Mitigation measures vs pest risk management.** The TPG discussed a proposal to revise the second paragraph of the section on Pests associated with fresh *Musa* spp. fruit to clarify the factors that should be considered by the national plant protection organization (NPPO) in its pest risk analysis. The proposed revision aimed to better explain that the NPPO should evaluate specific factors such as the cultivar, variety, geography, ecology, and agricultural practices when determining appropriate mitigation measures, rather than stating “the list of pests does not consider factors that may influence pest infestation of fruit in the country of origin (e.g. cultivar or variety, geographical and ecological factors, agricultural and production practices).” One TPG member noted that the original wording was consistent with CS 1, while the TPG steward observed that the proposal introduced a new concept, as the term “mitigation measures” was not commonly used in ISPMs. The steward further noted that, should the TPG agree with the proposal, the wording should be amended to read: “An NPPO should evaluate factors such as ... to determine appropriate phytosanitary measures to manage pest risk”, because such factors were considered when determining phytosanitary measures rather than mitigation measures. Ultimately, the TPG agreed that the proposal was technical rather than editorial and therefore outside the scope of the TPG.

[42] **Sufficient technical justification.** The TPG considered a proposal to insert “sufficient” before “technical justification” in the following sentence: “Inclusion of a pest in Table 1 does not constitute technical justification for its regulation by importing countries using this standard.” The chairperson disagreed with the proposal to qualify whether technical justification was sufficient, while the TPG steward considered the proposal a way to state that there were more technical justifications than the inclusion of a pest in Table 1. Ultimately, the TPG disagreed with the proposal.

[43] **Technical justification vs technically justified.** As with the draft commodity standard on fresh *C. esculenta* corms (agenda item 5.1), the TPG disagreed with the suggested rephrasing of a sentence about basing decisions on technical justification, because the current description of “technical justification” was consistent with the definition of the glossary term “technically justified”.

[44] **Mealybugs and scales (Hemiptera) vs scale insect.** The TPG considered a proposal to replace “Mealybugs and scales (Hemiptera)” with “scale insect” but disagreed for consistency with CS 1.

[45] **Pest-specific options and Table 3.** As with the draft commodity standard on fresh *C. esculenta* corms (agenda item 5.1), the TPG agreed with a consultation comment that the Options for phytosanitary measures section should refer to pest-specific options rather than “specific options” for consistency

with the title of Table 3 (Pest-specific options for phytosanitary measures), noting that in CS 1 the paragraph was not consistent with the table title.

[46] **Pest risk vs risk.** The TPG discussed a consultation comment that suggested that, to avoid repetition, “pest risk” be replaced with “risk” in a sentence referring to the NPPO of the importing country considering whether a measure for one pest will effectively manage the pest risk of other regulated pests of *Musa* spp. fruit. The TPG disagreed with the replacement of “pest risk” with “risk”, noting that “pest risk” was defined in ISPM 5.

[47] **Importing country NPPOs vs the NPPO of importing country.** As with the draft commodity standard on fresh *C. esculenta* corms, the TPG agreed with the proposal to refer to “the NPPO of the importing country” for the same reasons outlined in agenda item 5.1. The TPG therefore suggested revising the proposed text by adding the definite article “the”, so that it read “the NPPO of the importing country”, and further recommended that the wording in CS 1 be adjusted accordingly.

[48] **Inspection and control.** The TPG discussed a consultation comment that suggested that “inspection” be revised to “inspection and control” as one of the general options for phytosanitary measures. The TPG steward noted that “control” is not considered a measure and the chairperson suggested that it might refer to control measures. Consequently, the TPG agreed that this proposal was outside the scope of the TPG.

[49] **Phytosanitary inspection vs inspection.** The TPG did not support the proposal to insert the term “phytosanitary” before “inspection”, noting that the term “inspection” was already included in the table of general options for phytosanitary measures and that adding “phytosanitary” would be inconsistent with CS 1 and create redundancy.

[50] **Export inspection vs inspection.** The TPG considered a proposal to replace “export inspection” with “inspection” as an option for certain pest species in the pest-specific options for phytosanitary measures table. The TPG steward recalled that the SC had discussed this issue, acknowledging that the intended meaning of “export inspection” may not be clear because it could refer to the final inspection before export or to field inspection. However, the SC recognized that the term may be used in the references for the measures and so it should not be changed at that time. The TPG agreed that this proposal fell outside the scope of the panel because it was a technical matter.

[51] **Pest free area.** The TPG discussed and agreed with a consultation comment proposing to remove PFA as one of the pest-specific options for phytosanitary measures. The TPG noted that PFA was a general measure that applied to any pest and was already included in Table 2 (General options for phytosanitary measures), and they agreed that its removal would ensure consistency with CS 1. The TPG also considered a proposal to include PFA in Table 3 but agreed, for the same reason, that it should not be included.

[52] **Pest free production sites and pest free places of production.** Following the agreement to support the removal of PFA from Table 3, the TPG suggested the removal of pest free place of production (PFPP) from Table 3 as well, noting it was a general measure also included in Table 2. For the same reason, the TPG disagreed with the inclusion of pest free production site (PFPS) as a pest-specific option for phytosanitary measures.

[53] **Export inspection as pest-specific option for phytosanitary measures.** The TPG considered a proposal to delete “export inspection” from Table 3. The TPG noted that, while PFA and inspections were general measures, “export inspection” was not. Therefore, the TPG disagreed with the proposal and decided to retain “export inspection” as one of the pest-specific options for phytosanitary measures for certain pests.

[54] **Potential proposal of ink amendments to CS 1.** Considering the recommendations made, for both this standard and the draft commodity standard for *C. esculenta* (agenda item 5.1), the TPG discussed the potential need for ink amendments to CS 1 for consistency and to improve clarity. The TPG steward noted that the need for ink amendments would first depend on whether the stewards of the

draft ISPMs currently under consultation accepted the TPG's recommendations, so it was too earlier to form a conclusion.

[55] The TPG:

- (4) *agreed* its recommendations to the first consultation comments on the draft annex *International movement of fresh Musa spp. fruit* (2023-028) to ISPM 46 (*Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures*); and
- (5) *noted* that the TPG recommendations would be transmitted to the steward, the Technical Panel on Commodity Standards and the SC-7 for consideration.

