



Food and Agriculture  
Organization of the  
United Nations



International  
Plant Protection  
Convention

# **REPORT**

## **Technical Panel for the Glossary**

**Santiago, Chile**

**28 November – 2 December 2022**

**IPPC Secretariat**

**Required citation:**

IPPC Secretariat. 2023. *Report of the Meeting of the Technical Panel on the Glossary, 28 November - 2 December 2022*. Rome. Published by FAO on behalf of the Secretariat of the International Plant Protection Convention.

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

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

© FAO, 2023



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

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

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

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

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

## CONTENTS

1.	Opening of the meeting .....	5
1.1	Welcome by the host country and the IPPC Secretariat.....	5
2.	Meeting arrangements .....	5
2.1	Selection of the chairperson.....	5
2.2	Selection of the rapporteur .....	5
2.3	Adoption of the agenda .....	5
2.4	Current specification: TP 5 (TPG, 2016 – for information) .....	5
3.	Administrative matters .....	5
4.	Update and reports .....	5
4.1	Previous meeting report of the TPG (December 2021), including the TPG work plan .....	5
4.2	Extracts from other meeting reports of relevance to the TPG .....	5
4.3	Strategic discussion on the TPG’s work .....	6
5.	Addressing TPG-related comments on draft ISPMs submitted to the first consultation in 2022 (1 July–30 September 2022) .....	8
5.1	2022 draft amendments to ISPM 5 ( <i>Glossary of phytosanitary terms</i> ) (1994-001) ....	8
5.2	Diagnostic protocol for Genus <i>Ceratitidis</i> (2016-001), priority 1 .....	11
5.3	Draft annex to ISPM 37 (Determination of host status of fruit to fruit flies (Tephritidae)): Criteria for evaluation of available information for determining host status of fruit to fruit flies (2018-011), priority 3 .....	12
5.4	Spanish translations of draft ISPMs .....	13
6.	Subjects on the TPG work programme .....	13
6.1	Emerging pest (2018-003).....	13
6.2	Visual examination (2022-001).....	15
7.	2021 draft amendments to ISPM 5 ( <i>Glossary of phytosanitary terms</i> ) (1994-001): terms returned to the TPG and forwarded to the SC-7 by the SC November 2022.....	16
7.1	Terms returned to the TPG for re-consideration .....	16
7.2	Terms forwarded to SC-7 .....	18
8.	Review of ISPMs for consistency of terms and style .....	21
8.1	General recommendations on consistency .....	21
8.2	Consistency of adopted ISPMs .....	22
9.	Explanation of Glossary terms .....	22
9.1	Annotated Glossary: 2022 intermediate version .....	23
9.2	Proposals for amendments to the Annotated Glossary .....	23
9.3	TPG work on consistency with ISPMs: achievements and status.....	25
10.	TPG work plan for 2023–2024.....	25
11.	Any other business.....	25
12.	Date and type of next meetings .....	25
13.	Close of the meeting .....	26
	Appendix 1: Agenda .....	27
	Appendix 2: Documents list.....	30

---

Appendix 3: Participants list .....	32
Appendix 4: Draft 2023 amendments to ISPM 5: <i>Glossary of phytosanitary terms</i> (1994-001).....	34
Appendix 5: Consistency issues with ISPM 23.....	40
Appendix 6: TPG work on consistency with ISPMs: achievements and status .....	52
Appendix 7: Proposed ink amendments to ISPM 5 in relation to the term “entry (of a consignment)” .....	55
Appendix 8: TPG Work Plan 2023-2024 .....	56

## **1. Opening of the meeting**

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

- [1] On behalf of the IPPC Secretariat (hereafter referred to as “the secretariat”), Artur SHAMILOV opened the annual meeting of the Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG), which was being held in person with some participants joining by video link. He welcomed all participants and acknowledged the absence of Asenath Abigael KOECH (Kenya) and Shaza Roushdy OMAR (Egypt).
- [2] The TPG Steward, Álvaro SEPÚLVEDA LUQUE (Chile), welcomed everyone on behalf of the host organization, the national plant protection organization (NPPO) of Chile. The meeting was held at the Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture.

## **2. Meeting arrangements**

### **2.1 Selection of the chairperson**

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

### **2.2 Selection of the rapporteur**

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

### **2.3 Adoption of the agenda**

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

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

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

## **3. Administrative matters**

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

## **4. Update and reports**

### **4.1 Previous meeting report of the TPG (December 2021), including the TPG work plan**

- [8] There were no comments on the report of the December 2021 meeting of the TPG.<sup>2</sup>

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

- [9] The secretariat presented extracts from the reports of Standards Committee (SC) meetings in 2022, together with extracts from the report of the Expert Working Group on the Use of Systems Approaches in Managing Pest Risks Associated with the Movement of Wood (2015-004).<sup>3</sup>
- [10] **Use of Systems Approaches in Managing Pest Risks Associated with the Movement of Wood (2015-004).** The TPG noted some inconsistencies in the use of “shipping” and “shipment” in the expert working group (EWG) report, and noted that the term “dispatch”, which is usually preferred, may not

---

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

<sup>2</sup> TPG meeting reports: [www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/standards-setting/expert-drafting-groups/technical-panels/technical-panel-glossary-phytosanitary-terms-isp-5](http://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/standards-setting/expert-drafting-groups/technical-panels/technical-panel-glossary-phytosanitary-terms-isp-5)

<sup>3</sup> 09\_TPG\_2021\_Jan\_Rev1.

be a suitable alternative in all cases in this context. They noted, however, that they could provide comments on such issues when drafting responses to the first consultation comments in 2023.

