



Rome, Italy
10-14 February 2014

REPORT

Technical Panel for the Glossary February, 2014



Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

CONTENTS

1.	Opening of the Meeting	4
1.1	Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat	4
1.2	Introductions	4
1.3	Brief presentation on the IPPC, TPG and roles of participants.....	4
1.4	Selection of the Chairperson and Rapporteur.....	4
1.5	Review and adoption of the agenda	4
1.6	Current specification: TP5 (2013).....	4
2.	Administrative Matters	5
3.	Reports.....	5
3.1	Previous meetings of the TPG (February 2013).....	5
3.2	Extracts from other meeting reports of relevance to the TPG.....	5
3.3	CPM-9 (2014) side session on IPPC and CBD terminology.....	5
3.4	Current work plan Secretariat	6
4.	Review Relating to Draft ISPMs Sent for Member Consultation in 2013 (1 July-1 December)	6
4.1	Draft amendments to ISPM 5: Glossary of Phytosanitary Terms (1994-001)	6
4.2	Minimizing pest movement by sea containers (2008-001)	9
4.3	Movement of growing media in association with plants for planting in international trade (2005-004).....	9
4.4	Management of pest risks associated with international movement of wood (2006-029)	10
4.5	Phytosanitary procedures for fruit fly (Tephritidae) management (2005-010)	11
4.6	Draft annex to ISPM 27:2006 – <i>Xanthomonas citri</i> subsp. <i>citri</i> (2004-011)	11
4.7	Draft annex to ISPM 27:2006 – <i>Potato spindle tuber viroid</i> (2006-022)	12
4.8	Draft annex to ISPM 28:2007: Irradiation for <i>Dysmicoccus neobrevipes</i> , <i>Planococcus lilacinus</i> and <i>Planococcus minor</i> (2012-011).....	12
5.	Drafts ISPMs in Substantial Concerns Commenting Period (July-end Sept.).....	12
5.1	Definitions in draft ISPM on Determination of host status of fruit to fruit flies (Tephritidae) (2006-031).....	12
6.	Consideration of New or Revised Terms/Definitions.....	13
6.1	Subjects on the TPG work programme	13
6.1.1	<i>additional declaration</i> (2010-006).....	13
6.1.2	<i>area of low pest prevalence</i> (2013-014).....	13
6.1.3	<i>authorize, accredit, certify</i> (use of the terms) (2013-004).....	14
6.1.4	<i>bark</i> (2013-005) and <i>wood</i> (2013-011)	14
6.1.5	<i>commodity pest list</i> (2013-013).....	15
6.1.6	<i>pest list</i> (2012-014)	15
6.1.7	<i>identity</i> (2011-001), <i>phytosanitary security (of a consignment)</i> (2013-008) and <i>integrity (of a consignment)</i>	16
6.1.8	<i>kiln-drying</i> (2013-006).....	17
6.1.9	<i>mark</i> (2013-007).....	17
6.1.10	<i>phytosanitary status</i> (2010-004).....	17
6.1.11	<i>survey</i> (2013-015)	18

6.1.12	<i>trading partners</i> (2013-009).....	18
6.1.13	<i>visual examination</i> (2013-010).....	19
6.1.14	<i>grain</i> (2013-018).....	19
6.1.15	<i>effective dose</i> (2013-017).....	19
6.2	Advice on new or revised terms and consistency in other recent draft standards i.e. those possibly going out for consultation in 2014.....	20
6.2.1	Draft ISPM on <i>International movement of used equipment</i> (2006-004).....	20
6.2.2	Draft ISPM on <i>International movement of seed</i> (2009-003).....	21
7.	Review of ISPMs for Consistency of Terms and Style	21
7.1	General recommendations on consistency	21
7.2	Consistency across standards	22
7.3	Other issues linked to consistency	23
8.	Annotated Glossary: 2013 Amendments	24
9.	Explanation of Glossary Terms	24
10.	TPG Work Plan and Medium Term Plan	24
10.1	TPG work plan	24
10.2	Medium term plan	24
11.	Membership of the TPG	25
12.	ISO Standard on Definitions.....	25
13.	Other Issues	26
14.	Date and Venue of the Next Meeting	26
15.	Close	26

List of Appendixes

APPENDIX 1:	Annotated Agenda	27
APPENDIX 2:	TPG Activities in Relation to Languages	31
APPENDIX 3:	Documents List.....	32
APPENDIX 4:	Participants List.....	35
APPENDIX 5:	Draft Amendments to the Glossary (2013 – for SC-7 before SCCP).....	37
APPENDIX 6:	Draft Amendments to the Glossary (2014 – for SC for consideration for member consultation)	50
APPENDIX 8:	Items to be Archived and Needing Modification at Future Revisions of ISPMs	61
APPENDIX 9:	TPG Work Plan 2014-2015	63
APPENDIX 10:	TPG Medium Term Plan	74

1. Opening of the Meeting

1.1 Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat

- [1] The IPPC Secretariat welcomed the members of the Technical Panel of the Glossary (TPG) to Rome, and gave a special welcome to the two new TPG members Ms Bloem and Ms Bouhot-Delduc.

1.2 Introductions

- [2] The TPG members introduced themselves.

1.3 Brief presentation on the IPPC, TPG and roles of participants

- [3] The Secretariat presented the standard setting process with emphasis on steps relevant to the TPG. In particular, the SC decided that *Amendments to the Glossary* (1994-001) follow the same process as other ISPMs with the exception that the working group of the SC (SC-7) may decide that the amendments that have not received member comments are not processed to the Substantial concerns commenting period (SCCP), and are presented directly to the following SC meeting in November (see further discussion under Agenda item 4.1).

- [4] The different roles and responsibilities of the TPG were explained.

1.4 Selection of the Chairperson and Rapporteur

- [5] Mr Hedley was selected as Chairperson and Mr Nordbo (until Thursday) and Ms Melcho (for Friday) as Rapporteurs.

1.5 Review and adoption of the agenda

- [6] The TPG adopted the agenda with reordering of some agenda items (Appendix 1).

1.6 Current specification: TP5 (2013)

- [7] The Steward presented the current specification for the TPG (TP 5)¹, summarizing the tasks. He informed the TPG that the SC May 2013 had revised the “Expertise” section by adding wording about the need for terminology expertise.

- [8] The Secretariat recalled the tasks of the TPG in relation to languages, specifically in terms of what the TPG is mandated to work on, relative to what FAO Translation Services are responsible for. The main role of the TPG in relation to languages relates to the terms and definitions in languages, at different stages of the development process. Some of the language issues are ultimately addressed during the language review group (LRG) process (for those languages that have an LRG), and the LRG process provides that the TPG member for the language concerned be invited to participate.

- [9] It was recalled that, as proposed by the Secretariat at the TPG February 2013 meeting, the draft Amendments going to CPM for adoption would be checked in languages by individual TPG members (see details in Agenda item 4.1). In addition, the Secretariat also requested TPG members’ assistance to provide preliminary translations of terms added to the *List of topics for IPPC Standards* (see Agenda item 13).

- [10] A member queried whether the draft translations of terms and definitions provided by the TPG would always be used in the final translations. The Secretariat explained that proposals are transmitted to the translators. With the new mechanism according to which TPG members review the translations of draft Amendments before they are presented to the CPM for adoption, final adjustments could be made before the draft is presented to the CPM.

¹ TP 5 (2013): <https://www.ippc.int/publications/specification-tp-5-technical-panel-glossary-2013>

[11] The Secretariat circulated a paper presented to the TPG October 2012 meeting² outlining the TPG activities in relation to languages. The TPG felt that this document was useful, and that it could be presented to the SC for noting (even if the SC had previously been informed about it in a TPG update).

[12] The TPG:

- (1) *requested* the Secretariat to adjust the paper *TPG activities in relation to languages* to reflect the current standard setting procedure and TPG involvement, to circulate it to TPG members for comments and to attach it to this report.
- (2) *invited* the SC to note the paper *TPG activities in relation to languages* for inclusion in the IPPC Standard Setting Procedure Manual under the TPG (Appendix 2).

2. Administrative Matters

[13] The Documents list (Appendix 3), the Participants list (Appendix 4) and the local information³ were presented.

3. Reports

3.1 Previous meetings of the TPG (February 2013)

[14] There were no comments to the TPG February 2013 report⁴.

3.2 Extracts from other meeting reports of relevance to the TPG

[15] The Secretariat presented the paper⁵ and highlighted parts of the CPM-8 (2013), SC May 2013, SC November 2013 reports of special interest to the TPG.

3.3 CPM-9 (2014) side session on IPPC and CBD terminology

[16] The Technical consultation among regional plant protection organizations (RPPOs) in 2013 had asked that a side-session be held during CPM-9 (2014) on the terminology of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and the IPPC in relation to invasive alien species. Mr Hedley and Mr Nordbo had been invited as speakers, in their personal capacities, by the Capacity Development group of the Secretariat.

[17] The Russian language member noted that Appendix 1 of ISPM 5 used the official CBD translations for CBD terms and definitions, and some words used in the CBD definitions have a different meaning in the phytosanitary context (e.g. in the definition of *establishment*). This makes it difficult to understand the CBD definition in relation to the explanation given in Appendix 1 of ISPM 5 for the IPPC context. He suggested that this could be fixed by having footnotes in Appendix 1 of ISPM 5 by the words concerned, stating the appropriate translation in the phytosanitary context.

[18] In relation to this issue, one member recalled that the analysis of the CBD terminology in relation to ISPM 5 (which had resulted in Appendix 1 of ISPM 5) was based on the CBD definitions in English, and that the explanations in Appendix 1 were developed in relation to these English definitions. Appendix 1 had then been translated into other FAO languages using, for CBD terms and definitions, the CBD translations. However, it may be that, as explained for Russian, the words used in the CBD translations introduced additional difficulties in understanding the relationships between CBD and IPPC terminology. This had not been analyzed so far. Mr Smith volunteered to review the CBD translations of terms and definitions included in Appendix 1 of ISPM 5 (in French, Spanish, and

² TPG_2012_Oct_31

³ Local information document: <https://www.ippc.int/publications/local-information-meeting-participants-rome-italy>

⁴ <https://www.ippc.int/core-activities/standards-setting/expert-drafting-groups/technical-panels/technical-panel-glossary-phytosanitary-terms-isp-5>

⁵ 04_TPG_2014_Feb

Russian), to identify if there would be a need for further explanations specifically in relation to language versions. He would present a paper to the TPG in 2015.

[19] The TPG:

- (3) *invited the SC to note* that the TPG will analyze the CBD terminology in relation to ISPM 5 (which had resulted in Appendix 1 of ISPM 5) in other languages.

3.4 Current work plan Secretariat

[20] The current work plan⁶, as decided by the TPG February 2013, was introduced. There were no comments. The work plan was updated during the meeting (see agenda item 10.1)

4. Review Relating to Draft ISPMs Sent for Member Consultation in 2013 (1 July-1 December)

[21] The TPG reviewed member comments on terms and on consistency, and reviewed the drafts for consistency in the use of terms. For the draft ISPMs that included definitions, the TPG also reviewed the French and Spanish translations of the terms and definitions, and noted the translations suggested by TPG members for terms and definitions in Arabic, Chinese and Russian.

[22] The detailed TPG recommendations on member comments and consistency will be compiled by the Secretariat and steward after the meeting, transmitted to the relevant ISPM stewards and posted as a meeting document for the SC-7 meeting (in May 2014). For diagnostic protocols and treatments, recommendations will be transmitted to the relevant TP steward. The tables of TPG recommendations are not attached to this report but will be posted on the TPG work area. This report only indicates general issues and the TPG recommendations regarding requests by members that new definitions be developed. A different process was used for the *Amendments to the Glossary* (1994-001) and the draft ISPM on *Minimizing pest movement by sea containers* (2008-001), which is detailed under 4.1 and 4.2.

[23] The proposals on translation of draft terms and definitions will be transmitted by the Secretariat to translators for their consideration when translating the standards.

4.1 Draft amendments to ISPM 5: Glossary of Phytosanitary Terms (1994-001)

[24] The steward introduced the papers⁷ regarding the review of member comments and consistency in use of terms/definitions, the French and Spanish translation of terms/definitions, and the proposed translations for the other languages.

[25] 4.1.1 Review of member comments

[26] It was recalled several times during the review of member comments that definitions in the Glossary do not set requirements, but only define terms for the purpose of understanding what is meant in ISPMs. In addition, ISPM 5 clarifies the meaning of terms in the context of the IPPC, while it is acknowledged that the same term may have a broader meaning outside of the phytosanitary context.

[27] Several comments requested that some terms and definitions proposed for deletion be retained, because they are used in ISPMs. The TPG noted that deletion is generally proposed because a term does not have a specific meaning for the IPPC context. Deletion does not prevent from using the term in ISPMs, with its common meaning.

⁶ 05_TPG_2014_Feb

⁷ 1994-001_Amendments_ISPM_5; 06_TPG_2014_Feb; 1994-001_Fr; 1994-001_Es; 1994-001_Ar; 1994-001_Zh; 1994-001_Ru

[28] The TPG discussed the following substantive issues:

[29] official measures or phytosanitary measures

[30] Many member comments related to the proposed use of *official measures* instead of *phytosanitary measures* in several definitions (*exclusion, suppression, eradication, containment, control*). Because of these comments, it seemed more acceptable to use *phytosanitary measures* in these definitions, and this change was proposed in the draft prepared for the SC-7.

[31] However, the TPG noted the need to discuss how the term *phytosanitary measure* is understood in the IPPC context, in order to ensure that it is properly used in ISPMs. It seemed that the term is understood differently in countries (according to member comments), and diverging views were also expressed within the TPG. This is a fundamental point, which would warrant a detailed discussion at the SC, in order to clarify how the term should be used in the future.

[32] The definition of *phytosanitary measures* relates to *regulated pests*, but there is a fundamental question as to whose regulated pests. The term *official measures* was used in the proposed definition of *exclusion* (and related terms) to avoid being too restrictive, but also to avoid calling *phytosanitary measures* those measures that are taken in the exporting country in relation to regulated pests of an importing country (i.e. to comply with the phytosanitary import requirements of the importing country). In some recent ISPMs, the same approach had been applied and some efforts made to use *phytosanitary measures* only for measures of the importing country in relation to its own regulated pests. The arguments raised by TPG members in favour of a narrow or broad understanding of *phytosanitary measures* are summarized below.

[33] Narrow understanding: the term *phytosanitary measures* cannot be used for measures that exporting countries take for pests that are not regulated pests for themselves. This understanding was used in some recent ISPMs, which avoid using the term *phytosanitary measures* if not in relation to the measures of the importing country. In addition, measures that are not laid down by the importing country could not be phytosanitary measures in sanitary and phytosanitary agreement (SPS) terms. Also, if *phytosanitary measures* is used for all types of measures, it becomes impossible to know what kind of measures are in place, and it may also lead to unjustified measures. With that understanding of the term, exporting countries would not implement phytosanitary measures to the benefit of another country. Finally, measures to meet phytosanitary import requirements are technically justified for the importing country (through PRA), but not for the exporting country.

[34] Broad understanding. Measures applied to regulated pests, whether of the importing or exporting country, could be called *phytosanitary measures*, as they all serve the main aim of preventing the international spread of pests. There has never been anything in the definition of the term (nor in the IPPC) which restricts its meaning to cover only the measures of the importing country. This broad understanding is an assumption, which is not explicit in the definition. In addition, it is convenient that the term be used for all measures, as long as they apply to regulated pests. Measures applied at export, such as export certification, or treatments, could therefore be considered as phytosanitary measures and are actually described as such in those ISPMs that deal with them. This also simplifies the understanding of *phytosanitary measures*.

[35] It was noted that the annotated glossary may need to be modified depending on the outcome of the discussion (it currently expresses the narrow understanding).

[36] Contaminating pest

[37] The Glossary term *contaminating pest* was proposed for deletion. However, many member comments did not support this deletion. The TPG recognized, as raised by comments, that: (i) this term is used in practice, although it is not commonly used in ISPMs (only ISPM 15:2009 *Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade* and ISPM 32:2009 *Categorization of commodities according to their pest risk* mention *contaminating pest* whereas several other ISPMs use *contamination by pest* or *contamination of consignments*, etc.); (ii) both *contaminating pest* and

contamination are valid terms, and; (iii) *contaminating pest* is easier to use than *contamination* in some contexts.

[38] However, the TPG believed there is still a need to avoid duplication between the definitions. In addition, other issues have been raised in relation to *contamination* (see Agenda item 4.2). The TPG suggested that *contaminating pest* be withdrawn from the draft *Amendments to the Glossary*, for reconsideration at the next TPG meeting together with *contamination*. One member suggested that the term “fomite” (which is used in the medical area) could be considered in that discussion, if felt relevant.

[39] 4.1.2 Terms and definitions in languages

[40] As regards the translation of terms and definitions, it was noted that the original Arabic translation of some definitions in ISPM 5, for which revision was proposed in the draft amendments, had been incorrect. In this case, definitions had been fully rewritten (and not only modified with the changes proposed in the English version).

[41] Several TPG members noted issues with translation of some terms and definitions. The TPG member for Chinese noted that *exclusion* was difficult to translate and that there had also been a serious translation issue with *area of low pest prevalence*. In relation to *control*, in Russian there is a need to specify what the control applies to, and the definition itself would probably need to contain “(of a pest)” (even if this is also indicated between brackets in the term).

[42] 4.1.3 Process for further development

[43] The Secretariat noted that the TPG responses to member comments and modified draft Amendments will be submitted to the SC-7 (the draft Amendments are in Appendix 5 to this report and the responses will be made available on the TPG restricted work area). It was agreed that the explanations accompanying definitions in the draft Amendments would be adjusted to reflect the changes and should be submitted to the SCCP in order to inform CPM members adequately of the content of the definitions and the changes made.

[44] The Secretariat noted that, after review by the SC-7 in May 2014, the amendments will be submitted to the SCCP. It had previously been proposed (SC May 2013) that the Amendments could be processed in two sets (one going to SCCP and one directly to SC November). The Secretariat proposed that they could be kept together as one set, provided the terms that had not received member comments were not opened for comment. The TPG agreed.

[45] At the end of the SCCP (30 September 2014), member comments will be sent to the TPG steward, who will contact TPG members if any substantive issues need to be discussed. Such consultation is expected to happen in the first part of October 2014. The steward’s response and possible redraft will then go to SC November 2014 for approval for adoption and then be sent for translation for CPM. The translation of the Amendments should be ready to be reviewed by the TPG members in early January (15 January is official posting date for draft ISPMs for CPM). The Secretariat will send emails to individual members requesting them to review translations of terms and definitions to verify that no elements are missing and that there are no mistakes in translation of glossary terms.

[46] The TPG:

- (4) noted that responses to comments and modified draft *Amendments to the Glossary 2013* (1994-001) would be transmitted to the SC-7.
- (5) invited the SC to discuss and clarify the understanding of *phytosanitary measure*.
- (6) in relation to *contaminating pest* (2012-001), invited the SC to:
 - agree that the proposed deletion of *contaminating pest* is withdrawn from the draft *Amendments to the Glossary*, and request the SC-7 to apply this change
 - approve the addition of *contamination* to the List of topics for IPPC standards under the same topic number as *contaminating pest* (2012-011)

- *request* the TPG to rediscuss *contaminating pest* and *contamination* at its next meeting (also taking account of member comments made at the 2013 member consultation on *contaminating pest*) and make a proposal to the SC May 2015.
- (7) *noted* that the Secretariat will transmit the proposals regarding language versions of terms and definitions to the translators.

4.2 Minimizing pest movement by sea containers (2008-001)

- [47] The steward introduced the papers⁸ regarding the review of member comments and consistency in use of terms/definitions, the French and Spanish translation of terms/definitions, and the proposed translations for the other languages.
- [48] The Secretariat explained that this draft had been sent for a preliminary member consultation in order to gather general comments. It would not be submitted to the SC-7, and the SC in May 2014 would discuss how to proceed. Consequently, member comments on terms and consistency were not reviewed in detail and the TPG only reviewed the draft to identify general consistency issues. These would be transmitted to the steward and the SC.
- [49] One member noted that the word *certification* had been used inconsistently in the draft, to mean *authorization* in some cases, *accreditation* in others, but not in the usual sense of *certification*. The use of terms *authorize*, *accredit*, *certify* (2013-004) in ISPMs was also discussed more generally under agenda item 6.1.3.
- [50] The steward for the draft ISPM (also TPG member) noted that *contamination* was used in the draft in a broader sense than its glossary definition. It covered, for example, previous cargo, organisms other than plant pests (such as snails, slugs, soil and snakes) etc. This was not consistent with the definition in ISPM 5, but no other term had been found when drafting the standard. It was noted that it may be legitimate in this case to use the term in a specific meaning (broader than its ISPM 5 definition), applying only to that draft ISPM. One option would be that the existing definition of *contamination* be modified so as not to mention *storage place*, *conveyance* or *container*, but that this be added between brackets after the term (as a qualifier). This would allow for the term to be used more broadly in other contexts. The TPG concluded that it could rediscuss this issue at its next meeting when reviewing the definitions of *contaminating pest* and *contamination* (as proposed under agenda item 4.1).
- [51] The draft ISPM contained a number of draft definitions, and the TPG reviewed their translations. Proposals related to language versions will be transmitted to translators when the draft is sent for translation or adjustment of translations. The steward of the draft ISPM noted that the definition of *freight container* originates from an ISO standard, and there may already be ISO translations in certain languages.
- [52] The TPG:
- (8) *invited the SC to consider* the general consistency issues raised by the TPG.
- (9) *noted* that the Secretariat will forward translation comments to FAO translation when it is clear what will happen to the draft ISPM.

4.3 Movement of growing media in association with plants for planting in international trade (2005-004)

- [53] The Secretariat introduced the papers⁹ regarding the review of member comments and consistency in use of terms/definitions, the French and Spanish translation of terms/definitions and the proposed translations for the other languages.

⁸ 2008-001_Sea_containers; 07_TPG_2014_Feb; 08_TPG_2014_Feb; 27_TPG_2014_Feb

⁹ 2005-004_Growing_media; 09_TPG_2014_Feb; 10_TPG_2014_Feb

- [54] The major issue discussed was whether *soil* should be defined, as several member comments suggested that the definition was not needed. There was no agreement in the group but various recommendations were made to the steward and SC-7 to consider.
- [55] Some members thought that defining soil as a growing medium is difficult. A growing medium is defined as where plants are intended to be planted (according to ISPM 5), while soil remains soil if it is not associated with plants. Some members found that the definition of soil was not needed because it would be sufficient to mention that soil is a growing medium. If soil was defined, many other growing media would also have to be defined.
- [56] However, others noted that, for the purpose of this standard, soil is a growing medium. It would be useful to define soil in this standard (and the definition would not be transferred to ISPM 5). It would be important to specify that soil is a mixture of organic and mineral material.
- [57] Details of the discussions, as well as proposed rewording of the definition, were made available to the steward and SC-7 for their considerations.
- [58] In relation to the title of the draft, the TPG noted that there is currently no consistency in ISPM titles. The TPG proposed here to use the title “International movement of growing media in association with plants for planting”, because it is consistent with two titles recently proposed for commodity standards (seeds and grain). The TPG noted that the SC may wish to consider consistency of ISPM titles more generally.
- [59] Several countries had requested the following terms be defined:
- [60] - *bulk growing media* and *contaminant growing media*. The TPG suggested that these should not be defined as they are not covered in this standard (nor other ISPMs).
- [61] - *peat*. The TPG suggested that the SC-7 considers this when discussing whether to maintain the definition of *soil*. If the definition for *peat* suggested in the member comment is kept, it could be simplified. Detailed proposals for rewording were made in the responses to comments.
- [62] The TPG:
- (10) *noted* that recommendations on member comments and consistency would be transmitted to the steward and SC-7 for their consideration
 - (11) *invited the SC to consider* analyzing ISPM titles to decide whether more consistency is needed.
 - (12) *noted* that the Secretariat will transmit the proposals regarding language versions of the term and definition to the translators.