### **5.3 TPG activities and timing for providing recommendations and translation on consultation comments**

[56] The secretariat introduced the paper for this agenda item.<sup>7</sup> This outlined the background on the SC's decision to invite the TPG to prepare a document detailing their activities, the timeline for providing recommendations, and the translation of consultation comments, for consideration by the SC in November 2025.

[57] To provide further clarity, the TPG agreed to develop two timelines:

- TPG review of draft ISPMs (excluding draft amendments to ISPM 5) under first consultation and the development of draft TPG recommendations; and
- development and review of draft amendments to ISPM 5.

[58] In particular, the TPG underlined the importance of clarifying that, when draft amendments to ISPM 5 are recommended by the SC to the CPM for adoption, the panel revises the translation of terms and definitions in French and Spanish and develops translation proposals for Arabic, Chinese and Russian language versions (which are translated for the first time before being presented to the CPM). The secretariat then submits the draft amendments to ISPM 5 to the FAO translation service along with the TPG recommendations. For this reason, the TPG meeting is usually scheduled after the November SC meeting.

[59] The TPG:

- (6) *agreed* to present the paper on the TPG activities and timing for providing recommendations, and translation of consultation comments (Appendix 4) to the SC.

## **6. Subjects on the TPG work programme**

### **6.1 Terms related to wood packaging material**

[60] Beatriz MELCHO (Uruguay) provided an overview of the papers regarding a submission that had been received from a contracting party in September 2025 under the ongoing Call for Topics: Standards and Implementation.<sup>8</sup> The submission proposed the addition of terms related to wood packaging material (WPM), such as "shipborne dunnage", "crate", "case", "pallet" and "spool", to ISPM 5. In line with the new procedure introduced at the SC meeting in May 2025, the TPG conducted an initial assessment to determine whether the inclusion of these terms in ISPM 5 was necessary and to advise the SC accordingly.

[61] Ms MELCHO explained that, together with Laurence BOUHOT-DELDUC (France), she had conducted a review of the use of these terms in adopted ISPMs.<sup>9</sup> This had revealed that the terms were mainly used in ISPM 15 as examples of WPMs covered by the standard. While defining subcategories of WPM and dunnage could help to better target inspections according to the pest risk associated with

<sup>7</sup> 11\_TPG\_2025\_Oct.

<sup>8</sup> 08\_TPG\_2025\_Oct; 09\_TPG\_2025\_Oct.

<sup>9</sup> 08\_TPG\_2025\_Oct.

these subcategories, such definitions would not improve the understanding of what was or was not covered by ISPM 15. Rather, this appeared to be an implementation issue that may be addressed in the *Guide to the regulation of wood packaging material*. It was also noted that the outcomes of the ongoing project by the North American Plant Protection Organization (NAPPO), which aimed to develop a “science and technology document describing categories of wood packaging material used in North America and the pest risk associated with each related to processing and treatment”, might be more appropriate for consideration by the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee rather than by the TPG.

[62] One TPG member, who was also one of the submitters, acknowledged that, although this appeared to be an implementation issue, it was an issue related to the continuous improvement of ISPM 15, given the advancement in the NAPPO project of analysing compliance with ISPM 15. An example was provided concerning subcategories of dunnage, which are described differently across the countries involved in the project. The proposal therefore aimed to promote globally harmonized terminology rather than regional or bilateral alignment.

[63] The TPG noted that these terms did not have specific meaning under the IPPC framework and were mainly used in ISPM 15. They acknowledged that adding definitions for such terms to ISPM 5 could reduce flexibility and blur the distinction between operational examples and phytosanitary concepts. Moreover, such an approach would be inconsistent with the TPG’s principle that glossary definitions should capture only terms with a clear and broadly applicable phytosanitary meaning across ISPMs. Therefore, the TPG agreed that this issue primarily related to implementation rather than terminology and could be addressed more effectively through other means. However, the TPG developed two options for SC consideration.

[64] **Option 1.** This option focused on developing explanatory content within implementation or guidance material by expanding or updating the existing IPPC *Guide to the regulation of wood packaging material*. This guide already provided comprehensive information to facilitate understanding of ISPM 15, including guidance on approved treatment options for WPM and instructions regarding application of the ISPM 15 mark. The TPG noted that this approach would allow clear, practical explanations and examples without adding new terms or definitions to ISPM 5. The TPG also outlined the advantages and disadvantages of this option, highlighting that it would:

- allow flexibility and regular updates without the need to follow the Standard Setting Procedure;
- ensure consistency with ISPM 15 while maintaining its operational scope;
- enable the inclusion of detailed explanations, illustrations or case studies as needed; and
- support NPPOs in the practical application of ISPM 15.

[65] However, it was also noted that this approach would not enable direct participation by all contracting parties in the revision process, because the development of implementation and guidance material followed a different process from the Standard Setting Procedure, and that translation of the guide into FAO official languages would depend on the availability of resources.

[66] **Option 2.** The second option was to develop an appendix to ISPM 15 to provide detailed explanations of the terms used therein to ensure clarity for contracting parties and inspectors (i.e. a similar approach to that taken for ISPM 39 (*International movement of wood*)). This approach would provide formal, CPM-endorsed clarification within the framework of ISPM 15 and ensure consistency in interpretation and application. However, developing or updating an appendix would require following the full Standard Setting Procedure, making any revisions more time consuming and procedurally complex.

[67] One TPG member questioned whether inclusion of the proposed terms in ISPM 5 should be presented as an additional option, with corresponding advantages and disadvantages. Following discussion, the TPG agreed that this would be reflected as background information in the paper for the SC, which would provide the rationale for the TPG’s decision not to support the inclusion of these terms in ISPM 5 and outline the two proposed ways forward.

[68] The TPG:

- (7) *approved* a paper to be submitted to the SC (Appendix 5), presenting the TPG's recommended options for addressing the proposed addition of the WPM-related terms "shipborne dunnage", "crate", "case", "pallet" and "spool" to ISPM 5; and
- (8) *invited* the SC to discuss the considerations outlined in the above paper when deciding whether to add these terms to the TPG's work programme in the *List of topics for IPPC standards* as subjects.

## 6.2 Review of the use of *and/or* in adopted ISPMs

[69] Beatriz MELCHO (Uruguay) introduced this agenda item and informed the TPG that a paper was being developed in coordination with the secretariat but was not yet ready for discussion at this meeting.