- [11] **Dmin.** The TPG noted that the Standards Committee Working Group (SC-7) had invited the TPG to consider whether an ink amendment was necessary to the term “minimum absorbed dose (Dmin)” in ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*) to apply italics to the variable “D” and subscript roman type to the subscript “min”.<sup>4</sup> This matter had been raised by the secretariat regarding the revision of ISPM 18 (*Requirements for the use of irradiation as a phytosanitary measure*) (2014-007), to bring IPPC style into line with standard scientific notation. The TPG agreed, however, that matters of typography were a matter for the secretariat, not the TPG. The secretariat confirmed that they would therefore make the necessary change to the Glossary when preparing it for publication after adoption of the draft 2021 amendments by CPM-17 (2023).
- [12] The TPG noted that it was unusual for the abbreviation of a Glossary term to be included within the term, rather than being listed separately, but acknowledged that this in this case it aided understanding.
- [13] The TPG:
- (1) *agreed* that the typography of terms and definitions in ISPM 5 was outside the scope of the TPG and was a matter for the secretariat; and
  - (2) *noted* the extracts from other meeting reports of relevance to the TPG.

### 4.3 Strategic discussion on the TPG’s work

- [14] The secretariat introduced this agenda item, referring to the IPPC Strategic Framework 2022–2030 and the SC’s invitation to technical panels to recommend ways of streamlining technical panel processes. The secretariat noted that any recommendations made by the TPG would complement the draft paper to the SC on the TPG’s achievements, considered under agenda item 9.3.
- [15] The TPG considered ways of streamlining and otherwise improving their work, both in terms of the overall standard setting process and internal working practices within the TPG.
- [16] **Omitting second consultation when no comments.** The secretariat confirmed that the standard setting process already allowed the TPG to separate draft amendments, after first consultation, into two sets: one going to second consultation and the other (if there are no comments from first consultation) going directly to the SC November meeting for approval for adoption. The TPG noted, therefore, that no further streamlining on this aspect was needed.
- [17] **Earlier TPG input to drafting process.** The TPG considered whether input from the TPG during the early development of draft ISPMs would help to reduce inconsistencies in terminology. They considered whether a TPG member could, for example, be invited to a virtual session of an expert EWG meeting or a generic presentation be given to the EWG on consistency, but concluded that this would not be appropriate as it may impede the creative process of developing the first draft text. The TPG agreed, however, that it may be useful if one TPG member could review the draft text after the EWG have finished it but before it goes to the SC, to identify obvious inconsistencies. The TPG member could be tasked with preparing a very short (half-page) paper for the steward of the draft, cc. SC via the secretariat, with concrete proposals, but this would be done without spending too much time on it. The TPG agreed that it would be best if the TPG input came between the post-EWG editing stage and the draft being returned to the steward: this would be more efficient than doing it before the editing stage and would allow the steward to decide what to incorporate into the draft text and what to raise with the SC because it strayed too far from the EWG’s text. The TPG noted that this early input from the TPG could help reduce the number of consultation comments and hence reduce the burden on stewards and the SC.

---

<sup>4</sup> SC-7 2022-05, agenda item 4.4.

- [18] **Translations.** The experience of TPG members, in particular the member for the Spanish language, has been that translations of often used terms in ISPMs and even Glossary terms vary considerably from year to year, and that therefore countries, the TPG and LRGs spent much time and resources on repetitive corrections (see also Section 5.4 of this report). TPG agreed that the workload of the TPG could be lessened if there were a pool of translators that work regularly on draft ISPMs, so that the translators become familiar with ISPM terminology and in particular Glossary terms, in all FAO languages.
- [19] **Consequential terms.** The TPG noted that when they propose a term to be added to their work programme as a consequence of work on another term, there is a year's delay in starting work on the new term as it first needs to be approved by the SC. They recognized the importance of SC approval, but noted that in some cases the preparatory work on the consequential term may need to be done as part of the work on the terms already on the TPG's work programme. In these cases, where the work has already been done, the delay risked may cause a loss of momentum and seemed unnecessary, given that the TPG only makes *recommendations* to the SC and the SC can decline to add a proposed term to the work programme if it wishes.
- [20] **Responses to second consultation comments on draft amendments to ISPM 5.** The TPG noted the practice since long that second consultation comments on draft amendments to ISPM 5 were forwarded in October to the TPG steward and assistant steward who then, due to time constraints, together drafted the responses to be considered by the SC November meeting. With this procedure and if need be, the stewards may consult other TPG members when drafting the responses. In 2022, the responses submitted to the SC had been shared with the whole TPG for information. The TPG agreed that this additional latter practice should become the norm, but that the responses would only be for the *information* of TPG members, not for comment, as the timetable was too tight to generally allow input from other TPG members.
- [21] **Comments on explanatory text in draft amendments to ISPM 5.** The TPG noted that some contracting parties unnecessarily comment on the explanatory text in the draft ISPM 5 amendments, rather than just the terms and definitions proper, taking time for the countries concerned and for the TPG leads. The TPG agreed that guidance on this could be included in the Publication history upfront in the draft amendments, and also be explained at the IPPC regional workshops when the draft amendments are being presented.
- [22] The TPG considered whether only the terms and definitions could be open for comment within the Online Comment System and not the explanatory text, but noted that there would then be a risk that contracting parties would submit comments on the explanatory text as general comments, which would still be onerous to address.
- [23] **Standard responses to consultation comments.** The assistant TPG steward suggested that "Noted" be added to the standard list of stewards' responses to consultation comments, reflecting the custom-and-practice that has developed. He clarified that, for the TPG, this only applied to responses to draft amendments to ISPM 5, not to comments on other draft ISPMs.
- [24] **Responses to first consultation comments on other draft ISPMs.** The secretariat confirmed that, when the secretariat forward consultation comments to the TPG, the comments are screened by searching for the following key words in the comments: glossary, ISPM 5, translation, terminology, consistency, definition. Comments not including any of these words are not forwarded to the TPG.
- [25] The secretariat confirmed that the TPG was only asked to respond to first consultation comments, not second consultation comments, with one of the reasons for this being that the comments are considered by the SC at their November meeting and the TPG meets after this. There would also be too little time to do it before the SC November meeting. If a comment is relevant to the TPG, then it is the responsibility of the SC to forward that issue to the TPG for consideration. The steward of the draft ISPM can also bring it to the SC's attention.
- [26] **Translation of IPPC guides and training materials.** In response to a query from the TPG, the secretariat confirmed that although the original editions of IPPC guides and training materials are in