4.4 Management of pest risks associated with international movement of wood (2006-029)

- [63] The Secretariat introduced the papers¹⁰ related to the member comments on terms and consistency. The main issues of discussion were as follows. The definition of *wood* as a commodity class is under revision (see agenda item 6.1.4), and the changes proposed to the draft also allowed that the draft ISPM and proposed definition would be compatible.
- [64] The TPG noted that the words *commodity class* and *commodity* were used in this draft but could often be avoided, because their use may introduce inconsistencies with the definition of the general commodity class for wood. The draft can simply refer to different types of wood commodities without using these terms.
- [65] One member comment suggested that commodity types for wood mentioned in the standard and not defined in ISPM 5 should be defined. The TPG noted that major wood commodities are defined in the Glossary (e.g. round wood, sawn wood). It would not be possible to list, or define, all wood

¹⁰ 2006-029_Wood, 18_TPG_2014_Feb

commodities (see also the proposal for “wood” in the *Amendments to the glossary* (2014), Appendix 6).

[66] The TPG noted that use of common and scientific names was not consistent. It would be preferable to use scientific names only in this ISPM, especially because common names create enormous translation problems and misunderstanding (especially where common names relate to groups of pests).

[67] The TPG:

- (13) *noted* that recommendations on member comments and consistency would be transmitted to the steward and SC-7 for their consideration
- (14) *suggested* the Secretariat add a note to the status box of the draft standard that the term *wood* is under revision.
- (15) *noted* that the Secretariat will forward a proposal regarding a French translation issue to the translators.

4.5 Phytosanitary procedures for fruit fly (*Tephritidae*) management (2005-010)

[68] The Secretariat introduced the papers¹¹ related to the member comments on terms and consistency.

[69] Some member comments suggested that *fruit fly management strategies* should read *fruit fly management programs* throughout the text. However, the TPG suggested keeping *strategies*. ISPM 26:2006 *Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)* deals with eradication “programs”, which are prepared using one or several “strategies”.

[70] The TPG discussed whether the term *primary host* should be used and it was noted that it has been used in other standards (ISPM 30:2008 *Establishment of areas of low pest prevalence for fruit flies (Tephritidae)* and ISPM 26:2006) but that several member comments suggest that this term should not be used. The TPG agreed that it would be useful to find a better term to use instead.

[71] The TPG noted that the terms *trees* and *orchards* were used in some places. It agreed with several comments that not all host plants of fruit flies are trees, and suggested that other words be used (e.g. *host plant* instead of *tree*, *place of production* instead of *orchard*).

[72] The TPG noted that there were many instances of the present tense in the text. Some member comments had suggested throughout the draft that a modal verb (expressing a level of obligation) should be used instead (e.g. *may*, *should*). However, there seemed to be instances where the present tense is appropriate because the text refers to facts. The TPG advised the steward and the SC-7 to carefully consider whether the text expresses a level of obligation (and a modal verb should be used) or a fact (and the present can be used).

[73] The TPG:

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

4.6 Draft annex to ISPM 27:2006 – *Xanthomonas citri* subsp. *citri* (2004-011)

[74] The Secretariat introduced the draft ISPM¹² and noted that there were no member comments on terms or consistency. Minor consistency comments were made (incorrect cross-references to other sections in paragraphs [106] and [107]; Timmer et al. (2000) cited in the text but missing in the reference list).

[75] The TPG:

- (17) *noted* that recommendations would be transmitted to the TPDP steward.

¹¹ 2005-010_Phyto_procedures_FF; 19_TPG_2014_Feb

¹² 2004-011_X_citri_subsp_citri

4.7 Draft annex to ISPM 27:2006 – *Potato spindle tuber viroid* (2006-022)

- [76] The Secretariat introduced the draft ISPM¹³ and noted that there were no member comments on terms or consistency.
- [77] The TPG noted that the draft correctly used scientific names for host plants, but was inconsistent with regard to common names. For example in paragraph [6], *potato* is mentioned after the scientific name and used later in the text, while *tomato* is not indicated after the scientific name but is used later in the text, and *pepper* is indicated after the scientific name but does not appear to be used later in the text; no common name is mentioned for other plants in this paragraph.
- [78] At first mention of a scientific name (at least for insects), the describing authority should be mentioned.
- [79] The TPG:
- (18) *noted* that recommendations would be transmitted to the TPDP steward.

4.8 Draft annex to ISPM 28:2007: Irradiation for *Dysmicoccus neobrevipes*, *Planococcus lilacinus* and *Planococcus minor* (2012-011)

- [80] The Secretariat introduced the papers¹⁴ related to the member comments on terms and consistency.
- [81] The TPG noted that the describing authority for pests should be mentioned only once in the standard. This has not been done consistently in treatments. Normally, in scientific publications, the describing authority is indicated at first mention of the name. However, it seems that another approach had been followed for many adopted treatments (where it is mentioned under “target pest”). In any case, the same approach should be followed for all treatments.
- [82] A few other comments relating to consistency with adopted treatments were made.
- [83] The TPG:
- (19) *noted* that recommendations would be transmitted to the TPPT steward.

5. Drafts ISPMs in Substantial Concerns Commenting Period (July-end Sept.)

5.1 Definitions in draft ISPM on Determination of host status of fruit to fruit flies (Tephritidae) (2006-031)

- [84] The Secretariat introduced the paper¹⁵ explaining that the SC November 2013 adjusted the draft ISPM on *Determination of host status of fruit to fruit flies (Tephritidae)* (2006-031) based on SCCP comments. The SC requested the TPG to make a final check of the definitions in the draft before CPM-9 (2014) adoption. In particular the SC had changed the term *non-natural host* to *conditional host*, and had adjusted its definition.
- [85] The TPG expressed concerns in relation to the change from *non-natural host* to *conditional host*. This may cause confusion as *conditional host* may be understood to also cover determination in the laboratory, which is not intended in this standard.
- [86] It was explained that the Technical Panel on Pest Free Areas and Systems Approaches for Fruit Flies (TPFF) had agreed that the change was a terminology issue, and the SC had agreed using *conditional host*. However, TPG members noted that *conditional host* is normally understood to also cover determination in the laboratory, while in this draft it is used only in relation to determination in semi-natural field trials. Since *conditional host*, in its current use, has a broader meaning, it would not be appropriate for this draft because its use would be inconsistent with the understanding of the term

¹³ 2006-022_PSTVd

¹⁴ 2012-011_Irradiation, 20_TPG_2014_Feb

¹⁵ 11_TPG_2014_Feb

outside this draft. It was noted in particular that, in several publications on host status that are cited in the draft, the use of *conditional host* was also in relation to laboratory trials (Aluja and Mangan, 2008; two regional standards) and this would conflict with the narrow definition proposed in this standard.

- [87] It was also noted that *conditional host* is difficult to translate in some languages. In Chinese, there is no established term for *conditional host*, and the translation that was found means *artificial infestation host*. In Arabic, there is also no established term. In Russian, both *non-natural host* and *conditional host* introduce new terms.
- [88] The TPG also noted that the whole standard seemed more consistent and clearer (including Figure 1) when "non-natural host" was "opposed" to "natural host" (and "non-host").
- [89] Regarding the changes in the definition of *conditional host*, the TPG queried the meaning of "under defined permissive conditions as concluded from the semi-natural field conditions set out in this standard" and noted that the "defined permissive conditions" were not explained in the draft. If they referred to the conditions in the standard, deleting "under defined permissive conditions" would still convey the correct meaning. If another meaning was intended, the definition was not clear and the meaning was not clarified in the text itself.
- [90] The Secretariat noted that the TPG remarks would be transmitted to the SC before CPM-9.

6. Consideration of New or Revised Terms/Definitions

6.1 Subjects on the TPG work programme

- [91] The TPG discussed the working documents prepared by its members on individual terms on the *List of topics for IPPC standards*. Details of the original proposals, including reviews of the use of the term in ISPMs can be found in the TPG working papers. Proposals for new or revised terms and definitions, as well as justifications, were included in the draft *Amendments to the Glossary 2014* (Appendix 6). The draft *Amendments to the Glossary 2014* will be submitted to the SC in May 2014 for approval for member consultation in 2014. If sent for member consultation, the TPG will review member comments at its 2015 meeting.

6.1.1 additional declaration (2010-006)

- [92] The TPG member introduced the paper¹⁶. The TPG had been asked by the SC to revise the definition of *additional declaration* (2010-006) to mention regulated articles. A revised definition was proposed. Explanations are given in the draft *Amendments to the Glossary 2014* (Appendix 6) and there was no other point of discussion.
- [93] The TPG:
- (20) *proposed* the revision of *additional declaration* in the draft *Amendments to the Glossary 2014* (Appendix 6) to be presented to the SC May 2014.

6.1.2 area of low pest prevalence (2013-014)

- [94] The Secretariat introduced the paper¹⁷. A revised definition of *area of low prevalence* was sent for member consultation in 2013 as consequential change to the proposed deletion of *occurrence*. The SC in May 2013 agreed to the proposed amendment, but also decided that the definition needed further consideration, to decide whether *control and eradication* should be modified to *control*. The term *area of low pest prevalence* (2013-014) was consequently added to the *List of topics for IPPC standards*. However, the change above was already made during the SC meeting (*surveillance, control or eradication* changed to *surveillance or control*) in the version to be sent for member consultation, but was not marked as a change. The Secretariat asked for guidance on how to proceed. The TPG noted that the change made is purely a consistency issue. The change is correct, because *eradication* is

¹⁶ 28_TPG_2014_Feb

¹⁷ 29_TPG_2014_Feb

covered under *control*. The TPG supported that the change be maintained in the definition to be processed through the SC-7 and SCCP to CPM. An explanation was added to the draft *Amendments to the Glossary 2013*, for the consideration of the SC-7, in order to inform CPM members during the SCCP.

[95] The TPG:

- (21) *invited the SC to note* that the change from *surveillance, control or eradication* to *surveillance or control* in the definition of *area of low pest prevalence* was already made in the draft *Amendments to the Glossary 2013* and is a consistency change.
- (22) *invited the SC to agree* that this change is maintained in the draft *Amendments to the Glossary 2013* to be processed through the SC-7 to SCCP and CPM.
- (23) *invited the SC to request the SC-7* to review and modify the explanation added to the draft *Amendments to the Glossary 2013* before the SCCP, in order to inform CPM members in a transparent manner.

6.1.3 *authorize, accredit, certify* (use of the terms) (2013-004)

[96] The TPG member introduced the paper¹⁸. The subject had been added to the *List of topics for IPPC standards* by the SC May 2013, with the purpose of discussing the use of the terms, not necessarily defining them.

[97] It was noted that these terms are used in many ISPMs, but that they do not have a specific meaning in the IPPC context. In general, *accredit* generally relates to a person or institution, while *certify* applies to an object, and *authorize* is not limited in this sense. As the terms do not have a specific meaning for the IPPC, it is not proposed that they be defined in ISPM 5.

[98] However, there was a need to explain the use of these terms in ISPMs and ensure consistency. The analysis of ISPMs showed that *accredit, certify* and *authorize* have been used inconsistently with their dictionary definition and between ISPMs. Some guidance could be developed to explain the meanings and uses of these terms in ISPMs. One member proposed that this explanation be extended to related terms, such as *verify, audit, approve, register, validate* and *compliance*. However, it was noted that these terms seem to be used consistently in ISPMs and no explanation is needed. An explanation of *accredit, certify* and *authorize* would also be useful in the context of the draft ISPM on sea containers.

[99] The TPG discussed which type of document should be developed, and concluded that a clarification could be developed as part of the *General recommendations on consistency*. A draft would be developed by Mr Hedley and Mr Smith for the TPG February 2015 meeting. The TPG would finalize it for inclusion in the *General recommendations on consistency* (for presentation to the SC in May 2015) and would also envisage the need to apply consistency changes across existing standards.

[100] The TPG:

- (24) *invited the SC to note* that a draft statement to be included in the *General recommendations on consistency* will be prepared on the terms *authorize, accredit, certify* (2013-004) for discussion in the TPG 2015 meeting.
- (25) *invited the SC*, when discussing the draft specification *Authorization of non-PPPO entities to perform phytosanitary actions*, to consider a task related to the terms used.

6.1.4 *bark* (2013-005) and *wood* (2013-011)

[101] The TPG member introduced the paper¹⁹. Following discussion, the TPG proposed a revised definition for *wood*. The TPG also supported that the current definition of *bark* (i.e. in its biological sense) be maintained but that a definition for bark as a commodity would be useful (the term proposed is

¹⁸ 23_TPG_2014_Feb

¹⁹ 22_TPG_2014_Feb

isolated bark). Explanations are given in the draft *Amendments to the Glossary 2014* (Appendix 6) and there was no other point of discussion.

[102] The TPG:

(26) *proposed* the addition of *isolated bark* and the revision of *wood* in the draft *Amendments to the Glossary 2014* (Appendix 6) to be presented to the SC May 2014.

(27) *invited the SC to agree* that the definition of *bark* may remain as it is.

6.1.5 commodity pest list (2013-013)

[103] The TPG member introduced the paper²⁰ explaining that the SC had queried whether the intended meaning of *commodity pest list* was a list of all possible pests of that commodity or a list of pests of that commodity only in that specific area.

[104] In ISPM 6, *commodity pest list* is understood to relate to the pests present in an area and associated with the commodity in that area. The TPG agreed that a commodity pest list would in practice normally relate to pests having some association with a commodity in an area. However, the TPG concluded that such restriction in the definition of the meaning seems unnecessary and therefore the current definition was appropriate.

[105] The TPG:

(28) *invited the SC to agree* that the definition of *commodity pest list* does not need to be modified.

(29) *invited the SC to remove commodity pest list (2013-013) from the List of topics for IPPC standards.*

6.1.6 pest list (2012-014)

[106] The TPG member introduced the paper²¹. The SC had expressed concern that there is often confusion on whether the expression *pest list* is used in relation to lists of pests present in a country or lists of pests regulated by a country. It was also believed that there was often lack of clarity in ISPMs.

[107] The TPG reviewed the use of *pest list*, *list of pests* and related terms in ISPMs. It was noted that *commodity pest list* and *host pest list* are defined in ISPM 5. The definitions for *host pest list* and *commodity pest list* are not creating problems and these terms are used in a few places in ISPMs. The TPG concluded that they should be maintained as they are.

[108] There are a few cases where the use of pest list in ISPMs is ambiguous, namely in ISPM 2:2007 *Framework for pest risk analysis*, ISPM 6:1997 *Guidelines for surveillance*, ISPM 8:1998 *Determination of pest status in an area* and ISPM 11:2013 *Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests*. In ISPM 19:2003 *Guidelines on lists of regulated pests*, *pest list* is used without mentioning that it refers to lists of regulated pests, but the entire ISPM is about lists of regulated pests. The TPG therefore believed that there was no ambiguity. In ISPM 1:2006 *Phytosanitary principles for the protection of plants and the application of phytosanitary measures in international trade*, *pest listing* is one of the operational principles, but the wording of the principle makes it clear that it relates to lists of regulated pests.

[109] The TPG discussed whether the process of pest listing should be defined, to indicate the different types of pests lists that may be prepared (for example: “the process of establishing lists of pests, such as lists of regulated pests, commodity pest lists, host pest lists or lists of pests present in a country”). However, several members were of the opinion that this was not necessary.

[110] The TPG concluded that there was no need for a new definition, but that the few ambiguous uses in ISPM 2:2007, ISPM 6:1997, ISPM 8:1998 and ISPM 11:2013 should be clarified at revision of these standards (noting also that revision of ISPM 6:1997 and ISPM 8:1998 is planned). A note was also

²⁰ 13_TPG_2014_Feb

²¹ 24_TPG_2014_Feb

added to the *General recommendations on consistency*, to the effect that *pest list* should not be used alone in ISPMs and that the type of list should be specified (see Agenda item 7.1 and Appendix 7).

[111] The TPG:

- (30) *invited* the SC to agree that it is not necessary to define *pest list* (nor *pest listing*)
- (31) *invited the SC to note* that ambiguities in the use of *pest list* in ISPM 2:2007, ISPM 6:1997, ISPM 8:1998 and ISPM 11:2013 should be corrected at revision of these standards, and *requested* the Secretariat to archive this until revision (see Appendix 8).
- (32) *agreed* that commodity pest list and host pest list should be retained in ISPM 5.
- (33) *invited* the SC to remove pest list (2012-014) from the *List of topics for IPPC standards*.

6.1.7 identity (2011-001), phytosanitary security (of a consignment) (2013-008) and integrity (of a consignment)

[112] The TPG member introduced the paper²² summarizing the main issues and explaining that if the proposed definition of *identity* was agreed, the definition for *integrity* could be simplified. The TPG proposed the addition of *identity (of a consignment)* and revised definitions for *phytosanitary security (of a consignment)* and *integrity (of a consignment)*. Explanations are given in the draft *Amendments to the Glossary 2014* (Appendix 6). It was noted by the TPG that the text in the ISPM 12:2011 *Phytosanitary certificates* Section on re-export was unclear, in particular on account of the manner in which the terms *identity* and *phytosanitary status* were used.

[113] The TPG also noted that in many ISPMs the use of *identity* and *integrity* in the same sentence is redundant and confusing. The TPG however suggests that the issue does not seem sufficiently serious to warrant any immediate action and recommends this to be amended on future revision of the ISPMs.

[114] In the proposed definitions, the quantities in a consignment are considered to be part of its *identity*, and *integrity* to be the maintenance of *identity* (therefore including quantities). This was thought to correspond to how *identity* is used and understood in most cases in ISPMs. However, the TPG noted that there is an inconsistency between the definition proposed for *identity* and sections 4 and 6 of ISPM 12:2011 in relation to re-export. ISPM 12:2011 states that the consignment's *identity* needs to be maintained at re-export, but also allows for splitting of consignments at re-export, i.e. that the quantity is changed. According to the definition proposed, the *identity* of the consignment would not be maintained in this case. If it is agreed that *identity* normally covers quantities, then this inconsistency should be corrected when revising ISPM 12:2011.

[115] The discussion on *phytosanitary security* took account of the concern expressed that the definition should cover not only infestation of consignments from the outside, but also the possible escape of pests from consignments. However, the TPG noted that only in ISPM 25:2006 *Consignments in transit* (in its Background, paragraph 5) uses the term *phytosanitary security* to explain how escape of pests from the consignment should be prevented. This is not the common use of the term in other ISPMs. It was therefore concluded not to include this in the current definition, but to modify the wording in ISPM 25:2006 when the standard is revised.

[116] The TPG:

- (34) *proposed* the addition of *identity (of a consignment)* and revised definitions for *phytosanitary security (of a consignment)* and *integrity (of a consignment)* to in the draft *Amendments to the Glossary 2014* (Appendix 6) to be presented to the SC May 2014.
- (35) *invited the SC to note* the proposal that ISPM 25:2006 be modified at revision with regards to *phytosanitary security* and the escape of pests from consignments in transit, and *request* the Secretariat to archive this case for future revision (Appendix 8).

²² 12_TPG_2014_Feb

- (36) *invited the SC to note* the proposal that ISPM 12:2011 be modified at revision with regards to inconsistencies in relation to *identity*, and *request* the Secretariat to archive this case for future revision (Appendix 8).

6.1.8 kiln-drying (2013-006)

- [117] The TPG member introduced the paper²³ explaining the main issues. A revised definition for *kiln-drying* was proposed. Explanations are given in the draft *Amendments to the Glossary 2014* (Appendix 6) and there was no other point of discussion.

[118] The TPG:

- (37) *proposed* the revision of *kiln-drying* in the draft *Amendments to the Glossary 2014* (Appendix 6) to be presented to the SC May 2014.

6.1.9 mark (2013-007)

- [119] The Secretariat introduced the paper²⁴ detailing the main issues. A revised definition for *mark* was proposed. Explanations are given in the draft *Amendments to the Glossary 2014* (Appendix 6) and there was no other point of discussion.

[120] The TPG:

- (38) *proposed* the revision of *mark* in the draft *Amendments to the Glossary 2014* (Appendix 6) to be presented to the SC May 2014.

6.1.10 phytosanitary status (2010-004)

- [121] At its meeting in February 2013, the TPG noted that the meaning of *phytosanitary status* is not clear and proposed actions to correct that situation by making consistency changes across standards. The TPG had proposed that there may be a need to define *phytosanitary status* where it is used in relation to consignments. For the other cases, a paper proposing actions was presented to the SC May 2013, but was postponed to November 2013, and then May 2014.

- [122] The TPG member introduced a paper presenting an analysis of the cases where phytosanitary status is used in relation to consignments²⁵. In most cases, the text could be clarified by substituting other wording through ink amendments, and it was decided that these would be added to the proposals already made to the SC (but not yet reviewed). The SC paper is not attached to this report, but will be made available to the TPG in its work area

- [123] The TPG also confirmed its proposal that *phytosanitary status* should be avoided in ISPMs (see under *General recommendations on consistency* – agenda item 7.1 and Appendix 7).

- [124] There were two cases related to consignments in ISPM 12:2011 where rewording would necessitate substantial revision. In one case, the TPG discussed whether to propose a definition (in relation to section 5, Guidelines and Requirements for Completing Sections of a Phytosanitary Certificate for Export - place of origin) or to recommend that the text be modified when the standard is revised.

- [125] The following text on *phytosanitary status of a consignment* was drafted and could be used as a basis for further discussion on the need for a definition:

“a synthesis, at a given moment, of all the factors which determine the pest risk of the consignment, including in particular for plants and plant products the conditions under which they were produced (for example, cultural conditions, exposure to regulated pests, pest control methods applied, phytosanitary procedures followed), and those under which the consignment was subjected to phytosanitary certification, handled and moved (for example, whether and how it was packed,

²³ 21_TPG_2014_Feb

²⁴ 30_TPG_2014_Feb

²⁵ 25_TPG_2014_Feb

repacked or stored, how it was transported, what phytosanitary security measures were applied, whether it received any treatment, whether it was re-exported).”