[70] The secretariat noted that, following internal discussion, this task could potentially affect the other language versions of adopted ISPMs, as they may be subject to different grammatical, formatting and editorial conventions.

[71] The secretariat, in agreement with the chairperson, proposed deferring this item to the next TPG meeting to allow for completion of the paper.

[72] The TPG:

- (9) *agreed* to defer the discussion on the review of the use of "and/or" in adopted ISPMs to the next TPG meeting.

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

### 7.1 Consistency of adopted ISPMs (standard by standard): list of proposed or approved ink amendments for ISPMs

[73] The secretariat introduced this agenda item, explaining what ink amendments are and how they are developed and implemented in all official FAO languages, upon resource availability. The secretariat also presented the list of proposed and approved ink amendments for adopted ISPMs, which is maintained as a record and available on the International Phytosanitary Portal.<sup>10</sup>

[74] The secretariat observed that the definitions of glossary terms included, in brackets, the "source" (i.e. the body that approved them and the year); however, there was no record indicating whether ink amendments had been implemented for those definitions, even though the publication history of each ISPM recorded the implementation of such amendments in the text. The secretariat therefore invited the TPG to consider whether it might be appropriate to include, in the "source" of a glossary term's definition, an indication of when an ink amendment has been implemented. The chairperson recalled that information on ink amendments was already available in the annotated glossary, while noting that this document was distinct from ISPM 5 itself. The secretariat explained that, in the absence of a clear record of changes, there was a risk that the same amendment may be reconsidered repeatedly when language versions of adopted ISPMs are updated. The TPG noted that further discussion on this matter was required.

[75] The TPG:

- (10) *agreed* to continue discussing this item at a future TPG meeting.

<sup>10</sup> List of proposed or approved ink amendments for ISPMs: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/82115/>

## 7.2 Translation consistency changes to the French and Spanish translations of the terms “temperature treatment” and “heat treatment” in ISPMs

[76] Beatriz MELCHO (Uruguay) introduced the paper, which had been drafted with the French language expert for the TPG.<sup>11</sup>

[77] One TPG member noted that the terms “heat treatment” and “thermal treatment” have the same meaning in French. The member commented that, although the term “heat” is a common and easily understood term in French, it is considered less precise in technical or scientific contexts than the term “thermal”, which is more appropriate in normative or technical usage. The term “temperature treatment” covers both heat and cold treatments and should therefore be translated as “traitement par variation de température”, since it does not specify whether the treatment involves heating or cooling. Consequently, “heat treatment” should be translated as “traitement thermique”. As for the translation of “temperature treatment” into French, the term could be translated as “traitement par variation de température” but also as “traitement à température contrôlée”, both being terms appropriate in normative or technical contexts.

[78] However, in the absence of the French language expert for the TPG, the panel agreed to defer this item to the next TPG meeting.

[79] The TPG:

(11) *agreed* to defer the discussion on the translation consistency changes to the French and Spanish translations of the terms “temperature treatment” and “heat treatment” in ISPMs to the next TPG meeting.

## 8. Explanation of glossary terms

### 8.1 Explanatory document on ISPM 5 (annotated glossary): 2026 intermediate version

[80] The lead, Beatriz MELCHO (Uruguay), presented the draft of the updated annotated glossary as the 2026 intermediate version.<sup>12</sup> Because there had been no amendments to ISPM 5 in the previous year and few ink amendments were being presented to CPM-20 (2026) for noting, the updates were limited.

[81] The secretariat also recalled that the annotated glossary is generally published every two to three years, with the exception of the 2025 version, which had been published after only one year because there were more changes than usual.

[82] The TPG:

(12) *agreed* on the 2026 intermediate version of the annotated glossary to be posted in the TPG restricted work area.

## 9. TPG workplan

### 9.1 TPG workplan for 2026–2027

[83] The TPG updated its workplan for 2026–2027 (Appendix 6) to be presented to the May 2026 SC meeting for noting.

[84] One TPG member, also serving on the SC, noted a gap between when the workplans of the technical panels are updated and when they are presented to the SC for noting. The TPG steward suggested that the TPG workplan should be reviewed more frequently considering that the IPPC Call for Topics: Standards and Implementation is now ongoing. The secretariat noted that, although there is a gap between the update and the SC noting it, the workplan only includes work that is on the TPG work

<sup>11</sup> 05\_TPG\_2025\_Oct.

<sup>12</sup> 04\_TPG\_2025\_Oct.

programme approved by the SC and it should be feasible to adjust the workplan during the year to accommodate any changes the SC make to the TPG's work programme.

[85] The secretariat recalled that the papers finalized during this meeting would be uploaded to the TPG restricted work area for ease of access.

[86] The TPG:

- (13) *agreed* to the TPG workplan for 2026–2027 as modified during this meeting; and
- (14) *invited* the SC to note the TPG workplan for 2026–2027 (Appendix 6).

## **10. TPG membership review**

[87] The secretariat informed the TPG that the term of Beatriz MELCHO (Uruguay) as one of the Spanish language experts for the TPG would end in November 2025. Ms MELCHO confirmed her willingness to continue as a Spanish language expert for the TPG and noted that her organization supported her continued participation. The TPG agreed to recommend to the SC that her term be renewed for a five-year period commencing in 2025.

[88] The TPG:

- (15) *recommended* to the SC that the membership of Beatriz MELCHO (Uruguay), as one of the Spanish language experts for the TPG, be renewed for a five-year period commencing in 2025.

## **11. Any other business**

[89] No items were raised under this agenda item.

## **12. Date and venue of the next meeting**

[90] The next TPG meeting is tentatively scheduled to be held in November or December 2026 in Rome, Italy.

## **13. Evaluation of the meeting**

[91] The secretariat invited the TPG to complete the meeting evaluation via the link provided in the agenda.

## **14. Close of the meeting**

[92] The chairperson thanked all participants for their contributions, expressed appreciation for the opportunity to serve as chairperson, and extended thanks to the secretariat for organizing the meeting and for their continued support.

[93] On behalf of the secretariat, Daniel TORELLA thanked the participants for their valuable work and commitment, particularly for their effective organization and efforts in preparing the papers for the meeting within a short time frame following the end of the consultation period.

[94] The chairperson closed the meeting.