English, sometimes they are translated into other FAO languages. For some recent guides, the secretariat had reviewed the translations internally. The secretariat confirmed that review of translated guides was not within the scope of the language review groups, as their sole remit was to review, each year, the translations of ISPMs adopted that year.

[27] The TPG:

- (3) *invited* the SC to consider the following proposals for streamlining the work of the TPG:
  - that the TPG be invited to identify obvious inconsistencies in terminology in draft ISPMs before the drafts are first reviewed by the SC at their May meeting (after post-EWG editing and before the review and preparation for SC by the steward),
  - that the secretariat be asked to highlight, to FAO Translation Services, the importance of continuity in the use of translators for draft ISPMs to ensure translators are familiar with ISPM terminology and in particular Glossary terms in all FAO languages,
  - that the TPG be allowed to work on consequential terms not yet on the TPG's work programme but expected to become approved by the SC;
- (4) *requested* that secretariat forward the TPG stewards' responses to second consultation comments to all TPG members, before the SC November meeting, for information;
- (5) *suggested* that "Noted" be added to the standard list of stewards' responses to consultation comments;
- (6) *agreed* to add a note to the Publication history section of draft amendments to ISPM 5, to explain that comments were only sought on the terms and definitions, not on the associated explanatory text; and
- (7) *invited* the presenters of the draft amendments to ISPM 5 at IPPC regional workshops to ask contracting parties and regional plant protection organizations to address only the terms and definitions, but not the associated explanatory text, when submitting consultation comments.

## 5. Addressing TPG-related comments on draft ISPMs submitted to the first consultation in 2022 (1 July–30 September 2022)

### 5.1 2022 draft amendments to ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*) (1994-001)

[28] The 2022 *Draft amendments to ISPM 5* comprised two proposals: one for revision of the term "phytosanitary action" (2020-006) and the other for revision of the term "phytosanitary procedure" (2020-007). Ebbe NORDBO (Denmark), Assistant Steward, presented the draft TPG responses to the first consultation comments on these proposals.<sup>5</sup>

[29] The TPG considered the draft responses and adjusted as appropriate. The major points discussed are presented below.

#### *Generic issues*

[30] **Rationale for revising the terms.** The TPG considered a consultation comment that, while endorsing the revision of the two terms, suggested that it would have been more efficient to change the definition of "phytosanitary measure" to refer to the term "phytosanitary certification". The TPG acknowledged that this may indeed have been more efficient but noted that, as the term had been defined in the text of the IPPC, revising it could only take the form of a so-called "agreed interpretation" by the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM), and this had happened only twice before. Furthermore, they recalled that although the SC in 2014 had concluded that the term "phytosanitary" referred exclusively to *regulated* pests, the SC could not agree on a common understanding of the scope of "phytosanitary measure". However, the SC had also recognized that "phytosanitary" could be used, and has been used, in contexts where an NPPO of an exporting country is applying official measures through "phytosanitary action" and "phytosanitary procedure" against pests that are regulated in an importing country but not

<sup>5</sup> 09\_TPG\_2022\_Nov; 1994-001.



regulated in the exporting country applying the control. The SC had therefore decided it would be pertinent to revise the definitions of “phytosanitary action” and “phytosanitary procedure” to explicitly reflect their respective scope regarding the above export scenario. Such revision would provide clarity and consistency without violating the narrow interpretation of the definition of “phytosanitary measure” as being only related to pests regulated in the country where the measure is applied.

- [31] **Phytosanitary certification.** One consultation comment had suggested that, by referring to “phytosanitary certification” in the draft definition of “phytosanitary procedure”, the latter definition became circular, because the definition of “phytosanitary certification” already referred to “procedures”. The TPG did not accept this assertion, because the draft definition of “phytosanitary procedure” did not express that a phytosanitary procedure is equal to or includes phytosanitary certification but that it is a method *enabling* phytosanitary certification; likewise, the definition of “phytosanitary certification” did not express that this *is* a phytosanitary procedure but rather that such procedures are *used* in phytosanitary certification.
- [32] The TPG agreed that, although inspection, testing, surveillance and treatment, which are activities carried out to support phytosanitary certification, are mentioned in both the adopted and the draft definitions of “phytosanitary action” and “phytosanitary procedure”, the reference to phytosanitary certification in the draft definitions was not redundant, because the mention of the activities does not, in itself, establish that they are deemed to be phytosanitary procedures or actions supporting phytosanitary certification.
- [33] **Definitions for transboundary pest, migratory pest and emerging pest.** One consultation comment had suggested that these terms be added to the Glossary. The TPG noted that the term “emerging pest” had already been added to the TPG’s work programme (agenda item 6) and neither of the other two terms currently appeared in the convention nor any ISPM. The TPG noted, however, that the proponent could submit a formal proposal in response to a call for topics for standards.