[126] The TPG wished to receive guidance from the SC on whether the wording above expresses the concept in the correct manner and could be used to develop a definition, and whether the TPG should consider a definition again at its next meeting.

[127] The TPG :

- (39) *invited the SC to discuss* the draft outlined definition for *phytosanitary status (of consignment)* and *to decide* whether the TPG should discuss this further at its next meeting.
- (40) *invited the SC to note* that recommendations on consistency across standards were added to the paper presented to the SC in May and November 2013, and are presented to the SC May 2014 in a separate paper.

6.1.11 survey (2013-015)

[128] The Secretariat introduced the paper²⁶. The SC had requested the TPG to consider a change to the definition of *survey* (which was sent for member consultation in 2013), in relation to presence or absence of a pest. The TPG noted that the change proposed would restrict the definition to only some uses of surveys, and it needed to cover all cases when surveys are used. The TPG also noted that this definition has strong relationships to ISPM 6:1997 and terms used in that standard, and that ISPM 6:1997 is going to be revised. The TPG therefore proposed that consideration of the definition should remain pending until a draft revised ISPM 6:1997 is available.

[129] The TPG:

- (41) *invited the SC to agree* that the subject *survey* (2013-015) be made “pending” on the *List of topics for IPPC standards*, until a draft revised ISPM 6:1997 is available.

6.1.12 trading partners (2013-009)

[130] The TPG member introduced the paper²⁷. This term was originally proposed to make it clear that *trading partners* refer to countries and not to stakeholders generally. At the TPG meeting in February 2013, it was envisaged that this term in ISPMs covered both importing and exporting countries. However, the analysis made showed that in most cases the intended meaning of *trading partners* is ‘importing countries’. However, the TPG believed that the term *trading partners* potentially creates serious misunderstandings. In particular, it could be read to cover exporting countries and private companies, which was not intended in most cases.

[131] The TPG noted that a definition of *trading partners* would not be useful. It recommended that this term be avoided in ISPMs in the future, and text to this effect was added to the *General recommendation on consistency* (agenda item 7.1 and Appendix 7). Because its use caused serious misunderstanding of ISPMs, the TPG proposed that the process for consistency across standards be used to correct existing ISPMs. Proposals were made to replace *trading partners* where it is used in ISPMs, to be presented to the SC in May 2014. The SC paper is not attached to this report, but will be made available to the TPG in its work area.

[132] The TPG:

- (42) *proposed* recommendations on consistency across standards for *trading partners*, which will be presented to the SC May 2014 in a separate paper.

²⁶ 31_TPG_2014_Feb

²⁷ 34_TPG_2014_Feb

6.1.13 *visual examination* (2013-010)

[133] The TPG member introduced the paper²⁸. A revised definition for *visual examination* is proposed. Explanations are given in the draft *Amendments to the Glossary 2014* (Appendix 6). In addition, the following point was raised.

[134] The TPG noted that *visual inspection* is used in a number of ISPMs. This is redundant, because inspection is defined as a visual examination. This inconsistency is minor and does not create problems for the understanding of ISPMs. The TPG proposed to correct it when the relevant ISPMs are revised, and added a note to the *General recommendations on consistency* so that *visual inspection* is not used when drafting ISPMs (see agenda item 7.1 and Appendix 7).

[135] The TPG:

(43) *proposed* the revision of *visual examination* in the draft *Amendments to the Glossary 2014* to be presented to the SC May 2014.

(44) *invited the SC to note* the changes to be made to ISPMs in relation to *visual inspection* at revision, and *to request* the Secretariat archive those until revision (Appendix 8).

6.1.14 *grain* (2013-018)

[136] The Secretariat presented the subject, which had been raised by the SC in November 2013 when discussing the Specification on international movement of grain with the input of three strategic experts²⁹. Following discussion, a revised definition for *grain* and a consequential change to the definition of *seeds* are proposed. Explanations are given in the draft *Amendments to the Glossary 2014* (Appendix 6).

[137] As detailed in Appendix 6, the TPG recommended that the definition of *grain* (2013-018) be kept broad, and not be restricted to *cereals, oilseeds and pulses*. Consequently, because the draft ISPM on *international movement of grain* is planned for such grain only, the limitation could be indicated in the scope of the ISPM.

[138] The TPG:

(45) *proposed* the revision of *grain* and a consequential change to the definition of *seeds* in the draft *Amendments to the Glossary 2014* to be presented to the SC May 2014.

6.1.15 *effective dose* (2013-017)

[139] The TPPT had proposed a definition for *effective dose*³⁰. The Secretariat lead for the TPPT noted that this term is used several times in ISPM 28:2007 *Phytosanitary treatments for regulated pests*, in particular stating that “Supporting data may be presented from preliminary tests to refine the treatment schedule to establish the effective dose (e.g. temperature, chemical, and irradiation) under operational conditions,” thereby referring to the efficacy of the dose. The term should be defined in order to be well understood, especially for those wishing to submit treatments for consideration as IPPC treatments. The proposed definition was:

effective dose	The level of efficacy achieved by a stated treatment schedule. The level of efficacy is described as both a level of reliability and confidence. The effective dose (ED) should be presented in the following manner: ED[level of reliability] at the [level of confidence] level of confidence (e.g. ED _{99.9963} at the 95% level of confidence)
-----------------------	--

²⁸ 26_TPG_2014_Feb

²⁹ 14_TPG_2014_Feb

³⁰ 15_TPG_2014_Feb

- [140] The TPG had a fundamental concern with the term and definition proposed. A dose is normally a quantity, but is expressed here as a level of efficacy. This may be how the term is used in ISPM 28:2007, and how it is understood amongst treatment experts, but it would not be possible in a glossary to define a “dose” as an “efficacy”.
- [141] Several options were envisaged. Several members asked whether “ED” could be defined instead, as this is used in treatments to express the efficacy of the dose. The Secretariat lead of the TPPT noted that the original idea was to not change the term used in ISPM 28:2007 (which is *effective dose*), but to define what is meant. However, the TPG noted that the possibility of using another term, defining it within ISPM 28:2007 and making consistency changes within ISPM 28:2007 should be envisaged due to the fundamental problem with the proposed definition. It may be possible to replace *effective dose* by *efficacy of the dose*, which would cover the intended meaning, and define *efficacy (of a dose)* or possibly *ED*. This would help avoiding defining a “dose” as an “efficacy”.
- [142] It was also recalled that definitions can remain in the standard they apply to, and are not necessarily defined in ISPM 5 (however, it was not considered an option to keep the term and definition as proposed by the TPPT in ISPM 28:2007 only).
- [143] The TPG also queried whether translation of *effective dose* in FAO languages in ISPM 28:2007 had taken into account the terms used in practice in other languages. In English, *effective dose* is apparently understood by treatment experts as a level of efficacy, but is this the case for the equivalent terms used in other language versions of ISPM 28:2007? For example, the French version of ISPM 28:2007 uses *dose efficace*, but is this the term used by French-speaking treatment experts?
- [144] The TPG was not in a position to propose a definition and suggested that the views above be presented to the SC to be transmitted to the TPPT, if relevant.
- [145] The TPG:
- (46) *invited the SC to note* that the definition proposed by the TPPT is inconsistent with how definitions should be written.
 - (47) *invited the SC to decide* whether the TPPT should discuss this issue further, envisaging the options proposed by the TPG.
 - (48) *invited the SC to recommend* that the TPPT considers how *effective dose* was translated into other FAO languages in ISPM 28:2007, and whether the terms used correspond to terms used in practice in the field of treatments in FAO languages.

6.2 Advice on new or revised terms and consistency in other recent draft standards i.e. those possibly going out for consultation in 2014

- [146] The TPG reviewed the draft standards to be presented to the SC in May 2014 for approval for member consultation in relation to draft definitions and to consistency in the use of terms³¹. The Secretariat recalled that comments would be submitted to the stewards and the SC.

6.2.1 Draft ISPM on *International movement of used equipment (2006-004)*

- [147] Only general comments are outlined below. All comments made will be forwarded to the steward and SC, and posted on the TPG work area.
- [148] *Import / export or dispatch*. The TPG discussed the use of *import* and *export*. In some cases, the equipment may be dispatched (e.g. returning to its origin), but not imported or exported. For the same reason, it was discussed whether *country of destination* could be used instead of *importing country*, and *country of dispatch* instead of *exporting country*. However, for consistency and to avoid introducing other terms that may not provide additional clarity, it was recognized that using *import* and *export* was appropriate, recognizing nevertheless that the draft needs to cover situations where

³¹ 2006-004_UsedEquip; 2009-003_Seed

equipment is imported or exported as goods, and cases where equipment is moved for various other purposes (e.g. military equipment), but not imported or exported.

[149] The terms *articles*, *machines* and *equipment* should be used correctly and harmonized throughout standard. Regarding *articles*, the TPG did not find the draft clear in its use of the term, in particular as it may also include non-regulated articles.

[150] The TPG noted that the ISPM should use Glossary terms where available and be consistent with IPPC terminology. For example: the Glossary term *pest risk* instead of *phytosanitary risk* or *risk*; *carry pest* instead of *harbour pest* for consistency with the definition of *contaminating pest*; *plants as pests* (IPPC terminology) instead of *invasive alien species* (CBD terminology); *plants for planting* instead of *propagative material*.

[151] The main text contains examples of specific pests. In other ISPMs, such examples are sometimes included in an appendix, and this could be considered here. In addition, scientific names should be used.

[152] The TPG:

(49) *invited* the steward and SC to consider the TPG suggestions for the draft standard.

6.2.2 Draft ISPM on *International movement of seed* (2009-003)

[153] Only some general comments are outlined below. All comments will be forwarded to the steward and SC, and posted on the TPG work area.

[154] *Small seed lots* versus *commercial seed lots*. The TPG noted that combining procedures and requirements for commercial seed lots and small seed lots was confusing in the flow of the standard and would make the ISPM difficult to use. It wondered if these categories should be separated, for clarity.

[155] *Weed seeds*. The TPG wondered why the draft did not deal with contamination of seed lots with weed seeds (or broader: plants as pests), which is the main way weeds are moved internationally.

[156] *Intended use*. *Sowing* and *testing* are mentioned in several places as examples of intended use of seed. The TPG proposed that *research* may express the intended meaning better than the Glossary term *testing* (if it refers to small lots intended for research).

[157] Scientific names should be used consistently throughout the draft with the describing authority added at first mention, especially for pests.

[158] *Transferred* and *transmitted* are used in the text. One term should preferably be used throughout. *Transmitted* may be more appropriate in the context of a pest being transmitted from a seed to a plant.

[159] The TPG noted that the ISPM should use Glossary terms where available and be consistent with IPPC terminology. For example: *pest risk* instead of *phytosanitary risk*; *plants for planting* instead of *propagative material*; *phytosanitary measures* instead of *measures* or *risk management measures*; *plants as pests* (IPPC terminology) instead of *invasive alien species* (CBD terminology).

[160] The TPG:

(50) *invited* the steward and SC to consider the TPG suggestions for the draft standard.

7. Review of ISPMs for Consistency of Terms and Style

7.1 General recommendations on consistency

[161] The Secretariat recalled that the SC May 2013 had approved the *General recommendations on consistency* as proposed by TPG February 2013. The SC had also taken two decisions inviting the use

of these recommendations by expert drafting groups³². The *General recommendations on consistency* were also included in the 2013 IPPC Standard Setting Procedure Manual.

[162] The TPG modified the *General recommendations on consistency* by adding notes on *phytosanitary status* (as decided at the February 2013 meeting), *trading partners* (see agenda item 6.1.12), *inspection* (agenda item 6.1.13 on *visual examination*) and *pest list* (agenda item 6.1.6).

[163] Comments had been made under different agenda items regarding the use of scientific names in ISPMs. The TPG reiterated that scientific names should be used in ISPMs, and that the describing authority should also be included. It was noted that the IPPC Style Guide already gives guidance on this. The Secretariat invited TPG members to communicate any particular language exceptions to this rule, so that information is added to the IPPC Style Guide (currently, exceptions are included only for the Chinese language).

[164] The TPG:

(51) *invited* the SC to note the modified *General recommendations on consistency* (Appendix 7).

7.2 Consistency across standards

[165] The Secretariat noted that the *Process for consistency across ISPMs* in relation to a specific term³³ was approved by the SC November 2013 and had been included in the 2013 IPPC Standard Setting Procedure Manual.

[166] One member queried what system was in place to ensure that the consistency changes that were either approved or not accepted were tracked, and how this information could be made available to the TPG. In addition, how would consistency changes that applied to all ISPMs be listed?

[167] The Secretariat recalled that the TPG had created the *General recommendations on consistency* during the review of standards for consistency, for the purpose of keeping track of consistency issues linked to the use of terms in ISPMs. The main issues raised during the consistency review were therefore already in the *General recommendations on consistency*, and the TPG could continue to complete these when consistency issues are identified.

[168] Regarding ink amendments already proposed to the CPM, the Secretariat explained that there was no compiled list of ink amendments that had been noted by CPM, or not accepted by CPM. Ink amendments noted by CPM had been applied by the Secretariat to the standards concerned, while those not accepted were not applied and were listed only in CPM reports. Proposals regarding changes needed at future revisions of standards (usually referred to as “Tables B”) were archived by the Secretariat until future revision. Other changes to be made at revision were also identified by other groups and individuals, and were archived for future revision (e.g. SC, TPs, editor).

[169] The TPG noted that the ink amendments not accepted by CPM-8 (2013), i.e. deleted from “Tables A” (ink amendments), should be incorporated into Tables B (to be considered when revising the standards in question).

[170] It was noted that when a standard is revised, Tables B should be provided to expert working groups for their consideration, to ensure that problematic wording disappears from the revised standard.

[171] The TPG considered whether all ink amendments, accepted or not, should be made available to it in a compiled form, but the steward noted that it would be sufficient to have a list of ISPMs that have undergone ink amendments.

³² 16_TPG_2014_Feb

³³ 32_TPG_2014_Feb

[172] The TPG:

- (52) *requested* the Secretariat to prepare for the next meeting a list of standards that have gone through the consistency review.
- (53) *invited the SC to request* the Secretariat to transfer the ink amendments not accepted by CPM-8 (2013) to Tables B and archive them for future consideration when the standards concerned are revised.
- (54) *reminded* the Secretariat that Tables B should be transmitted to expert drafting groups when standards are revised.

7.3 Other issues linked to consistency

[173] *Consistency of ISPMs in languages*

[174] Several TPG members asked if decisions had been made with regards to applying ink amendments to ISPMs in languages other than English. There was a pressing need to apply these changes to avoid that there is a gap between the English version and versions in other languages.

[175] The Secretariat explained that this is on the agenda for the SC May 2014 meeting. However, a consistency review of standards in languages should be wider than just applying the ink amendments decided for the English (which are not necessarily transferable to other languages). There may be other changes to be made for each language, and a full consistency review of ISPM in languages would require additional resources. One member noted nevertheless that, as a pragmatic approach, the ink amendments made to the English should be reviewed and incorporated, where relevant, to other language versions.

[176] One member suggested that this would also be useful when LRGs review translations of ISPMs, and that LRGs could be involved in including ink amendments; this should be suggested to the SC. The Secretariat reminded the TPG that LRGs are under the direct guidance of CPM, and that the SC has in the past not reviewed any of the TPG recommendations related to LRGs.

[177] *Consistency of commodity classes in the glossary*

[178] During the discussions on *grain* (2013-018) and *wood* (2013-011) (respectively agenda items 6.1.14 and 6.1.4), it was noted that the terms and definitions for commodity classes in the glossary do not follow the current practice, where elements to delimit the term (here: “as a commodity class”) belong to the term and not to the definition. The TPG decided to propose ink amendments to correct this internal inconsistency in ISPM 5 for all terms whose definitions start with “a commodity class for...”, including terms and definitions proposed for revision in the *Amendments to the Glossary (2014)* (i.e. *wood*, *grain* and *seeds*; Amendments are in Appendix 6). The SC paper is not attached to this report, but will be made available to the TPG in its work area.

[179] The TPG noted that there may be a need to discuss other categories of commodities in the Glossary and their relation to individual commodity classes, for example *stored products*, *plants for planting* and *germplasm*. There was no agreement that such a discussion was needed. The TPG could consider at its next meeting whether it should request SC approval to work on this.

[180] The TPG:

- (55) *proposed* ink amendments to ISPM 5, which will be presented to the SC May 2014 in a separate paper.
- (56) *invited the SC to consider* the TPG discussion on consistency in languages, in the framework of the SC’s separate discussion on this issue.

8. Annotated Glossary: 2013 Amendments

- [181] Mr Smith recalled that the third version of the annotated glossary had been finalized by the TPG February 2013 and published. The next version should be finalized in 2016. Until now, intermediate versions were prepared every year, and available to the TPG, during meetings.
- [182] It was decided that the TPG would not receive intermediate versions at its meetings, but after the SC May (because the SC May is the main meeting that changes the outcomes of TPG meetings). The Secretariat noted that intermediate versions should also take account of any relevant decisions at the previous SC November and at the CPM.
- [183] For 2014, the TPG agreed that Mr Smith will update the Annotated Glossary taking into account the TPG February 2014 meeting outcomes, and relevant decisions made at CPM-8 (2013), and the SC in May and November 2013. The use of terms within the Annotated Glossary (consistency and proposed deletions; such as *occur* vs *present*) will also be checked. A new update will be produced after the SC May 2014 meeting (taking account of relevant decisions of CPM-9 and SC May 2014), and circulated to the TPG. The draft Annotated Glossary will be on the agenda of the TPG 2015 meeting, at least for information. A similar process will be followed for the 2015 intermediate version.
- [184] The Secretariat noted that, in 2016, the updated version of the Annotated Glossary should be prepared in advance of the TPG 2016 meeting to allow for the possibility of face-to-face discussions, because the 2016 version would be published.

9. Explanation of Glossary Terms

- [185] The TPG members did not raise any issues related to Glossary terms.

10. TPG Work Plan and Medium Term Plan

10.1 TPG work plan

- [186] The TPG updated its work plan for 2014 (Appendix 9). This work plan will be presented to SC May 2014.
- [187] Some members found it difficult to locate the drafts that are processed for SCCP. The Secretariat explained that drafts are open for commenting in the Online Commenting System, and are not posted on the IPP.
- [188] The Secretariat reminded TPG members that the work plan is posted on the TPG restricted work area and is updated throughout the year. Members should refer to the online version for the latest updates, and the Secretariat also circulates the work plan by email when needed.

- [189] The TPG:

(57) *invited the SC to note* the TPG work plan (Appendix 9).

10.2 Medium term plan

- [190] The TPG reviewed and updated its medium term plan³⁴. This plan will be presented to the SC May 2014.
- [191] The TPG:
- (58) *invited the SC to approve* the TPG medium term plan (Appendix 10).

11. Membership of the TPG

- [192] Under this agenda item, members are expected to notify any expected change in membership, so that calls can be organized in good time. None of the TPG members expressed any intent of leaving the panel in the near future.
- [193] The Secretariat noted that the TPG now had a complete membership. This was the first meeting of Mr Smith as an invited expert, and the TPG expressed appreciation that he had been able to participate in the meeting.
- [194] The TPG:
- (59) *invited the SC to agree* that Mr Smith be invited to the TPG February 2015 meeting as an invited expert.

12. ISO Standard on Definitions

- [195] FAO Terminology Group presented the use of the ISO standard 704:2009 on definitions. The presentation will be made available on the TPG restricted work area for future reference. The TPG expressed its appreciation for the presentation that was very interesting and helpful.
- [196] In particular, members noted the importance of the *one concept - one term* rule. It is important that for each concept one term only (whether defined or not) is used in draft ISPMs. In particular, the *General recommendations on consistency* mention preferred terms and also terms that should be avoided, and they should be continuously expanded and made available to the SC and expert drafting groups.
- [197] It was noted that while the designation (whole term) should not be repeated in its definition, it was acceptable that definitions use one of the words of a compound noun term. FAO Terminology Group commented that this is possible, if those re-used words are commonly understood or are themselves defined in the Glossary.
- [198] One member queried how to deal with abbreviations, especially where the same abbreviation is used for different terms in different domains. It was noted that abbreviations should be written out in full at first mention in the ISPM text, and they then have the meaning given in that specific context. A question was made as to whether abbreviations should be used in other languages if they have been used in the English. The Terminology Group noted that English uses more abbreviations than some other languages, and that abbreviations are generally difficult to translate. In some languages, for example French or Spanish, translations would tend to use the full term or the most meaningful part of it.
- [199] A member queried whether some terms could be accompanied with photos in order to enhance understanding of the term. The Terminology Group noted that this is being done only to a limited extent within FAO, among other things because of issues related to copyright of the photos.
- [200] The original request to the TPG to use the ISO standard when creating definitions had arisen because it had not been possible to include glossary definitions in the Canadian database Termium, for which definitions should be compliant with the ISO standard; this is not the case of all Glossary definitions. However, the FAO Terminology Group assured the TPG that this requirement does not apply with FAO databases. Glossary terms could be shared easily, as long as the source was indicated.
- [201] Many Glossary terms have a qualifier in brackets, e.g. *integrity (of a consignment)*, and it was queried if that was acceptable. The FAO Terminology Group explained that qualifiers in brackets are acceptable, but this information could also be added to a “remarks” section. This would facilitate searches, because a search for an exact term is more difficult if there is bracketed text. However, the Glossary currently does not make use of such remarks.
- [202] The TPG thanked the FAO Terminology Group for its participation and appreciated their demonstrated availability to review the draft definitions when necessary.

13. Other Issues

- [203] The Secretariat consulted the TPG in relation to terms as subjects on the *List of topics for IPPC standards*. Currently the SC takes the decisions to add or delete terms, and the resulting *List of topics for IPPC standards* is made available on the IPP and presented to the CPM, in all FAO languages. The Secretariat saw two issues with this: (i) users of ISPM 5 do not know that some terms are being worked on (e.g. are under revision), and (ii) when new terms are added, it is not known how they will be translated, and compiling the *List of topics* in languages is therefore challenging.
- [204] Several options were envisaged instead of listing the terms on the *List of topics for IPPC standards*: (i) listing them in an attachment to ISPM 5; (ii) listing them in the publication history of ISPM 5, and marking the terms under revision in the Glossary itself (for example with *), or; (iii) integrating them in the glossary itself, including new terms to be worked on and terms under revision (with appropriate marking).
- [205] The TPG generally agreed that it would be useful for users to know which terms are being worked on. However, even if a term is being worked on, it does not mean that it will lead to an addition, a revision or a deletion. Some members were therefore reluctant to choose option (iii) (by which all terms, including new terms still without definition would be included in the Glossary). One member noted it was important to mark terms under revision in cases where the existing definition is under revision because it is not in line with the current understanding of the term or how it is used in ISPMs (for example, *wood* and *pre-clearance*).
- [206] The TPG was finally more in favour of option (ii), because it was deemed important that, when reading the Glossary, all terms under revision could be easily identified, but it was not desirable to include new terms in the Glossary itself. Appropriate disclaimers should be added to indicate that work on a term may lead to an addition, revision or deletion, but that it may also leave an existing definition as it is. The Secretariat will consider following this approach and not have the terms presented in the *List of topics for IPPC standards*.
- [207] The Secretariat also requested the help of TPG members to provide preliminary translations of the terms recently added as subjects to the *List of topics for IPPC standards* in their languages, and may also need assistance to make sure that Glossary terms were correctly used in the translation of new topics. The Secretariat will request the help of TPG members for individual languages when the need arises. The next consultation would be around 5 March 2014.
- [208] The TPG:
- (60) *invited the SC to note* that the Secretariat had requested the help of TPG members in relation to the translation of terms added as subjects to the *List of topics for IPPC standards*.