## Appendix 1: Agenda

Agenda Item		Document No.	Presenter
1.	<b>Opening of the Meeting</b>		Nersisyan/Torella
1.1	Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat		Nersisyan/Torella
2.	<b>Meeting Arrangements</b>		Nersisyan/Torella
2.1	Election of the Chairperson		Nersisyan/Torella
2.2	Election of the Rapporteur		Chairperson
2.3	Adoption of the Agenda	01_TPG_2025_Oct	Chairperson
2.4	Current specification: TP 5 (TPG) (2016)	<a href="#">TP5</a>	-
3.	<b>Administrative Matters</b>		Chairperson
3.1	Documents list	02_TPG_2025_Oct	Torella
3.2	Participants list <a href="#">TPG membership list</a>	03_TPG_2025_Oct <a href="#">TPG membership list</a>	Torella
4.	<b>Updates and Reports</b>		Chairperson
4.1	Previous meeting report of the TPG (November 2024)	<a href="#">November 2024 TPG Meeting Report</a>	C.P. Da Silva
4.2	Extracts from other meeting reports of relevance to the TPG	10_TPG_2025_Oct	Torella
5.	<b>Addressing TPG-related Comments on Draft ISPMs Submitted to the First Consultation in 2025 (1 July-30 September).</b> The TPG will review consultation comments on terms and definitions and will review the drafts ISPMs for consistency in the use of terms. Draft TPG recommendations to compiled comments be proposed by TPG members. TPG recommendations will be transmitted to stewards and SC-7 (May 2026).	<a href="#">Guidelines on the standing TPG task on “Addressing TPG-related comments on draft ISPMs submitted for first consultation”</a>	Chairperson
5.1	Draft annex International movement of fresh <i>Colocasia esculenta corms</i> (2023-023) to ISPM 46 ( <i>Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures</i> ) - Review of TPG-related compiled comments and draft TPG recommendations (2023-023)	<a href="#">2023-023</a> 06_TPG_2025_Oct	Ji/Grebennikov
5.2	Draft annex International movement of fresh <i>Musaspp. fruit</i> (2023-028) to ISPM 46 ( <i>Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures</i> ) - Review of TPG-related compiled comments and draft TPG recommendations (2023-028)	<a href="#">2023-028</a> 07_TPG_2025_Oct	Koech/Dubon
5.3	TPG activities and timing for providing recommendations and translation on consultation comments	11_TPG_2025_Oct  <a href="#">Guidelines on the standing TPG task on “Addressing TPG-related comments on draft ISPMs submitted for first consultation”</a>  <a href="#">Section 7.5 of IPPC Procedure Manual for Standard Setting (2023-2024)</a>	Torella

Agenda Item		Document No.	Presenter
<b>6.</b>	<b>Subjects on the TPG Work Programme</b>  Proposals for new or revised terms/definitions will be compiled into new draft Amendments to ISPM 5 Glossary of phytosanitary terms, to be submitted to the SC in November 2025.		Chairperson
6.1	Terms related to Wood Packaging Material (WPM)	08_TPG_2025_Oct  09_TPG_2025_Oct	Melcho
6.2	Review of the use of <i>and/or</i> in adopted ISPMs		Melcho/Torella
<b>7.</b>	<b>Review of Adopted ISPMs for Consistency of Terms and Style</b>		Chairperson
7.1	Consistency of adopted ISPMs (standard by standard): List of proposed or approved ink amendments for ISPMs	<a href="#">List of proposed or approved ink amendments for ISPMs</a>	Del Greco
7.2	Translation consistency changes to the French and Spanish translations of the terms “temperature treatment” and “heat treatment” in ISPMs	05_TPG_2025_Oct	Melcho / Carua Guagua
<b>8</b>	<b>Explanation of Glossary Terms</b>  Standing agenda item for TPG meetings. Members identify before the meeting some glossary terms/definitions requiring further explanations. These terms/definitions will be discussed during the TPG meeting and the need for additional explanations (e.g., in the annotated glossary) discussed.		Chairperson
8.1	Explanatory Document on ISPM 5 (Annotated Glossary) - 2026intermediate version  [The annotated glossary was finalized, approved by SC in May 2025 and published in 2025. The TPG considers yearly which amendments need to be made and produces an intermediate version]	04_TPG_2025_Oct  <a href="#">Annotated glossary (2025 version)</a>	Melcho
<b>9.</b>	<b>TPG Work Plan</b>		Chairperson
9.1	TPG work plan for 2026-2027  [The TPG updates its work plan for the coming year, based on discussions at the meeting, to be presented to the SC May 2026 for noting]	To be prepared during the meeting  <a href="#">TPG work plan 2025-2026 (restricted work area: login required)</a>	Torella
<b>10.</b>	<b>TPG Membership Review</b>		Chairperson
<b>11.</b>	<b>Any Other Business</b>		Chairperson
<b>12.</b>	<b>Date and Venue of the Next Meeting</b>		Chairperson
<b>13.</b>	<b>Evaluation of the Meeting</b>	<a href="#">Survey link</a>	Chairperson
<b>14.</b>	<b>Close of the Meeting</b>		Chairperson

## Appendix 2: Documents list

Document no.	Agenda item	Document title	Date posted / distributed
<b>Meeting documents</b>			
01_TPG_2025_Oct	2.3	Provisional Agenda	1 <sup>st</sup> version: 2025-10-14 2 <sup>nd</sup> version: 2025-10-17 3 <sup>rd</sup> version: 2025-10-20 4 <sup>th</sup> version: 2025-10-25
02_TPG_2025_Oct	3.1	Documents List	1 <sup>st</sup> version: 2025-10-25
03_TPG_2025_Oct	3.2	Participants List	2025-10-20
04_TPG_2025_Oct	8.1	Explanatory Document on ISPM 5 (Annotated Glossary) - 2026 intermediate version	2025-10-14
05_TPG_2025_Oct	4.2	Translation consistency changes to the French and Spanish translations of the terms “temperature treatment” and “heat treatment” in ISPMs	2025-10-20
06_TPG_2025_Oct	5.1	Draft annex International movement of fresh <i>Colocasia esculenta corms</i> (2023-023) to ISPM 46 - Review of TPG-related compiled comments and draft TPG recommendations (2023-023)	2025-10-20
07_TPG_2025_Oct	5.2	Draft annex International movement of fresh <i>Musa</i> spp. fruit (2023-028) to ISPM 46 - Review of TPG-related compiled comments and draft TPG recommendations (2023-028)	2025-10-20
08_TPG_2025_Oct	6.1	Submission to the 2025 Call for Topics – TPG recommendations on adding terms to ISPM 5	2025-10-20
09_TPG_2025_Oct	6.1	Inclusion of additional terms in ISPM 5 (Glossary of Phytosanitary Terms) related to wood packaging material	2025-10-20
10_TPG_2025_Oct	4.2	Extracts from other meeting reports of relevance to the TPG	2025-10-21
11_TPG_2025_Oct	5.3	TPG activities and timing for providing recommendations and translation on consultation comments	2025-10-21