**“phytosanitary action” (2020-006)**

- [34] **Reporting of non-compliance.** In response to a consultation comment, the TPG noted that although reporting may be a required *consequence* if an import inspection reveals a case of non-compliance, neither phytosanitary action in general nor the examples of operations given in the draft definition of “phytosanitary action” has reporting as a *purpose*. There was therefore no need to add reporting to the latter definition.
- [35] **Operation vs procedure.** The TPG considered a consultation comment suggesting that a phytosanitary action be described as an “official procedure” rather than an “official operation” to align with terms used throughout the Glossary. The TPG did not accept this suggestion, for consistency with the adopted definition of “emergency action” and to avoid confusion with the term “phytosanitary procedure”.
- [36] **Document checking.** The TPG agreed that the checking of documentation conceptually belongs in the definition of “compliance procedure (for a consignment)”, the draft of which would be considered for adoption by CPM-17 (2023), rather than in the definition of “phytosanitary action”. They also noted that document checking is only relevant for consignments, whereas phytosanitary action has a wider scope.

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

- [37] **Combinations of measures.** The TPG noted that, although phytosanitary import requirements may be met by one or a combination of serial operations or measures, a phytosanitary procedure is a method for implementing a phytosanitary action and not, in itself, a measure, a combination of measures or indeed a phytosanitary action.
- [38] **Examples of phytosanitary actions.** The TPG did not accept a consultation suggestion that “such as” be deleted from the draft definition, because this would restrict the scope of a phytosanitary procedure to only those phytosanitary actions listed (i.e. inspections, tests, surveillance, treatments), whereas these were just examples.

[39] **Definitions not carrying obligations.** In response to two consultation comments suggesting wording that could have implied an obligation, the TPG recalled that definitions in the Glossary do not, and should not, carry obligations.

[40] **Simplifying the definition and linking it to the definition of “phytosanitary action”.** Some consultation comments had aimed to simplify the definition while also strengthening the interconnectivity between the terms “phytosanitary action” and “phytosanitary procedure” or between the three terms “phytosanitary action”, “phytosanitary procedure” and “phytosanitary measure”.

[41] The TPG noted that a phytosanitary procedure is a detailed instruction on how to perform a phytosanitary action. In considering how to convey this, they acknowledged that the word “instruction” did not work in the definition and discussed whether a method could *describe* something (e.g. an official method describing how to perform a phytosanitary action). The secretariat commented, however, that a method is a way of doing something and so is an abstract concept: as such, a method cannot *describe* anything (unlike a document, which can). The TPG considered alternative sentence structures that avoided the use of “describe” (e.g. “an official method for implementing phytosanitary measures or for enabling phytosanitary certification through the performance of phytosanitary actions”), but concluded that it was better to have a simple definition that clearly linked a phytosanitary procedure to a phytosanitary action.

[42] The TPG discussed two such simple options:

An **official** method on how to perform a **phytosanitary action**

An **official** method for performing a **phytosanitary action**

[43] They agreed that the first of these was preferable, as the use of the words “how to” conveyed the meaning of an instruction and provided a better structure to the definition.

[44] The TPG recognized that a method may relate to more than one phytosanitary action, but noted that, for simplicity, the default in the Glossary is to use the singular.

[45] **Use of definite and indefinite articles at the beginning of Glossary definitions.** The TPG noted that there was inconsistency in the Glossary in whether definitions started with an article (i.e. “the”, “a”, “an”) or not. While recognizing the need for consistency, the TPG agreed that the work involved to correct this would not be a priority unless it was resulting in the misinterpretation of definitions by countries. As the TPG was not aware of any such problems, they therefore agreed to defer the work on this issue until the volume of TPG work allowed sufficient time to address it.

### *Agreed draft definitions*

[46] Considering their discussions at this meeting, the TPG agreed to recommend that the draft definition of the term “phytosanitary action” be retained unchanged from the version submitted for second consultation:

An **official** operation, such as **inspection, testing, surveillance** or **treatment**, undertaken to implement **phytosanitary measures** or to enable **phytosanitary certification**

[47] They also agreed that the draft definition of the term “phytosanitary procedure” should be modified to the following:

An **official** method on how to perform a **phytosanitary action**

### *Language versions of 2022 amendments to ISPM 5*

[48] The TPG considered some consultation comments on the Spanish and French translations, but agreed that none of these needed to be referred to FAO Translation Services, as they either duplicated comments made on the English version, related to the concepts rather than the accuracy of the translation, or were suggesting amendments that the TPG did not support. For Spanish the TPG noted that consistency should be ensured between the definitions of “phytosanitary action” and “phytosanitary procedure” regarding the use of the indefinite article “un” at the beginning of both definitions.

[49] The TPG:

- (8) *agreed* its responses to the first consultation comments on the 2022 *Draft amendments to ISPM 5* (1994-01); and
- (9) *noted* that the TPG comments and the 2022 *Draft amendments to ISPM 5* (1994-01) as modified at this meeting would be transmitted to the SC-7.