14. Date and Venue of the Next Meeting

- [209] The next meeting is tentatively set for 2-6 February 2015. The Secretariat acknowledged that some members would prefer that TPG meetings take place at a different time of the year. However, this is difficult to accommodate in the current standard setting process, because the TPG needs to meet between the end of the member consultation on 1 December of one year, and the SC May meeting of the following year.

15. Close

- [210] The Steward thanked the members, in particular the new members, for their input into the meeting preparation, and their enthusiastic participation and efforts during the meeting. He also thanked the Secretariat for their dedicated work and for making arrangements for the meeting.

APPENDIX 1: Annotated Agenda**Technical Panel for the Glossary - 10-14 February 2014****FAO headquarters, Canada Room (A356/7)****Start Monday 10 February at 9.30 – End Friday 14 February at 17.00****Wednesday 11-13:00 Terminology branch will give a presentation on ISO Standard 704**

AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER
1. Opening of the meeting	-	
1.1 Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat	-	Secretariat
1.2 Introductions	-	-
1.3 Brief presentation on the IPPC, TPG and roles of participants (IPPC Secretariat, steward, rapporteur, chairperson, members)	-	Secretariat
1.4 Selection of the Chair and Rapporteur	-	-
1.5 Review and adoption of the agenda	01_TPG_2014_Feb	Chair
1.6 Current specification: TP5 (TPG) (2013) (for information)	Download from: https://www.ippc.int/publications/specification-tp-5-technical-panel-glossary-2013	Steward
2. Administrative Matters	-	
2.1 Local information	Download from: https://www.ippc.int/publications/local-information-meeting-participants-rome-italy	Secretariat
2.2 Documents list	02_TPG_2014_Feb	Secretariat
2.3 Participants list	03_TPG_2014_Feb	Secretariat
3. Reports	-	
3.1 Previous meetings of the TPG (February 2013).	Download from: https://www.ippc.int/core-activities/standards-setting/expert-drafting-groups/technical-panels/technical-panel-glossary-phytosanitary-terms-isp-5	Steward
3.2 Extracts from other meeting reports of relevance to the TPG (SC, CPM)	04_TPG_2014_Feb	Secretariat
3.3 CPM-9 (2014) side session on IPPC and CBD terminology (for information)	-	Hedley/Nordbo
3.4 Current work plan The work plan was decided by the TPG 2013 but changes made based on decisions of the SC in May 2013 and possibly November 2013 (meeting still to be held). Changes will be outlined. The work plan will be updated during the meeting (agenda item 10.1)	05_TPG_2014_Feb	Secretariat

AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER
<p>4. Review relating to draft ISPMs sent for member consultation in 2013 (1 July-1 December)</p> <p>The TPG will review member comments on terms and definitions, and will review the drafts for consistency in the use of terms. Recommendations will be transmitted to stewards and the SC-7 (May 2014). When countries make requests for definitions for new terms, the TPG considers the requests and make a recommendation for the SC to add, or not, these terms to the work programme. Volunteers for each term are also identified as needed during TPG meetings. Finally, the TPG reviews the translations of new and revised terms/definitions in the French and Spanish drafts, and may propose translations for terms and definitions in other languages.</p>	-	-
<p>4.1 Draft Amendments to ISPM 5: Glossary of Phytosanitary terms (1994-001)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Member comments on terms and consistency 2. Translations of terms and definitions in French and Spanish 3. Proposed draft translations of terms and definitions for Arabic, Chinese, Russian 	<p>1994-001_Amendments_ISPM_5_06_TPG_2014_Feb</p> <p>1994-001_Fr; 1994-001_Es</p> <p>1994-001_Ar; 1994-001_Zh; 1994-001_Ru</p>	S. Omar, Ning Hong, A. Orlinski
<p>4.2 Minimizing pest movement by sea containers (2008-001)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Member comments on terms and consistency 2. Translations of terms and definitions in French and Spanish 3. Proposed draft translations of terms and definitions for Arabic, Chinese, Russian 	<p>2008-001_Sea_containers_07_TPG_2014_Feb</p> <p>08_TPG_2014_Feb</p> <p>27_TPG_2014_Feb</p>	S. Omar, Ning Hong, A. Orlinski
<p>4.3 Movement of growing media in association with plants for planting in international trade (2005-004)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Member comments on terms and consistency 2. Translations of terms and definitions in French and Spanish 3. Proposed draft translations of terms and definitions for Arabic, Chinese, Russian 	<p>2005-004_Growing_media</p> <p>09_TPG_2014_Feb</p> <p>10_TPG_2014_Feb</p> <p>33_TPG_2014_Feb</p>	S. Omar, Ning Hong, A. Orlinski
<p>4.4 Management of pest risks associated with international movement of wood (2006-029)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Member comments on terms and consistency 	<p>2006-029_Wood</p> <p>18_TPG_2014_Feb</p>	
<p>4.5 Phytosanitary Procedures for Fruit Fly (Tephritidae) Management (2005-010)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Member comments on terms and consistency 	<p>2005-010_Phyto_procedures_FF</p> <p>19_TPG_2014_Feb</p>	
<p>4.6 Draft Annex to ISPM 27:2006 – <i>Xanthomonas citri</i> subsp. <i>citri</i> (2004-011)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No member comments on terms and consistency. TPG to discuss consistency issues (if any) 	<p>2004-011_X_citri_subsp_citri</p>	
<p>4.7 Draft Annex to ISPM 27:2006 – <i>Potato spindle tuber viroid</i> (2006-022)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No member comments on terms and consistency. TPG to discuss consistency issues (if any) 	<p>2006-022_PSTVd</p>	
<p>4.8 Draft Annex to ISPM 28:2007: Irradiation for <i>Dysmicoccus neobrevipes</i>, <i>Planococcus lilacinus</i> and <i>Planococcus minor</i> (2012-011)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Member comments on terms and consistency 	<p>2012-011_Irradiation</p> <p>20_TPG_2014_Feb</p>	
<p>5. Drafts ISPMs in Substantial concerns commenting period (July-end Sept.)</p> <p>The SC at its meeting in Nov. 2013 requested a final check (before CPM) of the definitions in the draft ISPM on host status of fruits and vegetables to fruit fly (Tephritidae) infestation (2006-031)</p>	-	-
<p>5.1 Definitions in draft ISPM Determination of host status of fruits and vegetables to fruit fly (Tephritidae) infestation (2006-031) (to be presented to CPM-9 (2014))</p>	11_TPG_2014_Feb	Secretariat
<p>6. Consideration of new or revised terms/definitions</p>	-	

AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER
<p>6.1 Subjects on the TPG work programme</p> <p>Discussion papers needed for the next meeting are listed below, and details are in the TPG work plan. The reasons for adding the term to the work programme and discussions in relevant groups (TPG, SC) should be taken into account (even if additional proposals are made). Deadline: 31-12-2013. Papers will be posted as they become available. Volunteers are still needed for a few terms.</p> <p>Proposals for new or revised terms/definition will be compiled into new draft Amendments to the Glossary, to be submitted to the SC in May 2014</p>	-	-
6.1.1 additional declaration (2010-006)	28_TPG_2014_Feb	John Hedley
6.1.2 area of low pest prevalence (2013-014)	29_TPG_2014_Feb	Volunteer needed
6.1.3 authorize, accredit, certify (Use of the terms) (2013-004)	23_TPG_2014_Feb	John Hedley, Secretariat
6.1.4 bark (2013-005), wood (2013-011)	22_TPG_2014_Feb	Andrei Orlinski
6.1.5 commodity pest list (2013-013)	13_TPG_2014_Feb	Ebbe Nordbo
6.1.6 pest list (2012-014)	24_TPG_2014_Feb	Shaza Omar
6.1.7 identity (2011-001), phytosanitary security (of a consignment) (2013-008)	12_TPG_2014_Feb	Ebbe Nordbo
6.1.8 kiln-drying (2013-006)	21_TPG_2014_Feb	Andrei Orlinski
6.1.9 mark (2013-007)	30_TPG_2014_Feb	Secretariat
6.1.10 phytosanitary status (2010-004)	25_TPG_2014_Feb	Beatriz Melcho
6.1.11 survey (2013-015)	31_TPG_2014_Feb	Volunteer needed
6.1.12 trading partners (2013-009)	34_TPG_2014_Feb	Ian Smith
6.1.13 visual examination (2013-010)	26_TPG_2014_Feb	Shaza Omar
6.1.14 grain (2013-018)	14_TPG_2014_Feb	Secretariat
6.1.15 effective dose (2013-017)	15_TPG_2014_Feb	Secretariat
<p>6.2 Advice on new or revised terms and consistency in other recent draft standards i.e. those possibly going out for consultation in 2014</p> <p>This point relates to draft terms and definitions proposed by expert drafting groups in new draft standards to be presented to the SC in May 2014. The TPG will review the drafts with regards to the new definitions (if any) and to consistency in the use of terms. Comments will be submitted to the stewards and the SC.</p>	-	
6.2.1 Draft ISPM on International movement of used equipment (2006-004)	2006-004_UsedEquip	
6.2.2 Draft ISPM on International movement of seed (2009-003)	2009-003_Seed	
7. Review of ISPMs for consistency of terms and style	-	
7.1 General recommendations on consistency (as modified following the TPG Feb 2013 and noted by the SC. To be reviewed and completed as needed)	16_TPG_2014_Feb	Secretariat
7.2 Consistency across standards Process as approved by SC Nov 2013	32_TPG_2014_Feb	Secretariat
7.3 Other issues linked to consistency		
<p>8. Annotated glossary: 2013 amendments</p> <p>The annotated glossary, version 3, was finalized at TPG 2013 and published. The next version should be finalized in 2016. The TPG considers yearly which amendments need to be made. In 2013, the TPG will consider whether amendments are needed as a result of CPM-8 (2013)</p>		Ian Smith

AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER
9. Explanation of Glossary terms Standing agenda item for TPG meetings. Members identify before the meeting some glossary terms/definitions requiring further explanations (and not already explained in other places, such as the annotated glossary) (with a short statement on what is the issue with the definition). These terms/definitions will be discussed during the TPG meeting and the need for additional explanations (e.g. in the annotated glossary) discussed.		Secretariat
10. TPG work plan and medium term plan	-	
10.1 TPG work plan The TPG will update its work plan for the coming year, based on discussions at the meeting, to be presented to the May 2014 SC.	To be prepared during the meeting	Secretariat
10.2 Medium term plan The TPG will review and update its medium term plan, to be presented to the May 2014 SC	17_TPG_2014_Feb	Steward
11. Membership of the TPG Under that agenda item, members are also expected to notify any expected change in membership, so that calls can be organized in good time	See 2014_TPG_Feb_03 agenda item 2.3	
12. ISO standard on definitions NB: Do not distribute or copy. This version is protected by copyright and the IPPC Secretariat has bought copies only for TPG members. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentation by the terminology group of FAO • Further discussion 	Download from: https://www.ippc.int/work-area-publications/iso-standard-704-terminology-work-principles-and-methods-0	
13. Other issues	-	
14. Date and venue of the next meeting	-	
15. Close	-	

APPENDIX 2: TPG Activities in Relation to Languages

(presented at the TPG Oct. 2012 meeting; revised by the TPG in 2014)

Under Article XII – 5 of the IPPC, ‘The Secretary shall provide translations in the official languages of the FAO of documentation for meetings of the Commission and international standards.’

Role of the TPG in relation to translations

From the TPG Specification (Specification TP 5), the TPG should “[...] ensure that potential translation problems [for terms and definitions] are identified”. This happens in particular when terms and definitions are first developed, in English only, and TPG members identify words or phrases that may not be easy to translate. The TPG also provides recommendations on translations of terms and definitions at several stages in the standard setting process.

In addition, "the combined membership should have expertise in all FAO languages" (Specification TP 5).

Outline of the standard setting procedure related to TPG involvement (in bold) related to translations¹:

Topics

- (61) Topics are proposed to the SC to be included in the List of topics for IPPC standards.
- (62) A draft ISPM is prepared by an expert drafting group.

Member consultation

- (63) The SC May approves the draft ISPM for member consultation, and the draft is posted for member consultation.
- (64) **After member consultation (when it reviews member comments on terms and definitions and consistency in the use of terms), the TPG makes suggestions regarding translation of the terms and definitions in the draft ISPM and informs the SC that such suggestions were made.** The Secretariat provides TPG suggestions to translators, to be taken into account the next time the translation of the draft ISPM is adjusted.

Substantial Concerns Commenting Period

- (65) The SC-7 approves the draft ISPM for the Substantial Concerns Commenting Period.
- (66) Following the SCCP, the draft ISPM is revised by the steward and presented to the SC November meeting, which reviews the draft ISPM and recommends it to CPM for adoption.

CPM

- (67) The draft ISPM is translated prior to CPM.
- (68) **For the draft Amendments to the Glossary (only), TPG members are invited to review and provide comments on the language versions of terms and definitions.** The Secretariat submits TPG comments to the translators, who adjust the Amendments to the Glossary as needed before posting for CPM.
- (69) The ISPM is adopted by CPM.

LRG

- (70) For the languages where a language review group (LRG) is formed, the adopted ISPMs will be submitted to the LRG process to consider the preferred use of terminology and to identify editing and formatting errors resulting from translation. **Individual TPG members for the relevant languages are invited to participate in the work of the LRG².**

¹TPG activities in relation to languages only are listed. The TPG also reviews draft ISPMs at different stages in the process in relation to member comments on terms and definitions, and to consistency in the use of terms.

² <https://www.ippc.int/core-activities/governance/standards-setting/ispm/language-review-groups>.

APPENDIX 3: Documents List

DOCUMENT NO.	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE	DATE POSTED / DISTRIBUTED
01_TPG_2014_Feb	1.5	Agenda	2013-12-09
02_TPG_2014_Feb	2.2	Documents list	2013-12-09
03_TPG_2014_Feb	2.3	Participants list	2013-12-09
04_TPG_2014_Feb	3.2	Extracts from other meeting report	2013-12-09
05_TPG_2014_Feb	3.4	Current work plan	2013-12-09
06_TPG_2014_Feb	4.1.1	Member comments on terms and consistency (1994-001)	2013-12-09
07_TPG_2014_Feb	4.2.1	Member comments on terms and consistency (2008-001)	2013-12-09
08_TPG_2014_Feb	4.2.2	Translations of terms and definitions in French and Spanish (2008-001)	2013-12-09
09_TPG_2014_Feb	4.3.1	Member comments on terms and consistency (2005-004)	2013-12-09
10_TPG_2014_Feb	4.3.2	Translations of terms and definitions in French and Spanish (2005-004)	2013-12-09
11_TPG_2014_Feb	5.1	Definitions in draft ISPM Determination of host status of fruits and vegetables to fruit fly (Tephritidae) infestation (2006-031)	2013-12-09
12_TPG_2014_Feb	6.1.6; 6.1.10	Subjects: identity (2011-001); phytosanitary security (of a consignment) (2013-008)	2013-12-09
13_TPG_2014_Feb	6.1.5	Subject: commodity pest list (2013-013)	2013-12-09
14_TPG_2014_Feb	6.1.16	Subject: grain (added by SC Nov 2013)	2013-12-09
15_TPG_2014_Feb	6.1.17	Subject: effective dose (added by SC Nov 2013)	2013-12-09
16_TPG_2014_Feb	7.1	General recommendations on consistency	2013-12-09
17_TPG_2014_Feb	10.2	Medium term plan	2013-12-09
18_TPG_2014_Feb	4.4	Member comments on terms and consistency (2006-029)	2013-12-09
19_TPG_2014_Feb	4.5	Member comments on terms and consistency (2005-010)	2013-12-09
20_TPG_2014_Feb	4.8	Member comments on terms and consistency (2012-011)	2013-12-09
21_TPG_2014_Feb	6.1.7	Subject: kiln-drying (2013-006)	2013-12-09
22_TPG_2014_Feb	6.1.4; 6.1.15	Subjects: bark (2013-005) and wood (2013-011)	2013-12-09
23_TPG_2014_Feb	6.1.3	Subject: authorize, accredit, certify (2013-004)	2014-01-09
24_TPG_2014_Feb	6.1.9	Subject: pest list (2012-014)	2014-01-09
25_TPG_2014_Feb	6.1.11	Subject: phytosanitary status (2010-004)	2014-01-09

DOCUMENT NO.	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE	DATE POSTED / DISTRIBUTED
26_TPG_2014_Feb	6.1.14	Subject: visual examination (2013-010)	2014-01-09
27_TPG_2014_Feb	4.2.3	Proposed translations in Ar, Ru and Zh for 2008-001	2014-01-09
28_TPG_2014_Feb	6.1.1	Subject: additional declaration (2010-006)	2014-01-14
29_TPG_2014_Feb	6.1.2	Subject: area of low pest prevalence (2013-014)	2014-01-14
30_TPG_2014_Feb	6.1.8	Subject: mark (2013-007)	2014-01-14
31_TPG_2014_Feb	6.1.12	Subject: survey (2013-015)	2014-01-14
32_TPG_2014_Feb	7.2	Consistency across standards	2014-01-14
33_TPG_2014_Feb	4.3	Translation of terms and definitions in Arabic, Chinese and Russian (2005-004)	2014-01-24
34_TPG_2014_Feb	6.1.13	Subject: Trading partners	2014-01-24
1994-001_Amendments_ISPM_5	4.1	Draft Amendments to ISPM 5: Glossary of Phytosanitary terms	2013-12-09
1994-001_Es	4.1	Translation of terms and definitions (Spanish)	2013-12-09
1994-001_Fr	4.1	Translation of terms and definitions (French)	2013-12-09
1994-001_Ar	4.1	Translation of terms and definitions (Arabic)	2014-01-09
1994-001_Ru	4.1	Translation of terms and definitions (Russian)	2014-01-09
1994-001_Zh	4.1	Translation of terms and definitions (Chinese)	2014-01-09
2006-022_PSTVd	4.7	Draft Annex to ISPM 27:2006 – Potato spindle tuber viroid	2013-12-09
2006-029_Wood	4.4	Management of pest risks associated with international movement of wood	2013-12-09
2008-001_Sea_containers	4.2	Minimizing pest movement by sea containers	2013-12-09
2012-011_Irradiation	4.8	Draft Annex to ISPM 28:2007: Irradiation for <i>Dysmicoccus neobrevipes</i> , <i>Planococcus lilacinus</i> and <i>Planococcus minor</i>	2013-12-09
2005-004_Growing_media	4.3	Movement of growing media in association with plants for planting in international trade (2005-004)	2013-12-09
2005-010_Phyto_procedures_FF	4.5	Phytosanitary Procedures for Fruit Fly (Tephritidae) Management (2005-010)	2013-12-09
2004-011_X_citri_subsp_citri	4.6	Draft Annex to ISPM 27:2006 – <i>Xanthomonas citri</i> subsp. <i>citri</i> (2004-011)	2013-12-09
2006-004_UsedEquip	6.2	Draft ISPM on International movement of used vehicles, machinery and equipment	2014-01-14
2009-003_Seed	6.2	Draft ISPM on the International movement of seed	2014-01-24

Web links (documents to be downloaded)

DOCUMENT NO.	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE	DATE POSTED / DISTRIBUTED
https://www.ippc.int/publications/specification-tp-5-technical-panel-glossary-2013	1.6	Current specification: TP5 (TPG) (2013) (for information)	N/A
https://www.ippc.int/publications/local-information-meeting-participants-rome-italy	2.1	Local information	N/A
https://www.ippc.int/core-activities/standards-setting/expert-drafting-groups/technical-panels/technical-panel-glossary-phytosanitary-terms-ispm-5	3.1	Previous meetings of the TPG (February 2013)	N/A
https://www.ippc.int/work-area-publications/iso-standard-704-terminology-work-principles-and-methods-0	12	ISO standard 704: Terminology work	N/A

APPENDIX 4: Participants List

A check (✓) in column 1 indicates confirmed attendance at the meeting.