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

Links	Agenda item	Document link
TP 5	2.4	<a href="#">Link to TP 5</a>
TPG membership list	3.2	<a href="#">TPG membership list</a>
Previous meeting report of the TPG	4.1	<a href="#">November 2024 TPG Meeting Report</a>
Draft annex International movement of fresh <i>Colocasia esculenta corms</i> (2023-023) to ISPM 46 ( <i>Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures</i> )	5.1	<a href="#">2023-023</a>
Draft annex International movement of fresh <i>Musa</i> spp. fruit (2023-028) to ISPM 46 ( <i>Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures</i> )	5.2	<a href="#">2023-028</a>

Guidelines on the standing TPG task on “Addressing TPG-related comments on draft ISPMs submitted for first consultation”	5.3	<a href="#"><u>Guidelines on the standing TPG task on “Addressing TPG-related comments on draft ISPMs submitted for first consultation”</u></a>
IPPC Procedure Manual for Standard Setting (2023-2024)	5.3	<a href="#"><u>IPPC Procedure Manual for Standard Setting (2023-2024)</u></a>
List of proposed or approved ink amendments for ISPMs	7.1	<a href="#"><u>List of proposed or approved ink amendments for ISPMs</u></a>
Explanatory Document on ISPM 5 (Annotated Glossary) – 2026 intermediate version	8.1	<a href="#"><u>Annotated glossary (2025 version)</u></a>
TPG work plan 2025-2026	9.1	<a href="#"><u>TPG work plan 2025-2026</u></a>
Evaluation of the meeting	13	<a href="#"><u>Survey link</u></a>

### Appendix 3: Participants list

	Participants details			TPG member's term	
	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Participant role	Email address	begins	ends
✓	<b>Mr André Felipe C. P. da SILVA</b> Federal Inspector Quarantine Division Ministry of Agriculture, Live Stock and Food Supply <b>BRAZIL</b> Tel: (61) 3218-2925	Steward	<a href="mailto:andre.peralta@agro.gov.br">andre.peralta@agro.gov.br</a>	May 2024	
✓	<b>Ms Besma M'RABET</b> Deputy Director of Analyses and Standardization Directorate General of Plant Health and Control of Agricultural Inputs (DG/SVCIA) <b>TUNISIA</b> Mob: +216 53 720 337	Arabic language expert	<a href="mailto:besma.mrabet.samaali@gmail.com">besma.mrabet.samaali@gmail.com</a>	October 2025	<b>October 2030</b>
✓	<b>Ms Xuemei JI</b> Assistant Director, Tropical Horticulture   Plant Sciences and Risk Assessment   Biosecurity Plant Division Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry <b>AUSTRALIA</b> Tel: +61 2 6272 5906 Mob: +61 412 418 490	Chinese language expert	<a href="mailto:xuemei.ji@aff.gov.au">xuemei.ji@aff.gov.au</a>	July 2022	<b>July 2027</b>
✓	<b>Ms Asenath Abigael KOECH</b> Pest Risk Analysis expert/Plant health inspector Kenya Plant Health Inspectorate Service (KEPHIS) KEPHIS Headquarters OLOOLUA RIDGE, KAREN P.O. BOX 49592-00100, NAIROBI, <b>KENYA</b> Mobile: +254 -722973535 Office: +254 – 709891110 Fax: +254 -020 3536175	English language expert	<a href="mailto:akoech@kephis.org">akoech@kephis.org</a> <a href="mailto:abigakoech@gmail.com">abigakoech@gmail.com</a>	May 2022	<b>May 2027</b> (1 <sup>st</sup> term: 2017 - 2022)

	Participants details			TPG member's term	
	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Participant role	Email address	begins	ends
✓	<b>Ms Stephanie M. DUBON</b> PPQ NAPPO Technical Director Plant Protection and Quarantine (PPQ), Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS), United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) 5601 Sunnyside Ave, Beltsville, MD 20705 USA <b>UNITED STATES OF AMERICA</b> Tel: +1 301-332-9071	English language expert	<a href="mailto:stephanie.m.dubon@usda.gov">stephanie.m.dubon@usda.gov</a>	January 2025	<b>January 2030</b>
	<b>Mr Alan MACLEOD</b> Principal Pest Risk Analyst Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) <b>UNITED KINGDOM</b> Mob: +44(0)7387055880	English language expert	<a href="mailto:alan.macleod@defra.gov.uk">alan.macleod@defra.gov.uk</a>	October 2025	<b>October 2030</b>
	<b>Ms Laurence BOUHOT-DELDUC</b> Ministry of Agriculture and Food, General directorate for food Europe, international and integrated risk management division 251 rue de Vaugirard 75732 Paris Cedex 15 <b>FRANCE</b> Tel: (+33) 149558437	French	<a href="mailto:laurence.delduc@free.fr">laurence.delduc@free.fr</a>	January 2024	<b>January 2029</b> (1 <sup>st</sup> term: 2013 - 2018) (2 <sup>nd</sup> term: 2019 - 2024)
✓	<b>Mr Konstantin GREBENNIKOV</b> Senior researcher, deputy head of the scientific-methodological and experimental center of FGBU "VNIIKR" 140150, Moscow Region, Ramenskoye, Bykovo, Pogranichnaya str. 32 <b>RUSSIAN FEDERATION</b> Tel.: +74997072227 (ext.1669)	Russian language expert	<a href="mailto:kgrebennikov@gmail.com">kgrebennikov@gmail.com</a>	November 2021	<b>November 2026</b>
✓	<b>Ms Beatriz MELCHO</b> Ministry of Livestock, Agriculture and Fisheries, General Direction of Agricultural Services, Plant Protection Division Avda. Millan 4703 CP 12900 Montevideo, <b>URUGUAY</b> Tel: (+598) 2 309 8410 ext 267	Spanish language expert	<a href="mailto:beatrizmelcho@gmail.com">beatrizmelcho@gmail.com</a> <a href="mailto:bemelcho@hotmail.com">bemelcho@hotmail.com</a>	November 2020	<b>November 2025</b> (1 <sup>st</sup> term: 2010 - 2015) (2 <sup>nd</sup> term: 2015 - 2020)