## 5.2 Diagnostic protocol for Genus *Ceratitis* (2016-001), priority 1

[50] Konstantin GREBENNIKOV (Russian Federation), presented the draft TPG responses.<sup>6</sup> The TPG provided responses to two comments on the draft and agreed that a further two consultation comments were outside the scope of the TPG.

[51] **FAR complex vs FAQ complex.** The TPG considered a consultation comment suggesting that the FAR complex be referred to as the “FAQ complex” to reflect the increasing use of the latter term in the scientific literature. They agreed, however, that this matter was outside the scope of the TPG.

[52] **Methods vs test.** The TPG considered a consultation comment suggesting that the use of “method” and “test” be checked throughout the protocol. The secretariat explained the editorial style applied to draft diagnostic protocols (DPs), with “method” being used to refer to the application of a technique to a particular matrix either in a set procedure or under a specified set of conditions (e.g. a particular polymerase chain reaction (PCR) method for a particular purpose, published by a named author or organization) and “test” being used to refer to the official application of a method to determine if a pest is present, or to identify a pest, in or on an individual matrix (e.g. an individual PCR to test for a particular pest in a sample). This was consistent with the Glossary definition of “test”, with the “method” being the instruction (a phytosanitary procedure) and the “test” being the resulting action (a phytosanitary action). The secretariat acknowledged, however, that the two instances of “test method” in this draft DP could be avoided by using “method” for the first instance and “method used for the test” for the second. The TPG thanked the secretariat for this explanation and expressed broad support for the approach taken. They also noted that, in due course, it would be helpful to include guidance on “method” vs “test” in the “General recommendations on use of terms in ISPMs” in the *IPPC style guide*. In the meantime, they suggested that the steward for the Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols (TPDP) consider the use of “method” and “test” in this draft DP, taking into account the Glossary term “test”.

[53] The TPG queried why the *IPPC style guide* said that “test” can be used for morphometric tests and the secretariat clarified that this guidance had been included at the request of the TPDP. The TPG recommended that “test” not be used for morphological identification whenever this implies only visual examination.

[54] **Detection.** The TPG considered a consultation comment suggesting some amendments to the introductory paragraph in the section on Detection. The TPG recognized the need for clarity.

[55] **Wing-banding pattern.** The TPG agreed that a consultation comment regarding the correct terminology to use for wing-banding patterns was outside the scope of the TPG.

[56] **Translations.** There were no issues to forward to FAO Translation Services.

[57] The TPG:

- (10) *noted* that recommendations on consistency would be transmitted to the TPDP steward for consideration.

---

<sup>6</sup> 08\_TPG\_2022\_Nov; 2016-001.

### 5.3 Draft annex to ISPM 37 (Determination of host status of fruit to fruit flies (Tephritidae)): Criteria for evaluation of available information for determining host status of fruit to fruit flies (2018-011), priority 3

- [58] Laurence BOUHOT-DELDUC (France) presented the suggested TPG responses on behalf of Asenath Abigael KOECH (Kenya), who had drafted them.<sup>7</sup> The TPG provided responses to four technical and substantive comments on the draft.
- [59] **Available information.** The TPG recognized that a range of terms were used in the draft annex with possibly the same intended meaning: “published information”, “information that already exists”, “available literature”, “published literature” and “available information”. They proposed that “available information” be used throughout, for consistency with the title of the draft annex and because this is the term used in pest risk analyses.
- [60] **Aligning host terms with those used in ISPM 37.** The TPG considered consultation comments suggesting that the draft annex be revised to align the descriptions of the three host status categories – natural hosts, conditional hosts and non-hosts – with the corresponding definitions in ISPM 37. The TPG concurred that there was a discrepancy between the draft annex and the core text of ISPM 37, as according to the draft annex a plant could be considered a conditional host if there was evidence of infestation under “certain, clearly described natural conditions”, not just under the semi-natural conditions referred to in ISPM 37. One TPG member commented that even if a plant were only a host under certain natural conditions, then it would still be considered a natural host, but the TPG recognized that this question was outside the scope of the TPG. Issues of consistency, however, were within their scope.
- [61] The TPG noted that, in addition to the discrepancy between the draft annex and the core text of ISPM 37, there were also internal inconsistencies within the draft annex. The criteria for a natural host, for example, included evidence of infestation under clearly described conditions, but the description of a natural host referred only to “natural conditions” *not* that these conditions needed to be clearly described.
- [62] Given these inconsistencies, the TPG suggested that the discrepancy between the draft annex and the definitions in the core text of ISPM 37 be solved based on the adopted text of ISPM 37 and that, having solved this main issue, the discrepancies within the annex itself be solved.
- [63] **Proposal for new Glossary definitions.** The TPG considered a consultation comment that suggested that the terms “natural host”, “conditional host” and “non-host” be included in the Glossary. The TPG noted that definitions that are given in ISPMs apply only to the ISPM in which they appear. The definitions of these three terms had been explicitly developed and adopted only for the purposes of ISPM 37 and applied to that standard only. It was also explicit in the terms and the corresponding definitions that they related specifically to fruit flies. For these reasons, and because the TPG believed that it would not be possible to harmonize such terms in the Glossary, the TPG did not support the inclusion of these terms in the Glossary.
- [64] **Pre-inspection.** The TPG queried the meaning of “pre-inspection” in the list of pest risk management options given in the final section of the draft annex, as this term was not explained in the draft annex or elsewhere in ISPMs.
- [65] **Translations.** The TPG considered a large number of consultation comments suggesting corrections to Spanish translations and agreed to forward its recommendations to the FAO translation group.
- [66] One of the issues concerned the need for the FAO Spanish translation group to find an appropriate translation of the word “evidence” in different contexts. They noted that in some ISPMs it is translated as “evidencia” (ISPM 27 (*Diagnostic protocols for regulated pests*)) and in other cases as “prueba” (Spanish Glossary term for “test”) or “datos empíricos”.