	Participants details			TPG member's term	
	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Participant role	Email address	begins	ends
✓	Mr John HEDLEY International Standard Organisations International Policy Ministry for Primary Industries Pastoral House, 25 The Terrace P.O. Box 2526 Wellington, New Zealand Tel: (+64) 4 894 0428 Mobile : (+64) 298940428 Fax: (+64) 4 894 0742	Steward / English	John.Hedley@mpi.govt.nz	2013	2018 (1 st term: 2008- 2013)
✓	Ms Stephanie BLOEM U.S. Department of Agriculture, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Plant Protection Quarantine (USDA, APHIS, PPQ) 1730 Varsity Drive, Suite 300, Room 310, Raleigh, North Carolina 27606, USA Tel: (+1) 919 8557650 Fax: (+1) 919 8557599	English	Stephanie.bloem@aphis.usda.gov	November 2013	2018
✓	Ms Laurence BOUHOT-DELDUC Ministry of Agriculture, Agro-food and Forestry General directorate for food Sub-directorate for plant quality and protection 251 rue de Vaugirard 75732 Paris Cedex 15 France Tel: (+33) 1 49558437 Fax: (+33) 1 49555949	French	laurence.bouhot-delduc@agriculture.gouv.fr	May 2013	2018
✓	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 ; bemelcho@hotmail.com	November 2010	2015
✓	Ms Hong NING Plant Quarantine Station of Sichuan Agricultural Department No. 4 Wuhouci Street, Chengdu, Sichuan, P.R. China 610041 Tel: (+86) 28 85505251 Fax: (+86) 28 85505251	Chinese	ninghong2006@yahoo.com.cn ; ninghong2006@aligun.com	September 2012	2017

	Participants details			TPG member's term	
	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Participant role	Email address	begins	ends
✓	Mr Ebbe NORDBO Danish AgriFish Agency Nyropsgade DK - 1780 Copenhagen V, Denmark Tel: (+45) 45 263 891 Fax: (+45) 45 263 613	English	eno@naturehverv.dk	May 2013	2018 (1 st term: 2009-2014)
✓	Ms Shaza Roushdy OMAR Phytosanitary Specialist Central Administration for Plant Quarantine Ministry of Agriculture 1 Nadi al Said Street Dokki, Giza, Egypt Mobile: (+20) 1111070634 / (+20) 104000813 Fax: (+20) 237608574	Arabic	shaza.roszdy@gmail.com	October 2012	2017
✓	Mr Andrei ORLINSKI European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization 21 bd. Richard Lenoir 75011 Paris, France Tel: (+33) 1 45 20 77 94 ; (+33) 1 84790743 Fax: (+33) 1 70 76 65 47	Russian	Orlinski@eppo.int	November 2010	2015
✓	Mr Ian SMITH c/o European Plant Protection Organization 21 bd. Richard Lenoir 75011 Paris, France	Invited Expert	ian@ianclaresmith.com		
✓	Ms Fabienne GROUSSET Standard Setting IPPC Secretariat FAO, Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00153 Rome, Italy Tel: +45 24483502 (cellphone)	IPPC Secretariat	Fabienne.Grousset@fao.org		
✓	Ms Eva MOLLER Standard Setting IPPC Secretariat FAO, Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00153 Rome, Italy Tel: +390657052855	IPPC Secretariat	Eva.Moller@fao.org		

APPENDIX 5: Draft Amendments to the Glossary (2013 – for SC-7 before SCCP)

[1]

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

[2] **Publication history**

[3]

Date of this document	2013-05-22
Document category	Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms)
Current document stage	2013-07 Submitted for Member Consultation
Major stages	CEPM (1994) added topic: 1994-001, Amendments to ISPM 5: Glossary of phytosanitary terms Specification TP5. 2012-10 and 2013-02 TPG drafted text 2013-05 SC revised and approved for MC 2014-02 Reviewed by the TPG
Notes	----

[4] Members are asked to consider the following proposals for additions, revisions and deletions to ISPM 5, as well as a proposal for the revision of the scope of ISPM 5. A brief explanation is given for each proposal. For revision of terms and definitions, only the proposed changes are open for comment. Terms and definitions that did not receive member comments at member consultation are not open for comment. [to SC7. This will be proposed to the SC May. This note is to be modified if SC decides otherwise]

[5] **1. ADDITIONS**[6] **1.1 EXCLUSION (2010-008)**[7] **Background**

[8] In 2009, the Technical Panel for Fruit Flies (TPFF) developed a proposal for a definition of *exclusion* in the draft ISPM on phytosanitary procedures for fruit fly management. The term was added to the *List of Topics for IPPC standards* by the SC in April 2010 based on a TPG proposal. The TPFF definition was reviewed and modified by the TPG in October 2010, reviewed by the SC in May 2011 and sent for member consultation in June 2011. In view of the comments received, in November 2011 the TPG suggested that *exclusion* should be reconsidered in association with *containment*, *suppression*, *eradication* and *control* (already on the *List of Topics for IPPC standards* – see section 2.2 for proposals for revision of these terms). A revised proposal was put forward by the TPG in October 2012 and reviewed by the SC in May 2013. The following explanatory points may be considered:

[9] It is useful to add this term and its definition to the existing collection of measure-related terms, which includes *containment*, *eradication* and *suppression*. The definition should be broad as the term has a wider application than fruit fly management, and has the same basic form as the other measure-related terms.

[10] At member consultation, this definition (as well as those for *containment*, *suppression*, *eradication* and *control*) used ~~It is recommended to use "official measures"~~ rather than *phytosanitary measures for all definitions in this group (exclusion, containment, suppression, eradication and control). This was originally proposed as *phytosanitary measures* was understood to relate to regulated pests only (i.e. quarantine pests or regulated non-quarantine pests), but there is no need to restrict the definition of these terms to regulated pests. On the contrary, the terms *exclusion*, *containment*, *suppression*, *eradication* and *control* do not relate only to quarantine pests of the country where the measures are applied, so*

official measures is more appropriate. In addition, countries may also apply exclusion for their own benefit, and not with regard to the regulated pests of another country. This was with the understanding that phytosanitary measures relate to the measures of the importing country (i.e. on its own regulated pests) and not to the measures in the exporting country to comply with phytosanitary import requirements of another country (in relation to regulated pests of the importing country). Many member comments requested that phytosanitary measures be used. It does not seem that phytosanitary measures is understood as described above. It is suggested that phytosanitary measures is used here in response to member comments. However, the TPG suggested the SC has a wider discussion to clarify for the IPPC how phytosanitary measures should be understood. [to SC7. This issue will be presented to the SC May 2014 for discussion. The text above, possibly definitions may have to be adjusted to take account of SC discussions]

- [11] The term is qualified by *of a pest* so the word *exclusion* can still be used in its common English meaning in other contexts, as is currently the case in various ISPMs (such as “excludes wood packaging material” in ISPM 15:2009, “exclude a certain area” in ISPM 22:2005, exclusion of chemicals or equipment in ISPM 27:2006). The use of a qualifier is also consistent with other glossary terms, such as *control*, *entry* and *establishment*.
- [12] The term *introduction* (i.e. *entry* and *establishment*) is used and not *entry*. A package of exclusion measures might include measures to prevent *establishment* in cases of transience or incursion. Ultimately, the aim of exclusion is to prevent establishment of pests.
- [13] Although the definition of *introduction* already refers (indirectly) to an area by using the term *entry*, the words *into an area* were added for clarification, as the concept of exclusion is linked to a defined area, whether a country or an area within a country or between several countries.
- [14] It was considered whether the wording *the application of measures in and around an area* should be used to be consistent with the definition of *containment* and to cover the case of a buffer zone. It is recognized that the definition of *exclusion* was originally developed to apply to pest free areas (PFAs) and areas of low pest prevalence (ALPPs) for fruit flies (in which case it is restricted to the application of measures *in and around an area*); however, *exclusion* also needs to be used in contexts other than fruit fly PFAs and ALPPs. *In and around an area* is not relevant in the common scenario in which the area under exclusion is a whole country, or when exclusion measures that benefit one country are applied in another country.

[15] **Proposed addition**

[16] exclusion (of a pest)	Application of official phytosanitary measures to prevent the introduction of a pest into an area .
-----------------------------------	---

[17] **1.2 PRODUCTION SITE (2012-004)**

[18] **Background**

- [19] The term *production site* was added to the *List of Topics for IPPC standards* by the SC in April 2012 based on a TPG proposal. A definition was proposed by the TPG in October 2012 and reviewed by the SC in May 2013. The following explanatory points may be considered:
- [20] The term *production site* is often used in standards and therefore a definition would be useful. *Pest free production sites* was used in ISPM 10:1999 (and is defined in ISPM 5) to cover situations in which such a site is designated within a place of production without at the same time making that place a *pest free place of production*. The term *place of production* is already defined.
- [21] The proposed definition identifies a production site as a separate unit within a place of production.
- [22] In ISPMs production sites are defined for phytosanitary purposes (and not for other purposes), and this should be stated in the definition.
- [23] As a consequence of defining *production site*, the definitions of *place of production* and *pest free production site* need to be amended (see section 2.4).

A few editorial changes were made at member consultation in order to clarify the definition.

[24] **Proposed addition**

[25] production site	A defined part of a place of production , that is managed for phytosanitary purposes as a separate unit <u>for phytosanitary purposes</u>
-----------------------------	---

[26] **2. REVISIONS**[27] **2.1 POINT OF ENTRY (2010-005)**[28] **Background**

[29] The term *point of entry* was added to the *List of Topics for IPPC standards* by the SC in November 2010 based on a TPG proposal. A revised definition was proposed by the TPG in October 2012 and reviewed by the SC in May 2013. The following explanatory points may be considered:

[30] The use of *border* reduces the scope of the definition. Phytosanitary operations may take place not at the border, but inland at some other officially designated locations. It is a common practice in many countries to have points of entry inside countries, far from borders.

[31] *Land point*, which remains by deleting *border*, is not a correct expression in English. Considering that points of entry may be, for example, a facility, nursery, orchard or factory, the word *location* was chosen. As a result of member consultation, it was recognized important to maintain examples for clarity, and "land border points" was reinstated in definition, as requested by many member comments.

[32] The use of *and/or* should be avoided. *Or* is appropriate here.

[33] *Import* is the usual term in ISPMs.

[34] It was thought useful to maintain the reference to airport and seaport in the definition; that is, to not simplify the definition by using *any location* instead of *airport, seaport or any other location*. Examples also seemed to be considered useful at member consultation.

Several comments requested that "crew" be added to the definition. It is recognized that "passengers" was too restrictive, but "passengers and crew" would also be, and "persons" was proposed.

[35] **Original definition**

[36] point of entry	Airport, seaport or land border point officially designated for the importation of consignments , and/or entrance of passengers [FAO, 1995]
----------------------------	---

[37] **Proposed revision**

[38] point of entry	Airport, seaport, <u>land border point</u> or <u>any other location</u> land border point officially designated for the importation of consignments , and/or the entrance of <u>passengers-persons</u>
----------------------------	--

[39] **2.2 SYSTEMS APPROACH(ES) (2010-002)**[40] **Background**

[41] The term *systems approach(es)* was added to the *List of Topics for IPPC standards* by the SC in November 2010 based on a TPG proposal. A revised definition was proposed by the TPG in October 2012 and reviewed by the SC in May 2013. The following explanatory points may be considered:

[42] A systems approach is a pest risk management option, and this is mentioned in the revised definition to clarify the concept.

[43] The wording *risk management measures* is replaced by *official measures*. The wording *official measures* was proposed at member consultation, but changed in reaction to member comments. "different measures" was thought preferable to "phytosanitary measures" as it is the resulting systems approach which is itself a phytosanitary measure. This wording reflects the fact that systems approaches may be used not only for regulated pests, but also for other pests, and is therefore preferred instead of

phytosanitary measures.

[44] The current definition includes three important elements, retained in the final proposal: the system approach integrates ~~phytosanitary~~ measures, two of those measures act independently, and all the measures have a cumulative effect.

[45] The definition should not specify the outcome of the systems approach and prejudge that it will be successful. The phrase *achieve the appropriate level of protection against regulated pests* was therefore deleted. However, the objective – pest risk management – is retained.

[46] Additional letters presented in parentheses that make a word optionally plural (such as “(es)”) should generally be avoided in ISPMs and in this case are not necessary as the definition was reworded as a pest risk management option.

Original definition

[48] systems approach(es)	The integration of different risk management measures, at least two of which act independently, and which cumulatively achieve the appropriate level of protection against regulated pests [ISPM 14:2002; revised ICPM, 2005]
----------------------------------	--

Proposed revision

[50] systems approach(es)	The integration of A pPest risk management option that integrates different risk management official measures, at least two of which act independently, <u>with cumulative effect</u> and which cumulatively achieve the appropriate level of protection against regulated pests
----------------------------------	---

2.3 SUPPRESSION (2011-002), ERADICATION (2011-003), CONTAINMENT (2011-004), CONTROL (2011-005)**Background**

[53] The terms *suppression*, *eradication*, *containment* and *control* were added to the *List of Topics for IPPC standards* by the SC in May 2011 based on a TPG proposal. Revised definitions were proposed by the TPG in October 2012 and reviewed by the SC in May 2013. The following explanatory points may be considered:

[54] For all definitions: *official* measures was used at member consultation, but reverted to ~~instead of phytosanitary measures as a result of member for consultation~~ (reasons detailed under the addition of exclusion, (see section 1.1). However, the TPG suggested the SC has a wider discussion to clarify for the IPPC how *phytosanitary measures* should be understood (see 1.1) [to SC7. This issue will be presented to the SC May 2014 for discussion. The text above, possibly definitions may have to be adjusted to take account of SC discussions]

[55] For *containment*: the term has been qualified by *of a pest* for consistency. The term is used in ISPM 3:2005 for biological control agents, but the theme of ISPM 3:2005 is biological control agents as (possible) pests, so the qualifier *of a pest* is adequate for its use in ISPM 3:2005.

[56] For *eradication*: for consistency with *containment* and *suppression*, *infested* was added to the definition. The term has been qualified by *of a pest* for consistency.

[57] For *suppression*: the glossary term has been qualified by *of a pest* for consistency. Currently *suppression* is used in ISPMs only in the sense of suppressing pests, except for one use in ISPM 2:2007 (section 1.2.1), where it is used with a non-glossary meaning: a (plant as) pest suppressing other plants. The definite article *the* beginning the definition could be deleted for consistency.

[58] For *control*: the words *of a pest population* were deleted, as *suppression*, *eradication* and *containment* mention to what these concepts are applied. In addition, *suppression* does refer to pest population while *eradication* and *containment* refer to a *pest* (note that *pest population* is necessary in the definition of *suppression* because a pest (i.e. defined as a species) cannot be suppressed).

[59] - For *suppression*: it is suggested that the definition refers to “a population” (in the singular) in an infested area.

[60] **Original definitions**

[61]

suppression	The application of phytosanitary measures in an infested area to reduce pest populations [FAO, 1995; revised CEPM, 1999]
eradication	Application of phytosanitary measures to eliminate a pest from an area [FAO, 1990; revised FAO, 1995; formerly eradicate]
containment	Application of phytosanitary measures in and around an infested area to prevent spread of a pest [FAO, 1995]
control (of a pest)	Suppression, containment or eradication of a pest population [FAO, 1995]

[62] **Proposed revisions**

[63]

suppression (of a pest)	The a Application of official phytosanitary measures phytosanitary measures in an infested area to reduce a pest populations
eradication (of a pest)	Application of official phytosanitary measures phytosanitary measures to eliminate a pest from an infested area
containment (of a pest)	Application of official phytosanitary measures phytosanitary measures in and around an infested area to prevent the spread of a pest
control (of a pest)	Suppression, containment or eradication of a pest population

[64] **2.4 PLACE OF PRODUCTION AND PEST FREE PRODUCTION SITE**

[65] **Background**

[66] Consequential changes to the definitions of *place of production* and *pest free production site* are needed due to the proposed new definition for *production site* (see section 1.2). Revised definitions were proposed by the TPG in October 2012 and reviewed by the SC in May 2013. The following explanatory points may be considered:

[67] The changes proposed simplify the definitions of both terms in view of the proposed new definition of *production site*.

[68] In addition, for *pest free production site*, the change from *does not occur* to *is absent* is a consequential change to the proposal to delete *occurrence* and to use *presence* or *present* (or *absent* for *does not occur*) (see section 3.1).

No changes were made to the proposed revised definitions as a result of member consultation, although “specified” is proposed in the definition of *pest free production site* for clarity.

[69] **Original definitions**

[70]

place of production	Any premises or collection of fields operated as a single production or farming unit. This may include production sites which are separately managed for phytosanitary purposes [FAO, 1990; revised CEPM, 1999]
pest free production site	A defined portion of a place of production in which a specific pest does not occur as demonstrated by scientific evidence and in which, where

	appropriate, this condition is being officially maintained for a defined period and that is managed as a separate unit in the same way as a pest free place of production [ISPM 10:1999]
--	--

[71] **Proposed revisions**

[72] place of production	Any premises or collection of fields operated as a single production or farming unit. This may include production sites which are separately managed for phytosanitary purposes
pest free production site	A production site defined portion of a place of production in which a specified specific pest does not occur is absent, as demonstrated by scientific evidence, and in which, where appropriate, this condition is being officially maintained for a defined period and that is managed as a separate unit in the same way as a pest free place of production

[73] **2.5 QUARANTINE STATION (2010-013)**

No member comments were made at member consultation. This definition is therefore not open for comments during the SCCP. [to SC-7. similar wording added for all definitions that did not receive comments. TPG February invited the SC May 2014 to consider this. This note may need to be modified depending on SC discussion.]

[74] **Background**

[75] The term *quarantine station* was added to the *List of Topics for IPPC standards* by the SC in April 2010. A revised definition was proposed by the TPG in October 2010, reviewed by the SC in May 2011 and sent for member consultation in June 2011. In November 2011 the TPG reviewed member comments and retained the proposed definition with fuller explanations. In November 2011 the SC returned the proposal to the TPG for further consideration. In October 2012 the TPG again discussed the proposal and submitted an unchanged definition but with added explanations to the SC. The revised definition was reviewed by the SC in May 2013. The following explanatory points may be considered:

[76] The current definition is restrictive as quarantine stations might be used to hold in quarantine not only plants or plant products, but also other regulated articles (including beneficial organisms, when being subject to phytosanitary regulation). The definition was therefore broadened to include other regulated articles and to mention beneficial organisms as possible regulated articles. It is still considered useful to cover the different types of elements that can be kept in a quarantine station.

[77] Specific mention of beneficial organisms is recommended, as it is important in relation to ISPM 3:2005. Note that ISPM 3:2005 currently uses *quarantine facilities* to refer to the concept of quarantine stations. For consistency in the use of terms, once the revised definition is adopted, ISPM 3:2005 could be adjusted to use *quarantine station*.

[78] Consideration was given as to whether *regulated articles* should be mentioned, as they cover not only plants and organisms, but also, for example, conveyances. Note that quarantine stations are used in practice for various regulated articles, such as baggage, pots and soil, and even vehicles and material, especially when quarantine stations are situated close to a point of entry. However, there is no need to restrict the definition. Definitions do not specify what countries should do or not do, and countries may have different practices and requirements regarding regulated articles in quarantine stations.

[79] The definition uses *quarantine*, which in turn includes *regulated articles* in its own definition.

[80] The expanded term *phytosanitary quarantine station* was considered. However, no other types of quarantine stations than those for phytosanitary purposes are mentioned in ISPMs so the word *phytosanitary* is not needed.

[81] Responses to member comments in 2011 may be found in the TPG 2011 meeting report.

[82] **Original definition**

[83]	quarantine station	Official station for holding plants or plant products in quarantine [FAO, 1990; revised FAO, 1995; formerly quarantine station or facility]
------	---------------------------	--

[84] **Proposed revision**

[85]	quarantine station	Official station for holding plants, plants products or other regulated articles, including beneficial organisms, in quarantine
------	---------------------------	--

[86] **2.6 AREA OF LOW PEST PREVALENCE, COMMODITY PEST LIST, HABITAT, PEST FREE AREA, PEST FREE PLACE OF PRODUCTION, SURVEILLANCE, SURVEY**

No member comments were made at member consultation on: commodity pest list, habitat, pest free area, surveillance and survey. These definitions are therefore not open for comments during the SCCP. To SC-7, similar wording added for all definitions that did not receive comments. TPG February invited the SC May 2014 to consider this. This note may need to be modified depending on SC discussion.

[note to Secretariat: some definitions would be open for SCCP comments (area of low pest prevalence, pest free place of production), others not. They are currently in the same paragraph 93, and 95. Maybe they need to be separated into 2 paragraphs for the purpose of opening only area of low pest prevalence and pest free place of production for SCCP]

[87] **Background**

[88] Consequential changes to the definitions below are needed due to the proposed deletion of the definition of *occurrence* (see section 3.1). A similar consequential change was made to *pest free production site* under 2.4. Revised definitions were proposed by the TPG in February 2013 and reviewed by the SC in May 2013. The following explanatory points may be considered:

[89] It is proposed that only *presence* and *present* are used in ISPMs.

[90] *Is absent* is preferred to *is not present* to replace and avoid the use of the negative form *does not occur* in the definitions concerned. This term is also used in ISPM 8:1998.

[91] Note: for ~~three-two~~ terms marked with * in the tables below (~~area of low pest prevalence, commodity pest list and survey~~), the SC identified the need to further consider conceptual issues in these definitions and added these terms as subjects to the List of topics for IPPC standards for further consideration by the TPG. However, the proposals below were maintained and only relate to the consequential change arising from the proposed deletion of *occurrence*. Regarding area of low pest prevalence, an additional change was made in the draft at member consultation (but not marked as such): "surveillance, control and eradication measures" was replaced by "surveillance and control measures". The TPG and SC believe that this is a consistency change (as eradication is covered under control), and that the definition should be approved with that change. [this is the proposal that will be made to the SC May meeting. To be modified if the SC does not agree to this]

[note to the SC-7: the TPG discussed commodity pest list at its February meeting and invited the SC May 2014 to remove the term from the List of topics. If the SC May accepts, paragraph 91 could be modified to remove mention of commodity pest list, for example as follows:

"The SC identified the need to further consider conceptual issues in the definition of survey and added this term as a subject to the List of topics for IPPC standards for further consideration by the TPG. However, the proposal below was maintained and only relates to the consequential change arising from the proposed deletion of occurrence."

[92] **Original definitions**

[93]	area of low pest prevalence*	An area , whether all of a country, part of a country, or all or parts of several countries, as identified by the competent authorities, in which a specific pest occurs at low levels and which is subject to effective surveillance, control or eradication measures [IPPC, 1997]
------	-------------------------------------	--

commodity pest list*	A list of pests occurring in an area which may be associated with a specific commodity [CEPM, 1996]
habitat	Part of an ecosystem with conditions in which an organism naturally occurs or can establish [ICPM, 2005]
pest free area	An area in which a specific pest does not occur as demonstrated by scientific evidence and in which, where appropriate, this condition is being officially maintained [FAO, 1995]
pest free place of production	Place of production in which a specific pest does not occur as demonstrated by scientific evidence and in which, where appropriate, this condition is being officially maintained for a defined period [ISPM 10:1999]
surveillance	An official process which collects and records data on pest occurrence or absence by survey, monitoring or other procedures [CEPM, 1996]
survey*	An official procedure conducted over a defined period of time to determine the characteristics of a pest population or to determine which species occur in an area [FAO, 1990; revised CEPM, 1996]

[94] **Proposed revisions**

[95]

area of low pest prevalence*	An area , whether all of a country, part of a country, or all or parts of several countries, as identified by the competent authorities, in which a specific pest occurs is present at low levels and which is subject to effective surveillance or control measures [IPPC, 1997]
commodity pest list*	A list of pests occurring present in an area which may be associated with a specific commodity [CEPM, 1996]
habitat	Part of an ecosystem with conditions in which an organism is naturally occurs present or can establish [ICPM, 2005]
pest free area	An area in which a specific pest does not occur is absent as demonstrated by scientific evidence and in which, where appropriate, this condition is being officially maintained [FAO, 1995]
pest free place of production	Place of production in which a specific pest does not occur is absent as demonstrated by scientific evidence and in which, where appropriate, this condition is being officially maintained for a defined period [ISPM 10:1999]
surveillance	An official process which collects and records data on pest presence occurrence or absence by survey, monitoring or other procedures [CEPM, 1996]
survey*	An official procedure conducted over a defined period of time to determine the characteristics of a pest population or to determine which species occur are present in an area [FAO, 1990; revised CEPM, 1996]

[96] **3. DELETIONS**

[97] **3.1 OCCURRENCE (2010-026)**

[98] **Background**

[99] The terms *occurrence* and *presence* (2010-025) were added to the *List of Topics for IPPC standards* by the SC in April 2010 based on a TPG proposal to consider how they are used in English and if a single term can be recommended, noting that both terms in ISPMs are translated to only one term in French (*presence*) and Spanish (*presencia*). Deletion of *occurrence* was proposed by the TPG in October 2012 and reviewed by the SC in May 2013. No action was recommended for *presence*. The following

explanatory points may be considered:

- [100] *Occurrence* is defined in terms of presence that implies a status more specific and restricted than *presence*. However, that distinction does not exist in other languages. The actual use in ISPMs does not seem to intend or require such distinction. Similarly, the Convention text (written before *occurrence* was defined) uses the two terms synonymously.
- [101] The current English definition of *occurrence* (referring to a degree of permanence) seems counter-intuitive to the normal English meaning of the word (referring to a sudden event).
- [102] It is suggested that the terms *presence* and *occurrence* should be accepted as synonyms in current ISPMs, and that only *presence* and *present* (or *absent* for “does not occur”) be used in future standards.
- [103] In addition, the current definition of *occurrence* (“officially recognized to be indigenous or introduced and not officially reported to have been eradicated”) refers to requirements. Definitions should not make such requirements.
- [104] It is proposed to delete the definition of *occurrence* and not to define *presence*, rather allowing the various grades and nuances of *presence* to be dealt with only in the revised ISPM 8:1998.
- [105] The proposal to delete *occurrence* includes a number of consequential changes to other glossary definitions are needed (see section 2.6).