	Participants details			TPG member's term	
	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Participant role	Email address	begins	ends
✓	<b>Ms Patricia Raquel CARUA GUAIGUA</b> Analista de manejo y control de plagas específicas Agencia de Regulación y Control Fito y Zoosanitario – Agrocalidad Eloy Alfaro y Federico González Suárez. Av. Interoceánica Km. 14 1/2, Sector La Granja, CP: 170903, 170184 <b>ECUADOR</b> Tel. +593984637218	Spanish language expert	<a href="mailto:patriciaraquelc8@gmail.com">patriciaraquelc8@gmail.com</a>	August 2023	<b>August 2028</b>

IPPC Secretariat		
	Name	Email address
	<b>Mr Avetik NERSISYAN</b> Standard Setting Unit Lead	<a href="mailto:Avetik.Nersisyan@fao.org">Avetik.Nersisyan@fao.org</a>
✓	<b>Mr Daniel Lorenzo TORELLA</b> Phytosanitary Standard Setting Support Specialist	<a href="mailto:Daniel.torella@fao.org">Daniel.torella@fao.org</a>
✓	<b>Ms Aixa DEL GRECO</b> Standard Setting Unit Specialist	<a href="mailto:Aixa.DelGreco@fao.org">Aixa.DelGreco@fao.org</a>

## Appendix 4: TPG activities and timing for providing recommendations and translation on consultation comments

(Prepared by the IPPC Secretariat and agreed by the TPG in October 2025)

### 1. Background

[1] At the May 2025 Standards Committee (SC) meeting<sup>13</sup>, the SC discussed whether it would be beneficial for the Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG) meeting to be earlier in the year, to avoid the TPG recommendations being received after the stewards of draft standards had already addressed the consultation comments. The secretariat explained that the current timing of the TPG meeting is also related to the timing of the SC's recommendation to the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) to adopt draft amendments to International Standard for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPM) 5 (*Glossary of Phytosanitary Terms*). During the TPG meeting, the TPG drafts comments on the language versions of terms and definitions contained in the draft amendments to ISPM 5 to ensure consistency among them. These comments are then submitted to FAO Translation Services for consideration during the translation process, before the draft amendments to ISPM 5 are submitted to the CPM for adoption.

[2] The SC questioned whether there was a need for the TPG to provide translations of comments but recognized that they would be translating the comments anyway, for the benefit of their fellow TPG members. The SC agreed to discuss the role of the TPG in reviewing draft ISPMs at the SC meeting in November 2025 and to invite the TPG to prepare a background paper to inform this discussion.

### 2. Introduction

[3] The timeline for the TPG's review of draft ISPMs under first consultation and the development of draft TPG recommendations can be found in Table 1.

[4] **Table 1.** Timeline for the TPG's review of draft ISPMs (excluding draft amendments to ISPM 5) under first consultation and the development of draft TPG recommendations.

#	Step	Date
1	First consultation period	1 July – 30 September
2	Close of first consultation period	30 September
3	Secretariat sends the compiled consultation comments (in English, French and Spanish) on draft ISPMs under first consultation to the designated English, French and Spanish TPG members, who are responsible for elaborating the draft TPG recommendations in the respective languages.  For English only, the secretariat highlights English consultation comments that may be relevant to TPG, to assist the assigned English TPG members.	Following the close of the consultation period and posting of the compiled consultation comments
4	The TPG members assigned to each draft ISPM: - review all the compiled consultation comments; - identify the consultation comments that fall within the scope of the TPG (consistency, terminology and translation) and elaborate the related draft TPG recommendations for discussion at the TPG meeting; - can propose TPG recommendations on portion of text of the draft ISPM that are not subject to consultation comments.  French and Spanish TPG members usually provide an informal translation of French and Spanish consultation comments to assist the TPG in the revision and finalization of the TPG recommendations.	No later than 2 weeks before the TPG meeting
5	TPG reviews and finalizes the draft TPG recommendations.	During TPG meeting, usually after the SC November meeting

<sup>13</sup> May 2025 SC meeting report: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/94779/>

6	<p>Secretariat consolidates the TPG recommendations in English, French and Spanish in one single output table for each draft ISPM, grouped per paragraph, and sends the tables to the assigned TPG members for proof-reading.</p> <p>Once finalized, the secretariat forwards the TPG recommendations to the relevant stewards or technical panels, which may include the translation of the French and Spanish consultation comments to aid the steward or the relevant technical panel in their work.</p> <p>Secretariat archives the finalized TPG recommendations on translation in French and Spanish for consideration by FAO Translations services when the draft ISPM is being revised in French and Spanish (i.e. once the SC recommends the draft ISPM to CPM for adoption) (see step 9)</p>	Immediately after the TPG meeting
7	Finalized TPG recommendations become papers for the SC-7 meeting following the TPG meeting.	SC-7 meeting following the next year
8	SC November reviews the draft ISPMs and recommends them to the CPM for adoption.	During SC November meeting
9	Secretariat submits draft ISPMs to FAO Translation services for translation in all official FAO languages along with the TPG recommendations on the translation of terms in French and Spanish.	December
10	Draft ISPMs are presented to CPM for adoption.	CPM meeting following the next year

[5] The timeline for the development and review of draft amendments to ISPM 5 can be found in Table 2.

[6] **Table 2.** Timeline for the development and review of draft amendments to ISPM 5.