<sup>7</sup> 10\_TPG\_2022\_Dec; 2018-011.

[67] One of the comments on translations was a technical comment suggesting that the text on fruit fly rearing methods be amended to refer to “artificial or natural” diet rather than “proven artificial diet used for larvae”. The TPG agreed to provide a translation of the consultation comment for the benefit of the steward.

[68] The TPG:

- (11) *noted* that recommendations on consistency would be transmitted to the steward and SC-7 for consideration;
- (12) *requested* that the secretariat send the Spanish translation issues to the FAO translation group so that the Spanish version of the draft annex *Criteria for evaluation of available information for determining host status of fruit to fruit flies* (2018-011) to ISPM 37 is amended; and
- (13) *requested* that the secretariat draw the attention of the FAO Spanish translation group to the need for an appropriate translation of the word “evidence” in different contexts.

## 5.4 Spanish translations of draft ISPMs

[69] The secretariat confirmed that the high number of comments on Spanish translations in the 2022 consultations was the reason for including this item on the agenda of this meeting. The TPG member for the Spanish language gave a verbal update on issues with Spanish translations of draft ISPMs. She explained that, for several years, there had been a persistent problem of errors occurring in translations from English to Spanish and in not using terms from the Spanish version of the Glossary (e.g. the Spanish terms for “pest risk assessment” and “pest risk analysis” may be mixed up).

[70] Recognizing that the inconsistencies may also include non-defined terms, for instance terms included in the “General recommendations on use of terms in ISPMs”, the TPG agreed that it would be beneficial to gradually compile a standard list of translated words for use by translators. They acknowledged, however, that this would have to wait until the second TPG member for the Spanish language was selected.

[71] The TPG recalled that FAO Translation Services had been invited to a previous TPG meeting, which had proved very useful. The TPG noted, however, that this had still not resolved the translation problems.

[72] The TPG:

- (14) *recognized* the potential benefits of compiling, as and when time allows, a standard list of translated words for use by translators; and
- (15) *requested* that the secretariat remind FAO Translation Services to use the instructions and references provided to translators for the translation of ISPMs in order to ensure a consistent and correct use of terms, given that standards are legal instruments recognized by the World Trade Organization’s Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures and so must be correct.

## 6. Subjects on the TPG work programme

[73] Under this agenda item, the TPG discusses working documents prepared by TPG members on individual terms on the *List of topics for IPPC standards*. Proposals agreed by the TPG for new or revised terms and definitions, as well as justifications, will be included in the 2023 *Draft amendments to ISPM 5* and submitted to the SC meeting in May 2023 for approval for consultation.

### 6.1 Emerging pest (2018-003)

[74] Ebbe NORDBO (Denmark) introduced the paper, which explained the background and rationale for the proposed addition of the term “emerging pest” to the Glossary and suggested three options for a



definition.<sup>8</sup> His preferred definition was based on an earlier definition proposed by the TPG in 2018,<sup>9</sup> a draft report by the CPM Focus Group on Pest Outbreak Alert and Response Systems (hereafter referred to as the “POARS focus group”) (IPPC Secretariat, 2022),<sup>10</sup> and subsequent informal correspondence with relevant members of the focus group following initial correspondence with the focus group chairperson. The earlier TPG definition had focused on the minimum that could be said and had avoided including any obligations or operational criteria. The definition suggested in the POARS report was based on that definition but modified to clarify some aspects.

- [75] The TPG considered the proposed definition from Mr NORDBO and recognized that it comprised three components concerning the regulatory status of the pest, the increase in the pest risk posed by the pest, and the impact of the pest:

A **quarantine pest**, or a **pest** having the potential to become regulated as a **quarantine pest**, for which the **pest risk** for an **area** has recently increased substantially, due to changes in **pest**-intrinsic factors, hosts, **pathways** or environment related factors, and for which the potential further **introduction**, **spread** and impact is likely to reach pandemic magnitude.

- [76] **Regulatory status of the pest.** The TPG accepted the recommendation from the POARS report that the term “emerging pest” should be restricted to quarantine pests or pests that have the potential to be a quarantine pest. The TPG noted, however, that the pest concerned may never be regulated and so it was better to refer to a pest that has been deemed to have the characteristics of a quarantine pest rather than the potential to be one. The process of determining whether a pest had such characteristics would be by pest risk analysis. The TPG avoided referring to the pest “having the characteristics of a quarantine pest”, as this could imply that a pest risk analysis had already been done.
- [77] **Increase in pest risk.** Mr NORDBO explained that the draft text for this component of the draft definition was derived from the original definition drafted by the TPG.
- [78] **Impact of the pest and the concept of a pandemic.** Mr NORDBO explained that the draft text for this component of the draft definition, which referred to the potential further introduction, spread and impact being likely to reach pandemic magnitude, originated from the POARS focus group members. Initially the term “endemic” had been used, but the focus group members had then strengthened it to “pandemic”. The focus group members and Mr NORDBO had recognized that the term “pandemic” is generally and originally used with respect to human health, but had also noted that is already used for animal health and, according to the informal reply from the focus group, for plant health.
- [79] The TPG had an extensive discussion about the use of the term “pandemic”. The TPG recognized that although the term “pandemic” is usually used in the context of the expansion of a disease rather than its impact, the focus group’s intention had been that the term “emerging pest” should relate only to those pests where there have already been substantial, widespread impacts but there was the risk of endemic or pandemic spread: it needed to refer to something that had the potential to be extraordinary, because otherwise the pest would simply be classed as a quarantine pest rather than an emerging pest.
- [80] The TPG noted, however, that the geographical extent of a pandemic was not clear, as it may be interpreted as referring to the whole world or to a whole country, region, continent or multiple continents. Some TPG members gave examples of the use of the term “emerging pest” to refer to a pest within their own region rather than globally. Some TPG members supported the idea of using the Glossary term “area” when describing the geographical extent. Mr NORDBO explained that the focus group’s intention was that the term “emerging pest” would not be limited to a region (e.g. a pest would

<sup>8</sup> 06\_TPG\_2022\_Nov.