Member comments were considered, but the proposed deletion was maintained as a result of the discussions.

[106] **Proposed deletion**

[107] occurrence	The presence in an area of a pest officially recognized to be indigenous or introduced and not officially reported to have been eradicated [FAO, 1990; revised FAO, 1995; ISPM No. 17; formerly occur]
-------------------------	---

[108] **3.2 ORGANISM (2010-021), NATURALLY OCCURRING (2010-023)**

[109] **Background**

[110] The terms *organism* and *naturally occurring* were added to the *List of Topics for IPPC standards* by the SC in April 2010 based on a TPG proposal to review the definitions and use in ISPMs of *pest*, *organism* and *naturally occurring*. Deletion of *organism* and *naturally occurring* was proposed by the TPG in October 2012 and reviewed by the SC in May 2013 (it was proposed that the definition of *pest* remains as it is). The following explanatory points may be considered:

- [111] The term *naturally occurring* is used only in the glossary definition of *organism*. Variants are used in ISPMs, with different meanings (e.g. the place where an organism naturally occurs (i.e. its place of origin); a place where the natural occurrence of a pest is low). The glossary definition of *naturally occurring* has no meaning or relevance in these contexts.
- [112] *Organism* is a common term, and it is not used in ISPMs with any specific meaning for IPPC purposes. It was originally defined as an individual term for the purpose of ISPM 3:2005, but is also used in other contexts.

Member comments were considered, but the proposed deletion was maintained as a result of the discussions.

[113] **Proposed deletions**

[114] naturally occurring	A component of an ecosystem or a selection from a wild population, not altered by artificial means [ISPM 3:1995]
organism	Any biotic entity capable of reproduction or replication in its naturally occurring state [ISPM 3:1995; revised ISPM 3:2005]

[115] 3.3 RESTRICTION (2010-027)**[116] Background**

[117] The term *restriction* was added to the *List of Topics for IPPC standards* by the SC in April 2010 based on a TPG proposal to review its inconsistent use in ISPMs. Deletion of *restriction* was proposed by the TPG in October 2012 and reviewed by the SC in May 2013. The following point may be considered:

[118] *Restriction* is used according to its definition in some cases, but not in others. When it is used according to its definition, it will always be possible and more correct to reword (as a matter of consistency) the text by referring to *phytosanitary import requirements*. The definition of *restriction* is therefore not needed. Indeed, most ISPMs already refer to the establishment of *phytosanitary import requirements* rather than to *restrictions*.

Member comments were considered, but the proposed deletion was maintained as a result of the discussions.

[119] Proposed deletion

[120]

restriction	A phytosanitary regulation allowing the importation or movement of specified commodities subject to specific requirements [CEPM, 1996; revised CEPM, 1999]
--------------------	--

[121] 3.4 PROTECTED AREA (2012-003), CONTROLLED AREA

No member comments were made at member consultation on protected area. This definition is therefore not open for comments during the SCCP. [to SC-7. similar wording added for all definitions that did not receive comments. TPG February invited the SC May 2014 to consider this. This note may need to be modified depending on SC discussion.]

[to Secretariat: same comment as above. One deletion would be open for comment, but not the other, and they are in the same paragraph. May need to separate into several paragraphs]

[122] Background

[123] The terms *endangered area* and *protected area* were added to the *List of Topics for IPPC standards* by the SC in April 2012 based on a TPG proposal. Deletion of *protected area* was proposed by the TPG in October 2012 and reviewed by the SC in May 2013. Deletion of *controlled area* was also proposed as a consequence. No change is considered necessary for the definition of *endangered area*. The following explanatory points may be considered:

[124] *Protected area* and *controlled area* are redundant, making the collection of area-related definitions overly complicated. Both terms are defined as particular cases of *regulated area*, applied in one case for *endangered area* (protected) and in the other for *quarantine area* (controlled).

[125] *Controlled area* has not been used in ISPMs.

[126] *Protected area* is used in ISPMs to a very limited extent, in one case (ISPM 11:2004) with a different meaning to its definition (referring to the protection of nature). Where referring in ISPMs to a *regulated area*, that term could be used instead for consistency.

[127] The term *protected area* was meant to apply to an *endangered area* (i.e. in the context of pest risk analysis). However, the revised ISPM 2:2007 already uses the term *regulated area*.

[128] Where *protected area* is used in ISPMs, it is described as being subject to constraints other than what the definition covers (i.e. technical justification and non-discrimination, not as the minimum area).

[129] Proposed deletions

[130]

controlled area	A regulated area which an NPPO has determined to be the minimum area necessary to prevent spread of a pest from a quarantine area [CEPM, 1996]
------------------------	--

protected area	A regulated area that an NPPO has determined to be the minimum area necessary for the effective protection of an endangered area [FAO, 1990; omitted from FAO, 1995; new concept from CEPM, 1996]
-----------------------	---

[131] **3.5 CONTAMINATING PEST (2012-001)**

As a result of member comments, the deletion of *contaminating pest* was withdrawn from the Amendments to the Glossary, and the SC requested that the TPG reconsiders *contaminating pest* together with *contamination* [note to the SC7: this is what will be proposed to the SC May. This would have to be adjusted if the SC does not agree with this approach]

~~[132] **Background**~~

~~[133] The term *contaminating pest* was added to the List of Topics for IPPC standards by the SC in April 2012 based on a TPG proposal. Deletion of *contaminating pest* was proposed by the TPG in February 2013. The following explanatory points may be considered:~~

~~[134] The definition of *contaminating pest* is limited to pests carried by a commodity, and does not cover pests carried by other means; for example, conveyances.~~

~~[135] There is a definition of *contamination* that covers appropriately all cases of contamination by pests or regulated articles (Contamination: Presence in a **commodity**, storage place, conveyance or container, of **pests** or other **regulated articles**, not constituting an **infestation** (see **infestation**) [CEPM, 1997; revised CEPM, 1999]).~~

~~[136] Deletion of *contaminating pest* is proposed rather than revising the definition because the wording *contaminating pest* can still be used as a derived form of *contamination*, which is defined appropriately. It is preferable to avoid duplicating definitions.~~

~~[137] **Proposed deletion**~~

~~[138]~~

contaminating pest	A pest that is carried by a commodity and, in the case of plants and plant products , does not infest these plants or plant products [CEPM, 1996; revised CEPM, 1999]
---------------------------	---

[139] **4. UNDERSTANDING OF “PLANTS” IN THE IPPC AND ITS ISPMs AND CONSEQUENTIAL REVISION OF THE SCOPE OF ISPM 5**

[140] **Background**

[141] In 2012, the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) raised the issue of whether the IPPC covered algae, bryophytes and fungi. It was noted that, when the IPPC was developed, living organisms were divided into only two kingdoms – plants and animals – and that these other organisms would have been covered under the term “plants”. At the request of the IPPC Secretariat, the TPG had preliminary discussions on this issue in October 2012. In November 2012, the SC requested the TPG to produce a document on the taxonomic classification of organisms such as algae, bryophytes and fungi and the IPPC coverage of plants. The proposal below was developed by the TPG in February 2013 and reviewed by the SC in May 2013.

[142] **What are “plants” for the IPPC?**

[143] There has never been a clear definition of what is to be understood by “plants” in the IPPC. Originally, the emphasis was on plants that are exploited for economic reasons by humans and that need to be protected from pests carried to new areas by international trade. In practice, this meant angiosperms, gymnosperms and pteridophytes (broadly “higher” or “vascular” plants). Yet the concept of plants for the botanical community at that time extended to bryophytes, algae, fungi and even bacteria; indeed, everything that was not animal. This was reflected in the fact that the same code of botanical nomenclature applied to all these organisms. The direct economic importance of these various other “plants” was not actually very great, and they did not need to be protected against the introduction and spread of pests. However, at that time, certain algae and fungi were exploited for economic reasons, and would presumably have qualified to be considered under the IPPC (though in fact no cases can be

recalled).

[144] Article IV.2.b of the revised IPPC (1997) makes it clear that the IPPC is also concerned with pests affecting uncultivated/unmanaged plants (“wild flora”) and with environmental effects and their consequences on plants, as reflected in various Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) decisions and in ISPM 11:2004 [*year to be adjusted after CPM-8*] (including its Annex 1). The scope of the IPPC now overlaps with that of the CBD, for plants. In practice, the CBD aims to protect species of all kinds of higher plants, including bryophytes. Algae and fungi are also covered by the CBD (whether they are considered to be plants or not).

[145] **Modern classification of plants**

[146] In the 21st century, the classification of organisms into kingdoms has greatly changed. There are no longer just the two kingdoms, Animalia and Plantae, but at least seven (Archaea, Bacteria, Animalia, Protozoa, Chromista, Fungi, Plantae). A fuller account of the changes is presented in Appendix 1. In modern terms, fungi and many algae are not plants. This leads to an apparent restriction in the scope of the IPPC, and it is accordingly proposed to make a specific declaration that restores the former implicit scope and asserts it explicitly. It is clear that certain algae and certain fungi are open to protection under the IPPC because of their economic exploitation, while others are important components of biodiversity.

[147] **Proposal for the understanding of “plants” in the IPPC and its ISPMs**

[148] At the recent International Botanical Congress in Melbourne, Australia (July 2011), the International Code of Botanical Nomenclature was renamed to the International *Code of Nomenclature* for algae, fungi, and plants (ICN). **The TPG suggests the IPPC should state that its scope ~~extends to~~ include algae and fungi, as well as plants, consistent with the International *Code of Nomenclature* for algae, fungi, and plants.**

[149] **Means of formal inclusion of this understanding into IPPC documentation**

[150] It is suggested that this understanding is included formally into IPPC documentation by amending the scope of ISPM 5. This is preferred over amending the current definition of “plants” (which relates to plants as a commodity) or of developing an agreed interpretation of “plants”.

[151] **Proposed revision of the scope of ISPM 5**

[152] This reference standard is a listing of terms and definitions with specific meaning for phytosanitary systems worldwide. It has been developed to provide a harmonized internationally agreed vocabulary associated with the implementation of the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) and International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPMs).

[153] Within the context of the IPPC and its ISPMs, all references to plants should be understood to ~~extend to~~ continue to include algae and fungi, consistent with the International Code of Nomenclature for algae, fungi, and plants.

[154] **Questions arising from this proposal**

[155] The proposal is made in relatively simple terms because its expression in greater detail would make it much more complex (see Appendix 1). In scientific terminology, the proposed scope would be Plantae, Chromista and Fungi, but these categories do not correspond exactly to the English-language equivalents.

[156] Some plants, and many algae and fungi, are micro-organisms. For this reason, it is much less likely that they would be actively considered for protection under the IPPC. However, the dividing line between macro-organisms and micro-organisms is not clear, and it does not seem appropriate to draw a line to exclude the latter.

[157] The kingdoms Bacteria and Archaea are not included in the proposal. The organisms within these kingdoms were at one time covered by the International Code of Botanical Nomenclature but now have their own code. They are all micro-organisms. It has been suggested that they should be included in the IPPC’s understanding of “plants”, but there is little immediate prospect that they would require protection

either for their economic importance or as components of biodiversity.

[158] Appendix 1. Present kingdoms and their former classifications

[159]

New kingdom	Groups included*	Former classification
Archaea	Primitive bacteria	Bacteria
Bacteria	Bacteria	Bacteria
	Cyanobacteria	Algae, and previously plants
Animalia	Animals	Animals
Protozoa	Protozoa	Animals
	Myxomycetes	Fungi, and previously plants
	Euglenozoa	Plants
Chromista	Phaeophyta (brown algae)	Plants
	Diatoms (microalgae)	Plants
	Dinoflagellates (microalgae)	Plants
	Oomycetes	Fungi, and previously plants
Fungi	Fungi and lichens	Fungi, and previously plants
Plantae	Higher plants and ferns	Plants
	Bryophytes	Plants
	Chlorophyta (green algae)	Plants
	Charophyta (stoneworts)	Plants
Plantae (or possibly another kingdom)	Rhodophyta (red algae)	Plants

[160] * There are other small groups of Algae (previously plants), now in Chromista or Plantae, which have been omitted for simplicity.

APPENDIX 6: Draft Amendments to the Glossary (2014 – for SC for consideration for member consultation)

EXPLANATORY NOTE FOR THE MAY 2014 STANDARDS COMMITTEE MEETING

At its meetings in February 2014, the Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG) made proposals for the addition and revision of terms and definitions in ISPM 5. As in past years, it is suggested that some explanation be given for each proposal in the document that will be sent for member consultation. The proposals refer to individual terms in the *List of topics for IPPC standards* and to consequential changes arising from these proposals. This paper is presented to the May 2014 SC meeting for review prior to member consultation.

Members are asked to consider the following proposals for additions and revisions to ISPM 5 (*Glossary of Phytosanitary Terms*). A brief explanation is given for each proposal. For revision of terms and definitions, only the proposed changes are open for comment. For full details on the discussions related to the specific terms, please refer to the meeting reports on the IPP.

1. ADDITIONS

1.1 IDENTITY (OF A CONSIGNMENT) (2011-001)

Background

At CPM-6 (2011), in relation to the revised ISPM 12 (*Phytosanitary certificates*), the SC was asked to consider the need to define *identity (of a consignment)*. In May 2011, the SC added the term to the *List of topics for IPPC standards*. The TPG discussed *identity* at its meeting in October 2012 and proposed an approach to the SC May 2013, which approved it. The terms *identity (of a consignment)*, *integrity (of a consignment)* and *phytosanitary security (of a consignment)* (2013-008) were discussed together by the TPG in February 2014 (see also section 2.5). The proposed definition for *identity (of a consignment)* was reviewed by the SC in May 2014. The following explanatory points may be considered when reviewing the proposal.

- The identity of a consignment relates to the accompanying phytosanitary certificate. It had been considered previously whether the number of the phytosanitary certificate might be sufficient to describe the identity (i.e. if all elements in a phytosanitary certificate are part of the consignment's identity). However, not all elements of the phytosanitary certificate are considered part of the identity of the consignment.
- The identity of the consignment is determined by the particular descriptive elements of the phytosanitary certificate (in section I of the model certificates; Annex 1 and 2 of ISPM 12: 2011) that are related to "origin", "quantities" and "constituents". These broad terms are used in the proposed definition to summarize the detailed descriptive terms in the model phytosanitary certificates.
- There was discussion on whether the quantities of a consignment are part of its *identity* (i.e. whether the identity of the consignment changes if a part is removed). If so, *integrity* simply means the maintenance of identity (see section 2.5); if not, then only *integrity* would relate to quantity. It was concluded that quantities are to be considered part of identity, in line with how *identity* was used in standards (except in the case of re-export in ISPM 12 – see below).
- Of the elements in section I of the model certificates, "origin" would cover: name and address of exporter, and place of origin "Constituents and quantities" would cover: number and description of packages, distinguishing marks, name of produce and quantity declared, botanical name of plants.
- The descriptive elements of the phytosanitary certificate not determining the identity of the consignment are: declared name and address of consignee, declared means of conveyance, declared point of entry.
- The number of the certificate is implicit as the identity refers to a specific certificate.

- Examples. If a consignment is composed of 100 apple trees and 100 pear trees from producer A, then, according to the proposed definition: if all pear trees are removed, the identity is changed (removal of quantity and constituents). If 50 of each are removed, the identity is changed (removal of quantities). If the 100 apple trees are replaced by 100 apple trees from producer B, the identity is changed (change of origin, substitution of constituents). In all three cases, the integrity is lost.
- The proposed definition is consistent with uses in ISPMs, except in relation to re-export of consignments in ISPM 12 (in sections 4 and 6), which allows splitting of consignments for re-export, while at the same time requiring that identity be maintained. It was proposed that the wording in ISPM 12 should be modified when the standard is revised.
- As a consequence of defining *identity (of a consignment)* and revising *phytosanitary security (of a consignment)*, the definition of *integrity (of a consignment)* needs to be amended (see section 2.5).

Proposed addition

identity (of a consignment)	The constituents, quantities and origin of a consignment as described in the accompanying phytosanitary certificate
------------------------------------	---

1.2 ISOLATED BARK (AS A COMMODITY)

The discussions on the revision of the definitions for *bark* (2013-005) and *wood* (2013-011) (see section 2.7) led to the proposal that *bark* (2013-005) did not need to be revised, but that *isolated bark (as a commodity)* should be defined. The definition was proposed by the TPG in February 2014 and reviewed by the SC in May 2014. The following explanatory points may be considered when reviewing the definition, as well as those related to *wood* under section 2.7.

- *Bark* is currently defined in the biological sense, specifying how the term should be understood in the IPPC context. Such a definition is needed, in particular, with regards to: ISPM 15 in relation to debarking; wood commodities' definitions in ISPM 5 ("with or without bark"); and the draft ISPM on management of pest risks associated with international movement of wood (2006-029) (which uses this term extensively).
- On the other hand, a definition for *bark* as a commodity would be useful. *Bark* is dealt with as a commodity in the draft ISPM on management of pest risks associated with international movement of wood (in its sections 2.2.2 and 2.2.8). The term *isolated bark* was proposed here, in order to avoid the term *bark* alone (to avoid confusion with the existing definition) and describe the commodity in a sufficiently broad manner (i.e. avoiding *bark chips*, used once in the draft ISPM on wood, which may not be appropriate for all bark commodities).
- *Isolated bark* as a commodity would be part of the commodity class *wood and bark* (see section 2.7).

Proposed addition

isolated bark commodity (as a)	Bark separated from wood
---------------------------------------	---------------------------------

2. REVISIONS

2.1 ADDITIONAL DECLARATION (2010-006)

The term *additional declaration* was added to the *List of topics for IPPC standards* by the SC in November 2010, as there was an inconsistency between the definition in ISPM 5 and ISPM 12:2011, which provides that soil may be the subject of additional declarations. The issue was discussed by the TPG in February 2013 and the SC November 2013 to consider whether *soil only* or *regulated articles* should be added to the definition. The SC requested the definition be modified to cover *regulated*

articles. A definition was proposed by the TPG in February 2014 and reviewed by the SC in May 2014. The following explanatory points may be considered when reviewing the definition.

- ISPM 12: 2011 provides that soil may also be the subject of additional declarations. Freedom from soil is a common requirement for additional declarations.
- Other items may be subject to additional declarations, such as growing media or the packaging in which the commodity is held. In order to cover such cases, the definition was broadened to regulated articles.

Original definition

additional declaration	A statement that is required by an importing country to be entered on a phytosanitary certificate and which provides specific additional information on a consignment in relation to regulated pests [FAO, 1990; revised ICPM, 2005]
-------------------------------	---

Proposed revision

additional declaration	A statement that is required by an importing country to be entered on a phytosanitary certificate and which provides specific additional information on a consignment in relation to regulated pests <u>or regulated articles</u>
-------------------------------	--

2.2 GRAIN (2013-018), SEEDS

Background

The term *grain* was added to the *List of Topics for IPPC standards* by the SC in November 2013 when reviewing the draft Specification on *International movement of grain*. A revised definition was proposed by the TPG in February 2014, taking account of the views expressed by three strategic experts at the SC meeting. The revised definition was reviewed by the SC in May 2014. A consequential revision to the definition of *seeds* was also proposed. The following explanatory points may be considered when reviewing the definition.

- Grain is currently described using the word “seeds”, which is confusing as *seeds* are defined in ISPM 5 to be for planting.
- When defining grain as a commodity class, using the word seed (in the botanical sense) cannot be avoided. However, in the definitions for *grain* and *seed*, it is indicated, for clarity, that the word seed is used in its botanical sense.
- The three strategic experts had proposed to focus the definition of *grain* on “cereals, oilseeds and pulses”. One reason was to address the scope of the future ISPM on international movement of grain. Another was because, in English, grain is commonly understood to cover “cereals, oilseeds and pulses” but not, for example, coffee beans, coconuts, cloves, nuts, poppy seed, etc. (which are nevertheless all covered by the current definition). However, that understanding of grain is not valid in other languages. For example, in Spanish, grain is commonly understood to cover also coffee beans. In French it would mostly be understood in relation to cereals only. In Chinese, it may be understood to cover potato tubers. It was felt that the definition of grain should be kept more general than only “cereals, oilseeds and pulses”.
- “but” is added to clarify the intended uses that are excluded from the definition, thus emphasising the contrast to *seeds*.
- It was considered whether the commodity class should become *seed* (in singular) to be consistent with *grain*. However, it remained as *seeds* (in plural), which is the term used in the definitions of “plant” in the IPPC itself.
- Cross-references between the two definitions are unnecessary and confusing and were therefore deleted. Finally "processing or consumption" is used consistently in both definitions.

Original definitions

grain	A commodity class for seeds intended for processing or consumption and not for planting (see seeds) [FAO, 1990; revised ICPM, 2001]
seeds	A commodity class for seeds for planting or intended for planting and not for consumption or processing (see grain) [FAO, 1990; revised ICPM, 2001]

Proposed revision

grain (as a commodity class)	A commodity class for seeds <u>Seeds (in the botanical sense)</u> intended for processing or consumption, but and not for planting (see seeds)
seeds (as a commodity class)	A commodity class for seeds <u>Seeds (in the botanical sense)</u> for planting or intended for planting, but and not for <u>processing or consumption</u> or processing (see grain)

2.3 KILN-DRYING (2013-006)

The SC May 2013 added *kiln-drying* to *List of topics for IPPC standards*, based on a TPG proposal. A revised definition was proposed by the TPG in February 2014 and reviewed by the SC in May 2014. The following explanatory points may be considered when reviewing the definition.

- The definition for *kiln-drying* is useful in relation to ISPM 15:2009 (*Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade*), where kiln-drying is a heat treatment if it meets the parameters of the standard. “And/or” needed to be removed from the definition, but this was not a straightforward change as kiln-drying can be performed with or without heat (e.g. can be done through circulation of air), but always includes humidity control (neither “and” nor “or” would be correct).
- *Kiln drying* is not specifically phytosanitary (although it is used in the phytosanitary context), but is generally an industrial process.
- The original definition referred to the commodity class “wood”. It was modified to use its revision *wood and bark* (see section 2.7), and kiln-drying may also be applied to *wood packaging material* (previously not mentioned in the definition).
- The word *control* is not necessary in the definition: "to achieve a required moisture content" already implies the use of *control* in the sense of measurement. *Humidity control* was deleted, because it is implicit in the wording "are dried".