#	Step	Date
1	<p>Requests to work on new terms/definitions or to revise a definition may come from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- CPM</li> <li>- SC</li> <li>- TPG itself</li> <li>- Other expert drafting groups (EWGs and TPs)</li> <li>- CPs, RPPOs and possibly organizations (such as CBD) as part of comments on draft ISPMs</li> <li>- CPs, RPPOs as part of regional workshops on draft ISPMs</li> <li>- CPs, RPPOs when proposing topics for the LOT during the biennial Call for topics</li> </ul>	<p>Ongoing</p> <p>During Call for Topics</p>
2	Secretariat gathers and compiles requests from other bodies and send them to TPG for consideration.	Before TPG meeting
3	TPG members can submit papers for discussion at the TPG meeting.	TPG meeting (usually November/December)
4	<p>TPG discusses the requests and their own proposals and recommends the SC whether to work on the term(s) or not.</p> <p>SC decides which terms should be added to the TPG work programme in the LOT as subjects.</p> <p>If agreed, draft Amendments to ISPM 5 can be compiled.</p>	SC May meeting following the next year
5	A lead (TPG member) is assigned to each term and elaborates the related draft definition.	Before TPG meeting
6	TPG reviews the draft definitions of terms in draft Amendments to ISPM 5.	TPG meeting
7	SC reviews and approves draft Amendments to ISPM 5 for first consultation.	SC May meeting following the next year
8	First consultation period.	1 July – 30 September
9	Close of first consultation period.	30 September
10	Draft Amendments to ISPM 5 and 1 <sup>st</sup> consultation comments reviewed.	TPG meeting
11	SC-7 reviews and approves draft Amendments to ISPM 5 for second consultation.	SC-7 meeting following the next year
12	Second consultation period.	1 July – 30 September
13	Close of second consultation period.	30 September
14	SC November reviews the draft amendments to ISPM 5 and recommends them to the CPM for adoption.	SC November
15	TPG:	TPG meeting after SC

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- revises the translation of terms and definitions in French and Spanish;</li> <li>- develops proposals from scratch for Arabic, Chinese and Russian language versions</li> </ul>	November meeting/December
16	Secretariat submits draft amendments to ISPM 5 to FAO Translation services along with the TPG recommendations (see step 15)	After SC November meeting/December
17	Draft amendments to ISPM 5 are submitted to CPM for adoption.	CPM meeting following the next year

[7] Additional resources for the SC's consideration:

- Specification TP 5 - Technical Panel for the Glossary (2016) (Appendix 1)<sup>14</sup>;
- section 7.5 of the *IPPC procedure manual for standard setting*<sup>15</sup>, which outlines the activities of the TPG (Appendix 2); and
- guidelines on the standing TPG task titled “Addressing TPG-related comments on draft ISPMs submitted for first consultation” (Appendix 3) as agreed during the November 2024 meeting.<sup>16</sup>

## 2. Recommendation

[8] The SC is *invited* to:

- (1) *consider and discuss* this paper.

[Appendices 1 and 2 have been omitted in the meeting report and can be accessed on the IPP. Appendix 3 is contained in the paper submitted to the SC and is available in the IPPC restricted work area for the TPG]

<sup>14</sup> Specification TP 5 - Technical Panel for the Glossary (2016): <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/1300/>

<sup>15</sup> IPPC procedure manual for standard setting: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/85024/>

<sup>16</sup> November 2024 TPG meeting report: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/94333/>

## Appendix 5: Options for addressing the Canadian request on developing definitions related to ISPM 15

(Prepared by the TPG steward and agreed by the TPG in October 2025)

### 1. Background

[1] At its Nineteenth Session (2025), the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) agreed to implement a two-year trial of an ongoing Call for Topics for Standards and Implementation. In this context, an IPPC contracting party (Canada) submitted a proposal to add to the International Standard for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPM) 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*) several terms related to wood packaging material (WPM): “shipborne dunnage”, “crate”, “case”, “pallet” and “spool”.

[2] Following a decision of the SC in May 2025, the Secretariat forwarded the submission to the TPG to advise the SC on its feasibility and to recommend priorities.

### 1. General considerations

[3] The TPG reviewed the use of these terms in adopted ISPMs (see Table 1) and noted that, they do not have specific meaning under the IPPC framework. Most of them are mainly used in ISPM 15 (*Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade*) as examples of wood packaging material covered by the standard.

**Table 1:** Use of terms in adopted ISPMs.

Term	# Instances	ISPM
CASE	2	ISPM 15 / DP 1
CRATE	3	ISPM 15/ DP 20/ DP 27
PALLET	8	ISPM 15 (2) / ISPM 18 (2) / ISPM 42 / DP 10 / DP 20 / DP 27
SPOOL	1	ISPM 15
SHIPBORNE DUNNAGE	0	

[4] While defining subcategories of WPM and dunnage could help to better target inspections according to pest risk associated with these subcategories, such definitions would not improve understanding of the scope of ISPM 15. While this option might appear to provide harmonization, these terms are operational in nature and lack distinct phytosanitary meaning. They are already adequately covered by the existing definitions and explanations of “wood packaging material” and “dunnage” in ISPM 5 and ISPM 15.

[5] Introducing such definitions into the Glossary could limit flexibility and blur the distinction between operational examples and phytosanitary concepts. Moreover, this would contradict the TPG’s principle that Glossary definitions should only capture terms with a clear and broad phytosanitary meaning applicable across ISPMs.

[6] The TPG agreed that this issue relates primarily to implementation rather than terminology, and could be more effectively addressed through explanatory material supporting ISPM 15, such as the *Guide to Regulation of Wood Packaging Material*. However, the TPG decided to provide two options for consideration by the SC.

### 3. Options for consideration by the SC

#### *Option 1. Develop explanatory content within implementation or guidance material*

[7] By expanding or updating the existing *Guide to Regulation of Wood Packaging Material* this approach would allow for clear, practical explanations and examples without adding new terms/definitions to ISPM 5. The *Guide to Regulation of Wood Packaging Material* (Sections 3, 8, and Appendices 1 and 2 and also in the Definitions section) already provides comprehensive information to facilitate understanding of ISPM 15, including guidance on approved treatment options for wood packaging material and instructions regarding application of the ISPM 15 mark.

[8] Advantages:

- allows flexibility and regular updates without the need to follow the standard setting procedure (SSP);
- ensures consistency with ISPM 15 while maintaining its operational scope;
- enables inclusion of detailed explanations, illustrations, or case studies as needed; and
- aligns with implementation objectives and supports NPPOs in practical application.

[9] Disadvantages:

- the process for developing implementation guides does not allow for the direct participation of contracting parties in the revision; and
- revision and translation of the guide into other official FAO languages depends on the availability of funds.

#### *Option 2. Develop an appendix to ISPM 15*

[10] By developing an appendix to ISPM 15 for reference purposes to clarify terminology related to wood packaging material, similar to the approach taken for ISPM 39 (*International movement of wood*). This appendix could provide detailed explanations of the terms used in ISPM 15, ensuring clarity for contracting parties and inspectors.