<sup>9</sup> TPG 2018/12, agenda item 6.3.

<sup>10</sup> **IPPC Secretariat.** 2022. *Recommendations for an effective pest outbreak alert and response system*. Draft, March 2022. Rome, FAO on behalf of the Secretariat of the International Plant Protection Convention. 72 pp. [https://assets.ippc.int/static/media/files/mediakitdocument/en/2022/03/POARS\\_All\\_Recommendations.pdf](https://assets.ippc.int/static/media/files/mediakitdocument/en/2022/03/POARS_All_Recommendations.pdf).

not be described as “an emerging pest for Europe”) and that it would only be used once there is a threat of a pandemic happening.

- [81] The TPG agreed that it was outside the scope of a Glossary definition to indicate who would be responsible for deciding whether individual pest species were emerging pests or not.
- [82] The TPG noted that the phrase “potential *further* introduction” in the third part of the definition referred back to the first two parts, where the pest was causing damage in an area, as well as the further expansion to, say, a continent expressed in the third part of the definition. However, they recognized that the pest may not already be in the first area, so agreed not to use the word “further”. The TPG considered whether to refer to “an area” in the first part of the definition and “other areas” in the last part of the definition, to better explain the expansion being described in the definition, but agreed to omit reference to “other areas” for the sake of simplicity.
- [83] With reference to the impact of the pest, the TPG agreed that the wording needed to be more specific and so referred to *economic* impact, as the definition of “quarantine pest” refers to economic importance. They noted, however, that it was not sufficient to refer to an unacceptable economic impact, as this would be a criterion for a quarantine pest and the criterion for an emerging pest should be higher.
- [84] Given the ambiguity of the term “pandemic”, the TPG considered using “epidemic” or using plain language to explain the expansion of the geographical distribution, noting that the latter could draw upon wording from the Glossary definition of “quarantine pest” or the Glossary definition of “spread (of a pest)”. This included one proposal from the secretariat that used the phrase “[a pest] that has the potential to expand its geographical distribution rapidly and to cause an extraordinarily severe economic impact across a large part of the world.” As well as avoiding the use of “pandemic”, the latter wording aimed to avoid the potential confusion caused by use of “introduction” and “spread”, which refer to one area (e.g. spread is expansion *within* an area, not expansion *to* other areas). However, the TPG concluded that it was better to use Glossary terms where possible, that the potential introduction and spread being referred to was the collective introduction and spread within multiple areas, that this was implicit in the last part of the definition, and hence it was acceptable to use “introduction” and “spread”. The TPG also preferred the cautious approach of the phrase “the potential introduction, spread and economic impact are likely to reach a pandemic level” in that it had levels of possibility and uncertainty as underscored by both words “potential” and “likely”.
- [85] The TPG considered whether the FAO legal Office needed to be consulted regarding the use of the term “pandemic” but concluded that this would not be necessary as there are no obligations in definitions and, in any case, it was beyond the scope of the TPG.

**Agreed draft definition.** Considering the various issues raised during the discussions at this meeting, the TPG agreed the following draft definition:

A **pest** deemed to have the characteristics of a **quarantine pest** for an **area**, for which the **pest risk** has recently increased substantially, because of changes in **pest**-intrinsic factors, hosts, **pathways** or environment-related factors, and for which the potential **introduction**, **spread** and economic impact are likely to reach a pandemic level.

- [86] The TPG:
- (16) *recommended* the draft definition of “emerging pest (2018-003)” as drafted in this meeting (Appendix 4) to the SC for approval for first consultation; and
  - (17) *agreed* that Ebbe NORDBO (Denmark) would simultaneously send a draft of the SC paper on this term to the other TPG members and, informally, to the relevant former members of the CPM Focus Group on Pest Outbreak Alert and Response Systems, for comment.

## 6.2 Visual examination (2022-001)

- [87] The term “visual examination” was added to the TPG’s work programme by SC November 2022 and the discussion and decision on this term are reflected in the section 7 of this report.

## 7. 2021 draft amendments to ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*) (1994-001): terms returned to the TPG and forwarded to the SC-7 by the SC November 2022

[88] The TPG steward introduced this agenda item, which concerned terms that had been considered by the SC at their November 2022 meeting but had then been either returned to the TPG or forwarded to the SC-7, together with an associated term that had been added to the TPG's work programme by the SC.<sup>11</sup>

### 7.1 Terms returned to the TPG for re-consideration

#### *Inspection (2017-005), test (2021-005), visual examination (2022-001)*

[89] The TPG steward explained that the SC had been satisfied with the definition for “inspection” (2017-005) proposed by the steward and assistant steward following second consultation, but had failed to reach consensus on “test” (2021-005). As these two terms were interconnected, the SC had therefore returned both terms to the TPG for further consideration; the SC had also added the term “visual examination” (2022-001) to the TPG's work programme, so that all three of these related terms could be considered together as a package.