Original definition

kiln-drying	A process in which wood is dried in a closed chamber using heat and/or humidity control to achieve a required moisture content [ISPM 15:2002]
--------------------	--

Proposed revision

kiln-drying	<u>An industrial</u> process in which wood and bark, or wood packaging material, are is dried in a closed chamber <u>with or without</u> using heat and/or humidity control to achieve a required moisture content
--------------------	--

2.4 MARK (2013-007)

The term *mark* was added to the *List of Topics for IPPC standards* by the SC in May 2013, based on a TPG proposal. A revised definition was proposed by the TPG in February 2014 and reviewed by the SC in May 2014. The following explanatory points may be considered when reviewing the definition.

- As agreed in the *General recommendations on consistency*, the use of *phytosanitary status* needs to be avoided as it is ambiguous and creates problems for the understanding of ISPMs.
- *Phytosanitary status* in the definition of *mark* is understood to relate to the fact that phytosanitary procedures were applied. The changes proposed make the definition explicit and precise. *Phytosanitary procedures* was preferred to *phytosanitary measures* (as procedures are applied, and measures complied with).
- At the moment, the term is used only in ISPM 15: 2009. However, it is kept broad as marks could be used in the future for other purposes.

Original definition

mark	An official stamp or brand, internationally recognized, applied to a regulated article to attest its phytosanitary status [ISPM 15:2002]
-------------	--

Proposed revision

mark	An official stamp or brand, internationally recognized, applied to a regulated article to attest its phytosanitary status <u>that certain phytosanitary procedures have been applied.</u>
-------------	--

2.5 PHYTOSANITARY SECURITY (OF A CONSIGNMENT) (2013-008) AND INTEGRITY (OF A CONSIGNMENT)

Background

The terms *phytosanitary security (of a consignment)* was added to the *List of topics for IPPC standards* by the SC in May 2013 based on a TPG proposal. The terms *identity (of a consignment)*, *integrity (of a consignment)* and *phytosanitary security (of a consignment)* were discussed together, as they are interlinked. Consequential changes to the definition of *integrity (of a consignment)* were needed due to the proposed new definition for *identity (of a consignment)* (see section 1.1). Revised definitions for *integrity (of a consignment)* and *phytosanitary security (of a consignment)* were proposed by the TPG in February 2014 and reviewed by the SC in May 2014. The following explanatory points may be considered when reviewing the definitions.

- The terms *identity* and *integrity* are used many times in ISPMs, often side-by-side, but their meaning and relation is not clear. Defining *identity (of a consignment)* partly clarifies this, but the use of *integrity* then becomes somewhat redundant. Suppressing *integrity* would however entail substantial revision of ISPMs. It is considered more appropriate to maintain *integrity*, and to revise the definitions of *integrity* and *phytosanitary security* to become related to *identity*. Consequently the definition of *integrity (of a consignment)* is considerably simplified.
- It was discussed whether the definition of *phytosanitary security (of a consignment)* should cover the possible escape of pests from consignments (and not only infestation from the outside). However, only ISPM 25: 2006 (on transit, in its *Background*, paragraph 5) uses the term *phytosanitary security* to explain how escape of pests from the consignment should be prevented. This is not the common use of *phytosanitary security* in other ISPMs. It was therefore concluded not to include this in the current definition, but to modify the wording in ISPM 25 when the standard is revised.

Original definitions

integrity (of a consignment)	Composition of a consignment as described by its phytosanitary certificate or other officially acceptable document, maintained without loss, addition or substitution [CPM, 2007]
phytosanitary security (of a consignment)	Maintenance of the integrity of a consignment and prevention of its infestation and contamination by regulated pests , through the application of appropriate phytosanitary measures [CPM, 2009]

Proposed revisions

integrity (of a consignment)	The identity Composition of a consignment as described by its phytosanitary certificate or other officially acceptable document, maintained without loss, addition or substitution
phytosanitary security (of a consignment)	Maintenance of the identity integrity of a consignment and prevention of its infestation and contamination by regulated pests , through the application of appropriate phytosanitary measures

2.6 VISUAL EXAMINATION (2013-010)

The term was added by the SC May 2013 to the *List of topics for IPPC standards*, based on a TPG proposal. A revised definition was proposed by the TPG in February 2014 and reviewed by the SC in May 2014. The following explanatory points may be considered when reviewing the definition.

- The definition should describe the process of visual examination, but not its purpose (to detect pests and contaminants). This is part of the definition of *inspection*, and both definitions are needed. *Visual examination* simply describes the process, whilst *inspection* describes its application in the phytosanitary context (i.e. it is *official* and *to determine if pests are present or to determine compliance with phytosanitary regulations*). The original wording in the definition of visual examination was also not correct (as *contamination* covers both “pests” and “other regulated articles”).
- In general, processing is part of testing, and it does not need to be mentioned separately.

Original definition

visual examination	The physical examination of plants, plant products , or other regulated articles using the unaided eye, lens, stereoscope or microscope to detect pests or contaminants without testing or processing [ISPM 23:2005]
---------------------------	---

Revised definition

visual examination	The physical examination of plants, plant products , or other regulated articles using the unaided eye, lens, stereoscope or microscope, to detect pests or contaminants , without testing or processing
---------------------------	--

2.7 WOOD (2013-011)

The SC May 2013 added *bark* and *wood* to *List of topics for IPPC standards*, based on a TPG proposal. A revised definition for *wood* was proposed by the TPG in February 2014 and reviewed by the SC in May 2014. It was not recommended to revise the definition of *bark*, but a definition was proposed for the commodity *isolated bark* (see section 1.2). The following explanatory points may be considered when reviewing the proposed definition.

- The current definition for *wood* as a commodity class is too restrictive considering the wide varieties of wood commodities that need to be covered.

- The commodity class proposed here is *wood and bark*. It covers a very wide variety of commodities, which are the subject of the draft ISPM on management of pest risks associated with international movement of wood (2006-029). It would not be possible to give an exhaustive list of commodities in the definition, partly because it would be difficult to find terms for broad categories, which would be agreeable internationally. It was therefore considered appropriate to list examples.
- The examples intend to reflect the main broad categories of wood commodities. The examples could not be limited to the wood commodities defined in ISPM 5 (*round wood, sawn wood, now isolated bark* [see section 1.2]), which represent only a few types of commodities. The examples of *wood chips* and *wood waste* were added.
- The term *wood waste* is straightforward and can be understood to cover commodities that are residues from the processing of wood (such as wood shavings, sawdust). *Wood chips* was in the original definition, is a widely used term, for a widely traded commodity; It was listed separately from wood waste as it may be produced for itself (and is not necessarily a by-product of wood processing). Other commodities that would fall under this commodity class according to this definition would be, for example, furniture made of non-processed wood etc.
- Definitions do not normally mention what they exclude. However, because the proposed definition gives only examples, it is clearer to indicate which commodities are excluded (which otherwise may be understood to be covered). Items excluded are: *wood packaging material* (defined separately and subject to the requirements of ISPM 15: 2009) and *processed wood material* (defined separately and not capable of being infested with quarantine pests according to ISPM 32: 2009).
- *Dunnage* was deleted from the original definition as it is a type of wood packaging material.
- It is not considered useful that wood be defined in the biological sense as it has no specific IPPC meaning (unlike bark – see section 1.2).

Original definition

wood	A commodity class for round wood, sawn wood , wood chips or dunnage , with or without bark [FAO, 1990; revised ICPM, 2001]
-------------	---

Proposed revision

wood and bark (as a commodity class)	A commodity class for Commodities such as round wood, sawn wood , wood chips or dunnage and wood waste , with or without bark , and isolated bark , but excluding wood packaging material and processed wood material .
---	--

APPENDIX 7: General Recommendations on Consistency

(first developed at TPG 2010; noted by the SC May 2011; modified by the TPG 2012 and TPG 2013 meetings; noted by the SC May 2013, modified by the TPG 2014; to be noted by the SC May 2014)

[Note to the SC: the terms added since the last version, noted by the SC May 2013, are underlined]

The SC in 2013:

In May “*encouraged the implementation of those recommendations by expert drafting groups and others directly involved in drafting ISPMs.*”

In November “*noted that the General recommendations on consistency, as developed and regularly updated by the TPG and noted or by the SC, are important to ensure proper use of terms in future ISPMs, and ask the Secretariat to make them available to expert drafting groups and others directly involved in drafting ISPMs (editor etc.).*”

One task of the Technical Panel for the Glossary is to review ISPMs, adopted or draft, for consistency in the use of terminology, especially of the Glossary terms. The TPG has identified a number of points where greater consistency is needed. General recommendations on these points are set out in this document. They have been applied to the ISPMs reviewed, and should also be taken into consideration in drafting new ISPMs.

These recommendations mainly concern two related principles:

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

List of terms considered below

Acceptable level of risk, appropriate level of protection	Phytosanitary import requirements
Contamination	Phytosanitary measures, phytosanitary actions
Country, contracting party, NPPO	<u>Phytosanitary status</u>
Efficacy, effectiveness	Point of entry
<u>Inspection</u>	Presence, occurrence
Intended use	Prevalence
(Non-)compliance, (non-)conformity	Restriction
Official	Security, phytosanitary security
Pest-free	Shipment
<u>Pest lists</u>	<u>Trading partners</u>
Pest risk management	and/or
Phytosanitary certificate, certificate	References to the text of the IPPC
	“/” and “(s)”

Recommendations on use of terms

Acceptable level of risk, appropriate level of protection

These terms are not defined in the Glossary, but are taken from the SPS Agreement. They should only be used in that context, and in that exact wording. In particular, exporting countries have to satisfy “phytosanitary import requirements” of the importing countries, not their “appropriate level of protection”. To avoid confusion, it is best not to use the terms “level of risk” or “level of protection” at all.

Contamination

This is the Glossary term, defined in relation to commodities, and it should be used in preference to “contaminant”.

Country, contracting party, NPPO

Countries are variously specified in ISPMs as “contracting parties”, “NPPOs” or just “countries”. These terms should be used with discrimination. The term “contracting party” should be limited to cases where reference is being made specifically to the text of the IPPC and its obligations. The term “NPPO” should be used if the responsibility falls among those specified in Article IV of the IPPC. Otherwise, “country” should be used, in particular because IPPC Art. XVIII explicitly encourages non-contracting parties to apply phytosanitary measures consistent with the provisions of the IPPC and ISPMs. When “NPPO” is used, the text should avoid such inappropriate expressions as “the importing NPPO”, and use instead “the NPPO of the importing country”.

Efficacy, effectiveness

“Efficacy” is a special concept linked to efficacy of treatments, and the terms “efficacy” and “efficacious” should be used only in this context. The term “efficacy (of a treatment)” is correctly defined in the glossary in this sense. In other cases, the term “effectiveness” and its derived form “effective” may be used, e.g. an effective measure, effectiveness of measures. The general understanding adopted is that efficacy refers to results under controlled conditions, whereas effectiveness refers to results in practice under natural conditions.

Intended use

This is the Glossary term, which should be used in preference to other wordings such as “end use”.

Inspection

This is the Glossary term. “Visual inspection” should not be used in ISPMs, as “inspection” is already defined as a visual examination.

(Non-)compliance, (non-)conformity

According to IPPC Art. VII (2f), “Importing contracting parties shall...inform...of instances of non-compliance with phytosanitary certification...”. Furthermore, “Compliance procedure (for a consignment)” has been defined in the Glossary. Thus, in those cases, compliance and non-compliance are clearly linked to consignments and thus to import. For other cases of correct/incorrect implementation of measures (e.g. regarding requirements prescribed for an entire place of production) it might be more appropriate to use other terms such as (non-)conformity.

Official

Anything “established, authorized or performed by an NPPO” is by definition “official”. Many Glossary terms are defined as “official” (e.g. area, inspection, phytosanitary action, phytosanitary measure, quarantine, surveillance, test, treatment). It is accordingly recommended not to use the word “official” where it is redundant.

Pest list

There are different types of pests lists, and the terms “pest list”, “list of pests” or “pest listing” used on their own may be ambiguous, especially where they may be read as referring to the pests *regulated by a country* or the pests *present in a country*. Therefore the terms “pest list”, “list of pests” or “pest listing” should not be used alone, but should always be qualified.

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

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

Pest risk management

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

suitable term. In general, it is preferable to refer to “risk” or “risk management” only in the PRA context.

Pest free

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

Phytosanitary certificate, certificate

Where “certificate” or “certification” refers to phytosanitary certificate or phytosanitary certification, these terms should be used, to distinguish from other instances where certificate and certification may relate to other situations (e.g. CITES certificates, certification scheme, certification of facilities). In ISPM 12:2011, the plural term “phytosanitary certificates” refers to export and re-export certificates.

Phytosanitary import requirements

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

Phytosanitary measures, phytosanitary actions

Care should be taken to use these terms correctly. Though in common language, “measures” can be “actions”, this is not so in the Glossary. “Measures” are “legislation, regulations or procedures” (in accordance also with the use of term in the SPS Agreement), while “actions” are “operations”. For a fuller explanation, see Note 10 of the Annotated Glossary.

Phytosanitary status

The use of *phytosanitary status* should be avoided as it presents a problem for the understanding of ISPMs, and creates conflicts of meaning between existing ISPMs. The defined terms “pest status” or “pest risk” may be used in some contexts. Note. The TPG is considering developing a definition for one specific situation linked to the use of *phytosanitary status*, namely in relation to a consignment.

Point of entry

This is the Glossary term. Firstly, “point of entry” should be used in preference to other wordings such as “port of entry”. Secondly, “point of entry” should not be used in relation to entrance points into a PFA or ALPP.

Presence, occurrence

The terms “presence” and “occurrence” have both been used in ISPMs in relation to pest status. In future ISPMs, it is recommended that the term “presence” should be preferred to the term “occurrence”. A proposal is under consideration in the *Amendments to the glossary* (2013) to delete the definition of occurrence, and that “presence” does not need a specific IPPC definition.

Prevalence

The word “prevalence” only exists in the Glossary within the term “area of low pest prevalence”. It should only be used in this context. Use of the term “prevalence” on its own should be avoided, and it is sometimes wrongly used in draft ISPMs to mean “incidence” (the term that is defined in the glossary).

Restriction

Where this current glossary term has been used in ISPMs, it has mainly been used in the meaning of another glossary term, “phytosanitary import requirements”. For that meaning only, “phytosanitary import requirements” should be used in the future. The glossary term “restriction” is proposed for deletion in the *Amendments to the glossary* (2013) and could be used with its general English meaning in the future.

Security, phytosanitary security

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

Shipment

“Shipment” is used in ISPMs in different contexts. Where it is intended to mean “consignment” (defined in the glossary) or “dispatch”, these terms should preferably be used, and “shipment” avoided.

Trading partner

“Trading partner” (or “trade partner”) has been used in ISPMs in different contexts. This term should be avoided as it causes confusion. In ISPMs, it has often been used to make reference to an “importing country”, and does not cover the broader understanding of the term, which may include stakeholders and private companies. Where it is intended to mean “importing country”, this expression should be used. Otherwise precise words should be used.

Other recommendations

and/or

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

References to the text of the IPPC

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

“/” and “(s)”

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

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

APPENDIX 8: Items to be Archived and Needing Modification at Future Revisions of ISPMs

When the items below are given to expert drafting groups, they should be accompanied with relevant extracts of the 2014 TPG report and the latest *General recommendations on consistency*.

In relation to pest list (agenda item 6.1.6)

ISPM 2 (Framework for Pest Risk Analysis)

- section 3.3.2: “..... for pathway – initiated analysis: commodity description and **categorized pest list**”

ISPM 6 (Guidelines for Surveillance)

- Scope: “..... when appropriate the preparation of **pest lists**”.
- 5: Record keeping

“..... Information kept should be appropriate for the intended purpose, for example support of specific pest risk analyses, establishment of pest free areas and preparation of **pest lists**. Voucher specimens should be deposited, where appropriate

ISPM 8 (Determination of pest status in an area)

- General Request for determination of pest status:
 1. Purposes of pest status determination
 - All countries may use pest status information for:
 - PRA purposes
 - Planning national, regional or international pest management
 - Establishing **national pest lists**

ISPM 11 (Pest Risk analysis for quarantine pests)

- 4.1: Documentation requirements, 2nd paragraph
- The main elements of documentation are:
 - Purpose for PRA
 - Pest, **pest list**, pathways, PRA area, endangered area
 - Sources of information
 - **Categorized pest list**
 -

In relation to identity and phytosanitary security (agenda item 6.1.7)

identity – ISPM 12 – review needed where the term is used, especially sections 4 and 6.

phytosanitary security - ISPM 25, Background, paragraph 5: It should be noted that the term “transit” is not only used for phytosanitary purposes but is also the accepted name for the standard procedure for moving goods under Customs control. Customs control may include document verification, tracking (e.g. electronic), sealing, control of carrier and entry/exit control. Customs control by itself is not intended to guarantee **phytosanitary** integrity and **security** of consignments and thus will not necessarily offer protection against the introduction and/or spread of pests.

In relation to visual inspection (agenda item 6.1.13 on visual examination)

ISPM 6 (Guidelines of Surveillance)

- 2: Specific Surveys
 - description of survey methodology and quality management including an explanation of:

- sampling procedures (e.g. attractant trapping, whole plant sampling, **visual inspection**, sample collection and laboratory analysis); the procedure would be determined by the biology of pest and/or purpose of survey

ISPM 10 (*Requirements for the establishment of Pest Free Places of Production and Pest Free Production Sites*)

- 2.1.1: Characteristics of the pest
A place of production or a production site can be declared free from a given pest with the required assurance of pest freedom if the characteristics of the pest are suitable for this. Suitable characteristics may include the following:
 - sufficiently sensitive methods for detection of the pest are available, either by **visual inspection** or by tests applied in the field or in the laboratory, at the appropriate season

ISPM 12 (*Phytosanitary Certificate*)

- 6. Considerations for Re-Export Situations and Transit (third paragraph)
 - If the NPPO of the country of re-export does not require a phytosanitary certificate for the import of a commodity but the NPPO of the country of destination does, and the phytosanitary import requirements can be fulfilled by **visual inspections** or laboratory testing of samples,”

ISPM 27 Annex 03 (*Trogoderma granarium Everts*)

- 3. Detection (5th paragraph)
 - 1st sentence. Samples of suspect products have to be **visually inspected** in a well-lit area, using a 10× magnification hand lens”
 - 8th sentence. **Visual inspection** is preferable to sieving because the latter can easily destroy or seriously damage dead adults and larval exuviae rendering the morphological identification very difficult or impossible.

APPENDIX 9: TPG Work Plan 2014-2015*(Prepared by the Secretariat, last updated 2014-04-15)*[Table 1: regular tasks](#)[Table 2: one-off tasks](#)[Table 3: terms on the TPG work programme as subjects](#)[Table 4: Chronological summary of deadlines](#)**Table 1 - Regular tasks**

Regular tasks	Detailed task	Responsible	Deadline BY	Comments	
1- Meeting reports: preparation and update to SC	2014	Draft report to Steward and rapporteur	Secretariat	01-03-2014	Done
		Steward and rapporteur send back draft report	Steward & rapporteur	25-03-2014	Done
		Secretariat finalizes report and sends to TPG	Secretariat	25-03-2014	Done
		TPG review report and sends comments	ALL	09-04-2014	Done
		Final report	Secretariat	15-04-2014	Done
	Update for SC May 2014	Prepare update (incl. decisions) from Feb 2014 meetings for SC May 2014	Secretariat with steward	15-04-2014	Done
2- Draft ISPMs in member consultation (for Amendments, see 5)	2013 MC (except Amendments, see under 5)	check accuracy of translation of definitions in draft ISPMs. Members receive draft definitions for their language	French, Spanish	09-02-2014	
		Proposals of translations for Chinese, Arabic and Russian in draft ISPMs	Russian, Chinese, Arabic	09-02-2014	
		Review for possible inconsistencies and consideration of comments	All prior to meeting	09-02-2014	
		Terms and consistency comments extracted	Secretariat	10-12-2013	
		Reactions to comments/consistency review integrated in tables: all drafts, and sent to stewards via Secretariat	Secretariat with steward	28-03-2014	Done
		Reactions on translation of terms sent to Secretariat for consideration at next translation phase (to be archived by Secretariat)	ALL	01-03-2014	Done
		Reactions to requests for new terms and definitions in member comments	Secretariat with steward	In report	Done
	2014 MC (except Amendments, see under 5)	Check accuracy of translation of definitions in draft ISPMs. Members receive draft definitions for their language	French, Spanish	Before TPG 2015	
		Proposals of translations for Chinese, Arabic and Russian in draft ISPMs	Russian, Chinese, Arabic	Before TPG 2015	
		Review for possible inconsistencies and consideration of	All prior to meeting	Before TPG	

		comments		2015	
		Terms and consistency comments extracted	Secretariat	15-12-2014	
		Reactions to comments/consistency review integrated in tables: all drafts, and sent to stewards via Secretariat	Secretariat with steward	To be determined (TBD)	After TPG 2015
		Reactions on translation of terms sent to Secretariat for consideration at next translation phase	Secretariat	TBD	After TPG 2015
		Reactions to requests for new terms and definitions in member comments	Secretariat with steward	TBD	After TPG 2015
3- Early draft ISPMs going to SC May prior to MC	2014	TPG to review the drafts	ALL	09-02-2014	TPG 2014
		General comments compiled and sent to stewards	Secretariat with steward	01-03-2014	Done
	2015	TPG to review the drafts in relation to definitions (if any) and consistency	ALL	Before TPG 2015	
		General comments compiled and sent to stewards	Secretariat with steward	After TPG 2015	
4- Drafts ISPMs in Substantial concerns commenting period (July-end September)	2014 SCCP	Possible consultation by email on terms and inconsistencies in other drafts	Secretariat	Sometime between 01-10 and 25-10-2014	
		Final check of definitions in the draft ISPM on Determination of host status of fruit to fruit fly infestation	ALL	09-02-2014	
		Definitions in the draft ISPM on Determination of host status of fruit to fruit fly infestation – finalize TPG comments	Secretariat and steward	20-02-2014	
5- Terms and definitions (incl. Amendments to the Glossary)	Feb 2013 Amendments	Volunteer sends draft meeting paper to Secretariat	As allocated in Table 3	31-12-2012	TPG 2013
		Draft amendments 2013 completed based on discussions at Feb 2013, to SC	Secretariat, Steward	20-03-2013	
		Draft amendments in member consultation (possibly)		07 to 12-2013	
		Draft amendments and member comments considered by TPG	As per steps in task 2		TPG 2014
		Amendments finalized and send to TPG for comment (responses processed directly to SC7)	Secretariat with steward	25-03-2014	Done
		TPG sends back comments	ALL	09-04-2014	Done
		Amendments and responses processed for SC-7	Secretariat and steward	04-2014	Done
		Consultation by email on SCCP comments Amendments to the Glossary	ALL	Sometime between 01-10 and 25-10-2014	
		Check translations of draft Amendments going for adoption (i.e. after SC November and when it has been revised/translated into all languages)	Members for languages	In the first part of January 2015	Will be very short deadline