[11] Advantages:

- provides formal, CPM-endorsed clarification within the framework of ISPM 15; and
- ensures consistency in interpretation and application of ISPM 15 terminology.

[12] Disadvantages:

- The development of an appendix or any updates would require following the whole SSP, making revisions more complex and time-consuming.

### 4. Recommendation

[13] The SC is *invited* to:

- (1) *discuss the TPG considerations outlined in this paper when deciding whether to add the terms “shipborne dunnage”, “crate”, “case”, “pallet” and “spool” to the TPG work programme in the List of topics for IPPC standards as subjects.*

## Appendix 6: TPG workplan for 2026–2027

Legend:

Tasks that have been completed are presented in a greyed-out format.

**TABLE 1 - REGULAR TASKS**

Regular tasks		Detailed task	Responsible	Deadline	Comments
1. Meeting reports: preparation and update to SC	October - December 2025	Draft report to editor	Secretariat	2025-11-17	
		Editor reviews report and send comments	Editor	2025-11-24	Tentative
		Secretariat finalizes report and sends it to steward, chairperson and rapporteur	Secretariat	2025-11-26	Tentative
		Steward, chairperson and rapporteur send back draft report	Steward, Chairperson, Rapporteur	2025-12-17	
		Final report	Secretariat	2025-12-26	
	Update for SC May 2026	Prepare update (including decisions) from TPG October 2025 meeting for SC May 2026	Secretariat with stewards	2026-03-25	Secretariat to draft; steward to respond by 25/03 tentative Deadline to post documents is 27/04
2. Draft ISPMs in 1 <sup>st</sup> / 2 <sup>nd</sup> consultation (except Amendments, see 3)	Going to SC-7 / 2 <sup>nd</sup> consultation	Terms and consistency comments extracted and forwarded to the assigned TPG members to elaborate draft TPG recommendations	Secretariat	2025-10-03	
		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
<b>3. Terms and definitions (incl. Amendments to the Glossary)</b>	<b>2026</b> Volunteers send draft meeting papers to secretariat	ALL, as allocated in Table 3	2025-09-22	TPG October 2025
	Draft 2026 Amendments compiled based on discussions at TPG 2025-11	Secretariat and steward	2025-11-28	Back to secretariat by 2026-01-10
	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 <sup>st</sup> consultation	French, Spanish	2026-05-01	These will be submitted to translation-services
	Draft amendments to 1 <sup>st</sup> Consultation		2026-07 to 09	
	Draft amendments and 1 <sup>st</sup> 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 <sup>nd</sup> 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 <sup>nd</sup> Consultation		2027-07 to 09	
	Consultation by email on 2 <sup>nd</sup> Cons. comments	ALL	in 2027-10	If Steward feels consultation is needed. The draft Amendments and responses to 2 <sup>nd</sup> Cons. comments are submitted to SC November

Regular tasks	Detailed task		Responsible	Deadline	Comments
	Check of translations of draft Amendments going for adoption (i.e. after SC November and when it has been revised/translated into all languages)		French, Spanish, Russian, Arabic, Chinese	TBD, in 2028-01	The translations will be ready for review around the beginning of January and must be posted by 1 March for CPM.
<b>4. Annotated Glossary – (to be published every 3 years, last published in July 2022)</b>	2019 (intermediate)	To prepare intermediate update based on TPG comments, outcomes of CPM 2019, SC May 2019	Beatriz Melcho	2019-06-15	
		To review intermediate update	All	2019-06-30	
	2020 (intermediate)	To prepare intermediate update based on TPG comments, outcomes of TPG 2019, including updates from SC Nov. 2019, CPM 2020, SC May 2020	Beatriz Melcho	After SC 2020-05	All to review / provide comments by end June 2020
	2021 (intermediate)	To prepare intermediate update based on TPG comments, outcomes of TPG 2020, including updates from SC Nov. 2020, CPM 2021, SC May 2021	Beatriz Melcho	After SC 2021-05	All to review / provide comments by end June 2021
	2022 (for publishing)	To prepare update based on TPG comments, outcomes of TPG 2021, including updates from SC Nov. 2021	Beatriz Melcho	2022-02-15	All to review / provide comments during TPG 2021 meeting
		To review update	All	TPG meeting	Approved by SC via e-decision in 2022
	2023 (intermediate)	To prepare intermediate update based on TPG comments, outcomes of TPG 2022, including updates from SC Nov. 2022, CPM-17 (2023), SC May 2023	Beatriz Melcho	After SC 2023-05	All to review / provide comments by end October 2023
	2024 (for publishing)	To prepare update based on TPG comments, outcomes of TPG 2023, including updates from SC Nov. 2023 and CPM-18 (2024), SC May and SC-7	Beatriz Melcho	After SC 2024-05	All to review / provide comments during TPG 2024 meeting
	2024 (for publishing)	Annotated glossary is updated and sent for publication	Secretariat	After SC 2024-05	Before TPG 2024 (published in April 2024)
	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	Before SC 2025-05	
	2025 (for publishing)	Annotated glossary is updated and sent for publication	Secretariat	After SC 2025-05	Before TPG 2025 (published in October 2025)
	2026	To prepare intermediate update based on TPG comments,	Beatriz Melcho	TPG 2025	

Regular tasks	Detailed task	Responsible	Deadline	Comments
	(intermediate) SC November 2024, SC May 2025			
<b>5. Explanation of Glossary terms</b>	Members to identify before the meeting some Glossary terms/definitions requiring further explanations (and not already explained in other places, such as the Annotated Glossary)	All	2025-09-22	
<b>6. Review of membership</b>	Annual review of membership to make recommendations to SC on new members needed		TPG meeting	

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

One-off tasks	Detailed task	Responsible	Deadline	Comments
<b>7. Review of ISPMs for consistency and style (other than in draft ISPMs)</b>	Ongoing consistency review	All during TPG meeting		TPG meeting
	Present all ink amendments / proposals for revision made so far	Secretariat	Ongoing	TPG meeting
	Development of position papers, explanation, recommendations etc			
<b>8. Other tasks</b>	General recommendations on consistency: yearly updates as needed	Secretariat with stewards	2026-01-07	
	General recommendations on consistency	ALL	2025-12-26	Appended to TPG report
	Development of position papers, explanation, recommendations etc			

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

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

Orange text: Terms to be submitted to CPM

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