	Feb 2014 amendments	Volunteers sends draft meeting papers to Secretariat	ALL, as allocated in Table 3	31-12-2013	TPG 2014
		Draft amendments 2014 compiled based on discussions at Feb 2014, and finalized with steward, and sent to TPG for comment	Secretariat and steward	28-03-2014	Done
		TPG sends back comments	ALL	09-04-2014	Done
		Amendments processed for SC	Secretariat	10-04-2014	Done
		Draft amendments in member consultation (possibly)		07 to 12-2013	
	Draft amendments and member comments considered by TPG			TPG 2015	
	Translation of terms	Secretariat to solicit TPG members' help to translate new terms in languages for the List of topics	Secretariat	Around March	5 Deadline in Secretariat email
6- Annotated glossary – (to be published every 3 years)	2014 (intermediate)	To prepare intermediate update based on outcome of CPM 2013, SC 2013 (May and Nov.), TPG 2014, CPM 2014, SC May 2014, and consistency	Ian Smith	30-08-2014	
		To review intermediate update and send comments	ALL	15-12-2014	
	2015 (intermediate)	To prepare intermediate update based on TPG comments, outcome of SC Nov 2014, TPG 2015, CPM 2015, SC May 2015	Ian Smith	30-08-2015	
		To review intermediate update	ALL	15-12-2015	
	2016 (for publication)	To prepare intermediate update based on outcome of SC Nov 2015 and comments of SC November 2015	Ian Smith	15-01-2016	Draft to be reviewed at TPG 2016 meeting
		To modify and finalize based on the outcome of TPG 2016 meeting	Ian Smith	01-03-2016	
		To comment	ALL	15-03-2016	
To finalize for publication	Ian Smith	30-03-2016			
7- 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 to send to Secretariat		31-12-2014	
8- Review of membership	Annual review of membership to make recommendations to SC on new members needed			TPG 2015	

Table 2 - One-off tasks (for individual terms to be worked on, see table 3)

One-off tasks	Detailed task	Responsible	Deadline	Comments
9- Review of ISPMs for consistency and style (other than in draft ISPMs)	General recommendations on consistency: yearly updates 2014 as needed	All prior to meeting	09-02-2014	TPG 2014
		Secretariat and steward to SC		In TPG report
	General recommendations on consistency: yearly updates 2015 as needed	All prior to meeting	Before TPG	

			2015	
	Procedure for consistency changes across standards, mechanisms	Secretariat, steward	31-12-2012	TPG 2013
	Consistency across standards: phytosanitary status: main paper (from Feb 2013 meeting) and additions from Feb 2013 meeting	To SC	28-03-2014	Consolidated paper
	Consistency across standards: trading partners	Secretariat and steward	28-03-2014	As SC paper
	Consistency of ISPM 5: definitions of commodity classes	Secretariat and steward	28-03-2014	As SC paper
	Ongoing consistency review	All during TPG 2015		TPG 2015
	Present all ink amendments / proposals for revision made so far	Secretariat	31-12-2014	TPG 2015
10-- CBD terminology in languages	To analyse the possible need for explanations on CBD terminology in Appendix 1 of ISPM 15 for languages other than English	Ian Smith (French, Spanish, Russian)	31-12-2014	TPG 2015

Table 3 - Terms on the TPG work programme as subjects

Deadline for preparation of papers for TPG 2014 is **31 December 2014** for all terms.

		Source of the proposal	volunteer	Comments	Summary of previous outcome and next step
Terms on the List of topics for IPPC standards (in green, papers to be prepared for TPG 2014; others: in member consultation, member comments to be reviewed in TPG 2014)					
1.	additional declaration (2010-006)	SC November 2010	John Hedley	SC November 2010 - Deletion of “soil or other” was proposed, as the definition for additional declaration includes the wording “in relation to regulated pests”. On the other hand it was noted that the AD is the only place on the phytosanitary certificate where statements for specific situations, such as soil freedom, can be made. The SC requested the TPG to consider revision of the definition of <i>additional declaration</i> . Paper discussed at TPG 2013 No agreement found on how the definition should be revised, submitted to SC May 2013 for decision on how to proceed. SC May 2013 gave guidance, Secretariat to compile Discussed at TPG 2014	Incorporate to Amendments to the Glossary (new) for May 2014 SC
2.	area of low pest prevalence (2013-014)	SC May 2013	Secretariat	Additional change requested at SC May 2013, already made in MC version Discussed at TPG 2014	Present situation to SC May 2014 in TPG report Add note to 2013 Amendments to the Glossary to SC7
3.	authorize, accredit, certify (Use of the terms) (2013-004)	TPG 2013, added SC May 2013	John Hedley with Ian Smith Paper needed for TPG 2015	To review the use of these terms in ISPMs and draft ISPMs, as well as terminology as used in other domains, and make proposal on use of terms. - Analyse use of terms in ISPMs - Enquire on terminology from maritime area - Investigate harmonized terminology in other domains	Propose addition to the List of topics to SC May 2013. SC May 2013 added subject to List of topics Draft text to be prepared for TPG

		Source of the proposal	volunteer	Comments	Summary of previous outcome and next step
				Details in February 2013 Discussed at TPG 2014	2015 for General recommendations on consistency
4.	bark (2013-005)	TPG 2013, added SC May 2013	Andrei Orlinski	See details in February 2013 report - Propose addition to the List of topics to SC May 2013. - SC May 2013 added subject to List of topics - Discussed TPG 2014	Incorporate to Amendments to the Glossary (new) for May 2014 SC
5.	commodity pest list (2013-013)	Added SC May 2013	Ebbe Nordbo	See SC May 2013 Discussed at TPG 2014	Report to SC : - no change needed - ask removal of subject from List of topics
6.	contaminating pest (2012-001) / contamination	Added SC April 2012	Volunteer needed to write paper for TPG 2015 (if SC agrees with approach proposed)	Definition to be reviewed to make sure that it covers the concepts normally expressed by a hitch-hiker pest. (see report of 2011 TPG meeting) - deletion proposed in Amendments 2013 - SC May 2013 agreed with proposal - TPG 2014 reviewed member comments TPG 2014 proposed to remove contaminating pests from the Amendments to the Glossary, and to reconsider at the 2015 meeting with contamination	Invite SC to : - add contamination to the List of topics - propose removal of contaminating pest from 2013 Amendments If SC accepts proposals: - TPG reconsider in Feb 2015
7.	identity (2011-001)	Added SC May 2011 based on CPM-6 discussion	Ebbe Nordbo	At CPM-6, in relation to the revised ISPM 12: 2010, some members suggested that the SC consider whether there is a need to define the term "identity", and the SC added the term to the work programme as TPG subject. TPG 2012 suggested an approach, but asked SC to validate before further work. SC agreed (see TPG Oct 2012 report and SC May 2013 report) TPG 2014 discussed	Incorporate to Amendments to the Glossary (new) for May 2014 SC
8.	kiln-drying (2013-006)	TPG 2012, added SC May 2013	Andrei Orlinski	Details in Oct 2012 TPG report Propose addition to the List of topics to SC May 2013. SC May 2013 agreed TPG 2014 discussed	Incorporate to Amendments to the Glossary (new) for May 2014 SC
9.	mark (2013-007)	TPG 2013, added SC May 2013	Secretariat	To remove "phytosanitary status" in the definition. Proposal already exists. To be extracted from relevant document Propose addition to the List of topics to SC May 2013. SC May 2013 agreed TPG 2014 discussed	Incorporate to Amendments to the Glossary (new) for May 2014 SC
10.	organism (2010-021), naturally occurring (2010-023)	TPG discussion 2009	Ian Smith	Review the three definitions Deletion of organism and naturally occurring proposed in <i>Amendments to the glossary 2013</i>	SC-7 and SCCP

		Source of the proposal	volunteer	Comments	Summary of previous outcome and next step
				SC May 2013 approved proposals in amendments to the glossary TPG 2014 reviewed member comments	
11.	pest list (2012-014)	Added SC November 2012	Shaza Omar	To make recommendations on how to resolve the confusion around the use of the term pest list. SC concerns presented in TPG_2013_Feb_09. Further discussion in TPG February meeting report. 2014 TPG	Preliminary discussion at TPG 2013. Report to SC and propose: - not define - add General recommendation consistency - remove from List of topics
12.	phytosanitary security (of a consignment) (2013-008)	TPG 2012, added SC May 2013	Ebbe Nordbo	Details in Oct 2012 TPG report SC May 2013 added term to List of topics TPG 2014	Incorporate to Amendments to the Glossary (new) for May 2014 SC
13.	phytosanitary status (2010-004)	TPG 2010, added SC November 2010	2013 Ebbe Nordbo 2014 Beatriz Melcho	To review the use in ISPMs and consider if the term needs to be clarified. Raised in TPG 2010 in relation to the draft ISPM on plants for planting. TPG 2012-2013 developed proposals across standards. Paper on consistency across standards presented to the SC in May 2013, but discussion postponed to November 2013, then to May 2014 - proposed actions in the paper on consistency across standards (incl. general consistency recommendation) - definition for phytosanitary status (of a consignment accompanied by a PC) to be developed - TPG 2014 discussed	Propose to SC: - No new definition proposed - Ink amendments to be added to those presented to SC in May 2013 (incl. Table B)
14.	point of entry (2010-005)	From the review of the draft annotated glossary, TPG 2010, added SC November 2010	Beatriz Melcho	This definition is now out of date and does not allow for the current practice of having points of entry inside countries. - revised def in Amendments 2013, and informed the SC May 2013 that revision needed in 3 ISPMs. - add to general consistency recommendations - all agreed by SC May 2013 - TPG 2014 reviewed member comments	SC-7 and SCCP
15.	occurrence (2010-026)	TPG 2009, added SC April 2010	Ebbe Nordbo and Ian Smith	To review the use in English ISPMs and in languages to make sure consistent. TPG 2010 discussed. Outcome detailed in the 2010 report - deletion of occurrence in amendments to the glossary 2013 - add general consistency recommendation - revision of defs. containing occur in <i>Amendments to the glossary</i> - SC May 2013 agreed - TPG 2014 reviewed member comments	SC-7 and SCCP
16.	production site (2012-	added SC April 2012	Ian Smith	To clarify the ambiguity linked to place of production (see report of 2011	SC-7 and SCCP

		Source of the proposal	volunteer	Comments	Summary of previous outcome and next step
	004)			TPG meeting) - new definition in Amendments 2013 - consequential: change to place of production and pest-free production site (both in Amendments 2013) - SC May 2013 agreed with proposals - TPG 2014 reviewed member comments	
17.	protected area (2012-003)	added SC April 2012	Ian Smith	To consider whether the current definitions should be revised to be consistent with the current definition of <i>quarantine pest</i> , and to review the use of the term in ISPMs, especially those on PRA (see report of 2011 TPG meeting) - deletion of <i>protected area</i> in Amendments 2013 - propose to SC that <i>endangered area</i> be deleted from list of topics - SC May 2013 agreed with proposals - TPG 2014 reviewed member comments on protected area	SC-7 and SCCP
18.	quarantine station (2010-013)	TPG June 2009, added SC 2010-04	Secretariat	To revise based on ISPM No. 3. The definition should also refer to organisms or other regulated articles in quarantine instead of only referring to plants or plant products. TPG 2010 proposed revision. Member consultation in 2011. TPG 2011 modified definition. SC November 2011 sent back to TPG (details in SC report) - revision in Amendments 2013 (as sent for MC in 2011) - SC May 2013 agreed with proposal - TPG 2014 reviewed member comments	SC-7 and SCCP
19.	restriction (2010-027)	TPG 2009, added SC 2010-04	Ian Smith	Review the use of restriction in ISPMs, as well as the use of restrictive. Used in inconsistent way. - deletion (amendments 2013) - add general consistency recommendation - SC May 2013 accepted - TPG 2014 reviewed member comments	SC-7 and SCCP
20.	suppression (2011-002), eradication (2011-003) and containment (2011-004), exclusion (2010-008), control (2011-005)	Exclusion: TPF 2009 Others: TPG October 2010	Ebbe Nordbo	<i>Suppression, eradication, containment</i> : proposed for addition to the work programme in order to consider the use of <i>phytosanitary measures</i> in these definitions. <i>Exclusion</i> : Proposed by the TPF in Sept. 2009, but not considered by TPG 2009. TPF 2010 resubmitted a definition to TPG. TPG 2010 modified definition. SC May 2011 decided to send for MC. Based on comments received, TPG 2011 advised that the draft definition should be reconsidered together with <i>suppression, eradication, containment, control</i> . <i>Control</i> : proposed for addition to the work programme in order to consider mentioning exclusion in the definition. - All for revision in amendments 2013	SC-7 and SCCP

		Source of the proposal	volunteer	Comments	Summary of previous outcome and next step
				- SC May 2013 agreed - TPG 2014 reviewed member comments	
21.	survey (2013-015)	SC May 2013		See SC May 2013 TPG 2014 discussed	Propose to SC May 2014 to classify as “pending” until progress made with revision of ISPM 6
22.	systems approach (2010-002)	TPG 2010 Added SC November 2010	Beatriz Melcho	To consider the pros and cons of redefining/revising. Need to review use in standards and consider whether to revise. Two issues to be considered for possible revision of the definition: “risk management measures” (should it be “pest risk management measures”) meeting “appropriate level of protection” (should it be “phytosanitary import requirements”) - Revision in amendments 2013 - TPG agreed that not needed to define integrated measures (details to TPG report). - SC May 2013 agreed with proposal - TPG 2014 reviewed member comments	SC-7 and SCCP
23.	The concept of the IPPC coverage of “plants” (2013-012)	TPG discussions 2012 & 2013. Added by SC May 2013	Ian Smith	- TPG 2012 and 2013 developed proposal for a modification of the scope of ISPM 5 in Amendments to the glossary 2013 - SC agreed to proposal - TPG 2014 reviewed member comments	SC-7 and SCCP
24.	trading partners (2013-009)	TPG 2012, added SC May 2013	Ian Smith	Details in Oct 2012 TPG report Propose addition to the List of topics to SC May 2013 SC May 2013 agreed TPG 2014 discussed	Propose to SC May 2014: - Not define - Proposals for consistency across standards to SC - General recommendation on consistency
25.	visual examination (2013-010)	TPG 2012, added SC May 2013	Shaza Omar	Details in Oct 2012 TPG report Propose addition to the List of topics to SC May 2013. SC May 2013 agreed TPG 2014 discussed	- Incorporate to Amendments to the Glossary (new) for May 2014 SC - General recommendation on consistency (on visual inspection) - note to SC that occurrences of visual inspection in ISPMs will need to be corrected at revision

		Source of the proposal	volunteer	Comments	Summary of previous outcome and next step
26.	wood (2013-011)	TPG 2013, added SC May 2013	Andrei Orlinski	See details in February 2013 report Propose addition to the List of topics to SC May 2013. SC May 2013 agreed TPG 2014 discussed	Incorporate to Amendments to the Glossary (new) for May 2014 SC
27.	grain	Added SC November 2013	Secretariat	Added in relation to the consideration of the draft specification on International movement on grain. SC Nov 2013 added to List of topics, to be discussed at TPG 2014	Incorporate to Amendments to the Glossary (new) for May 2014 SC, together with consequential change for “seeds”
28.	effective dose	Added SC November 2013	Secretariat	Added based on paper submitted by the TPPT SC Nov 2013 added to List of topics, to be discussed. Discussed at TPG 2014	Report to SC on recommendations and options for the TPPT
Related to consistency					
29.	Review of the use of “and/or” in adopted ISPMs (2010-030)	TPG discussion 2009 Modified SC November 2010	Stays on the work programme to be implemented during the consistency review	Consistent with general recommendations on consistency, but require a review of every occurrence. Will be considered during consistency study.	
Pending terms					
30.	country of origin (2006-016)	Past TPG meetings (but pending)	Pending for ISPM 11 - Done for ISPM 7 and 12 - Will be done for ISPM 20 as part of consistency review	In standard setting programme presented to CPM-4: SC decided that this would be taken up under the review of ISPMs 7 and 12 and the review of other ISPMs. Addressed in ISPM 7, and needs to be addressed in 11 and 20	
31.	cut flowers and branches (2012-007)	Added SC April 2012, pending SC May 2013	Pending until EWG on International movement of cut flowers and branches (2008-005)	- Discussed by the SC in relation to the specification for the topic of <i>International movement of cut flowers and branches</i> . The SC asked the TPG to review the current definition of cut flowers and branches - TPG 2013 proposal submitted to SC May 2013 as part of Amendments to the glossary 2013 - SC May 2013 <i>postponed</i> the consideration of the revised definition of <i>cut flowers and branches</i> (2008-005), and <i>requested</i> the Secretariat to transmit the proposed revised definition (and associated explanations) to the EWG on <i>International movement of cut flowers and branches</i> (2008-005) for further consideration.	Pending until EWG on international movement of cut flowers and branches

		Source of the proposal	volunteer	Comments	Summary of previous outcome and next step
32.	tolerance level (2012-005)	TPFF 2010. Added SC April 2012, pending SC May 2013	Pending until SC in 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To be considered based on a draft revised definition proposed by the TPFF. - TPG 2012-2013 finalized a revised definition. - Proposed to SC May 2013 to decide whether to add to the amendments 2013 or not revise for the moment (details and proposed def in 2013 TPG report). - SC May 2013 changed the status of tolerance level (of a pest) to pending, to be reconsidered by the SC in 2015 (Note: not by the TPG) 	SC will consider in 2015
33.	quarantine area (2012-006)	TPFF 2011. Added SC April 2012, pending SC May 2013	Pending until revision of ISPM 8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To be considered based on a draft revised definition proposed by the TPFF. - TPG 2012-2013 considered definition, but proposed it should be postponed until ISPM 8 is revised. (details in TPG 2012 and 2013 reports) - SC May 2013 changed the status to pending until after the revision of ISPM 8:1998 (Determination of pest status in an area) 	Wait until after the revision of ISPM 8
34.	pre-clearance (2013-016)	Added by 1SC May 2013 as pending	Pending until SC decides	Concepts are being considered by the SC. Work on the definition will start only when the concepts are clarified. However, the SC decided to add pre-clearance as pending	Wait until SC decides

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

Only deadlines until the next meeting are listed below

Deadline	Activity in tables	Resp.	Task
09-04-2014	5. Terms and def.	ALL	Draft Amendments to the Glossary 2013: comment on modified draft and on responses to comments (as modified after the TPG meeting, going to SC-7 and SCCP)
09-04-2014	5. Terms and def.	ALL	Draft Amendments to the Glossary 2014: comment on draft (as assembled following the TPG meeting, going to SC May prior to MC)
09-04-2014	1. Meeting report	ALL	Comment on draft TPG report
30-08-2014	6. Annotated glossary	Ian Smith	To prepare 2014 intermediate update based on outcome of: CPM 2013, SC 2013 (May and Nov.), TPG 2014, CPM 2014, SC May 2014, and consistency in the use of terms
01/25-10-2014	5. Terms and def.	ALL	Draft Amendments to the Glossary 2013 in SCCP: consultation by email on SCCP comments, as necessary
01/25-10-2014	4. Draft ISPMs in SCCP	ALL	Other draft ISPMs in SCCP: possible consultation by email on definitions and inconsistencies in drafts, as necessary
15-12-2014	6. Annotated glossary	ALL	To review and comment on intermediate update 2014
31-12-2014	7. Explanations of terms	ALL	Members to identify some glossary terms/definitions requiring further explanations (and not already explained in other places, such as the annotated glossary).
31-12-2014	10. CBD terms (App. 1, ISPM 5)	Ian Smith	To analyse CBD terminology in Appendix 1 of ISPM 15 for languages other than English (French, Spanish, Russian) in relation to the glossary
31-12-2014	5. Terms and definitions	John Hedley	Paper on authorize, accredit, certify (use of the terms) for General recommendations on consistency
31-12-2014	5. Terms and definitions	Volunteer needed	Paper on contaminating pest and contamination
01/15-01-2015	5. Terms and definitions	ALL	Check translations of draft Amendments (2013) going for adoption (i.e. after SC November and when it has been revised/translated into all languages)
Before TPG 2015	2. Draft ISPMs in MC	ALL	Draft ISPMs in 2014 MC (except Amendments, see 5). - Check accuracy of translation of definitions in draft ISPMs/propose translations - Review for possible inconsistencies and consideration of comments
Before TPG 2015	3. Early draft ISPMs	ALL	Early draft ISPMs going to SC May prior to MC: review drafts in relation to definitions and consistency
Before TPG 2015	9. Consistency	ALL	Review general recommendations on consistency and need for adjustments
TPG 2015			Planned 2-6 February 2015

APPENDIX 10: TPG Medium Term Plan

SC query: “review their work programme and the continued need for their work, and develop a medium term plan for their work, identify key areas that may need addressing, set a completion date if possible, and report back to the SC.”

- Continued need for TPG work: As long as standards are developed, in relation to terms and definition, consistency of standards and any issue necessitating input relating to definitions.
- Key areas that may need addressing: The TPG considers that the key area for its work is the consideration of draft ISPMs (new terms and definitions, consistency in the use of terms, and review of translations of terms and definitions).
- TPG activities and medium term plan/completion date/comments:

Draft ISPMs for member consultation: - consideration of member comments on terms, - review of drafts for consistency in the use of terms - review of translations of terms/definitions	continuing	
Draft ISPMs for Substantial Concerns Commenting Period (SCCP) - consideration of definitions, member comments on terms, consistency in the use of terms, as needed or requested by the SC	continuing	The TPG reviews comments from the SCCP on the Amendments to the Glossary. For other drafts, it is involved mostly through specific requests resulting from Nov. SC meeting (for timing reasons, as the SCCP ends at the end of Sept., and draft ISPMs are approved by the SC in Nov. for submission to the CPM)
Draft ISPMs at earlier stages of development - consideration of draft definitions (study of definitions and input on translation of terms and definitions) - review of drafts for consistency in the use of terms	continuing	
Development and revision of terms and definitions	continuing	
Annotated glossary - yearly updates, including explanations as needed - finalization for publication every three years	continuing	Next publication 2016
Review of adopted ISPMs for consistency in the use of terms: - consistency changes to several ISPMs (ink amendments) - procedures for consistency standard-by-standard and consistency across standards - adjustments as needed (standard-by-standard or across standards) - <i>General recommendations on consistency</i>	2013 2010& 2013 continuing ongoing	Completed Providing the framework for the consistency study To address necessary changes as needed To be consolidated, as needed, at each meeting, and presented to the SC for noting
Work of the TPG in relation to languages: - general (e.g. definitions) - review of glossary terms in languages	- continuing - continuing	Linked to draft ISPMs