[90] The steward explained that the main point of contention had been whether the concepts of “inspection” and “test” could be distinguished based on one being visual (“inspection”) and the other (“test”) not being visual, given that some tests include visual observations.

[91] The assistant steward recalled that the TPG's main intention in the revision of “inspection” and “test” had been merely to make small adjustments for consistency, with the main revision being to the term “compliance procedure (for a consignment)” (2021-006). However, whereas the latter had been approved by the SC to go for adoption by CPM-17 (2023), the proposed changes to the former two definitions had given rise to problems.

[92] The secretariat confirmed that the SC had added the term “visual examination” to the work programme because of its links to the terms “inspection” and “test”, but had not suggested any changes to the term.

[93] **Inspection (2017-005).** The assistant steward confirmed that the draft definition of “inspection” had been modified by himself and the steward following second consultation, to change “check” to “verify”, because of comments that “check” was too informal. The TPG recalled the reasons for using “check” in the definition of “inspection” but “verify” in the definition of “test”, with “verify” implying that the result of a test is final and conclusive, whereas the result of an inspection may not be conclusive and hence “check” was more appropriate. However, they acknowledged that such small nuances between definitions may not necessarily be understood or accepted by everyone and that the SC had rejected “check”, as it was not universally accepted.

[94] Noting that the SC had been satisfied with the definition proposed by the TPG stewards following second consultation, the TPG therefore recommended that there should be no further change to the draft definition of “inspection”:

**Official visual examination of plants, plant products or other regulated articles** to determine if pests are present or to verify conformity with phytosanitary requirements

[95] **Test (2021-005).** The assistant steward explained that the draft definition had been modified by himself and the steward following second consultation, with “non-visual” being changed to “other than visual examination” (as sent for first consultation but with “examination” added) in order to make the link with the Glossary term “visual examination”. The order of the text had also been rearranged to accommodate this change.

[96] Noting that the resulting definition was rather negative, saying more about what a test is not than what it is, the TPG considered adding some examples of types of methods that could be used for tests. This would also help illustrate the distinction between test and inspection. The TPG considered referring to

<sup>11</sup> 12\_TPG\_2022\_Nov; 13\_TPG\_2022\_Nov; 14\_TPG\_2022\_Nov; 1994-001.



biochemical (e.g. electrophoresis, serological), chemical, molecular (e.g. PCR) and physical (e.g. moisture level of fruit) methods, but noted that reference to physical methods may be confusing and that readers would understand “serological methods” but may not as easily understand what was meant by “biochemical methods” in the context of tests. They also recognized that the definition did not have to include all types of methods, as examples would be sufficient. The TPG therefore included reference to chemical, molecular and serological methods and listed them in alphabetical order as per standard editorial practice.

[97] The TPG agreed that “other than visual examination” was an important element of the draft definition of “test” but found it difficult to determine where best to place it in the definition if examples were also to be given. They considered enclosing it in parentheses but recognized that this may imply that it was less important. They considered placing the examples in parentheses instead, but had difficulty finding a structure that could accommodate this without giving rise to ambiguity. They considered reverting back to “non-visual examination” as in the version sent for consultation, but acknowledged that some contracting parties may consider this too strong, given the concerns raised about the visual component of some tests, and that “visual examination” (without the prefix “non”) was the Glossary term and so it was better to use that. They also noted that saying “except for visual examination” would be too strong. The TPG’s conclusion was to place the phrase “other than visual examination” near the start of the definition so that it was clear that it was in opposition to “official examination” and to emphasize that it is the main distinction between “test” and “inspection”.

[98] The TPG were of the view that “visual examination” does not encompass every action involving sight: for example, looking at PCR bands would not constitute visual examination. However, they did recognize that visual observations may be a component of some tests: for example, in a tetrazolium test for seed viability, seeds are soaked in a chemical solution and then examined under the microscope to determine whether there has been a colour change in the embryo, but this would be deemed a chemical test rather than an inspection, even though it involves a microscope and a microscope is referred to in the definition of “visual examination” upon which “inspection” relies. With this in mind, the TPG considered whether to include “other than solely visual examination” in the draft definition of “test” but noted that this had been rejected by the SC; the TPG therefore concluded that it would be better to revise the definition of “visual examination” instead.

[99] The TPG agreed to recommend the following draft definition of “test”<sup>12</sup>:

**Official** examination other than **visual examination**, using for example chemical, molecular or serological methods, of **plants, plant products** or other **regulated articles** to determine if **pests** are present, identify **pests** or verify conformity with specific phytosanitary requirements.

[100] They expressed hope that this would be acceptable, given that the only substantive change was the addition of examples.

[101] The TPG noted that normally “for example” would be placed within commas if mid-sentence, but recognized that this could be confusing in this instance, given the numerous other commas in the surrounding text.

**Visual examination (2022-001).** The TPG agreed that, following their decision on the draft definition of “test”, the draft definition of “visual examination” should be revised to make it clear that this term referred to examination that was only visual. They therefore agreed to insert “only” after “using”, to give the following draft definition:

Examination using only the unaided eye, lens, stereoscope or other optical microscope

---

<sup>12</sup> Other alternative definitions of “test” discussed during this TPG meeting are available for TPG members in the restricted work area.

## 7.2 Terms forwarded to SC-7

### *General surveillance (2018-046), specific surveillance (2018-047), surveillance (2020-009)*

- [102] The TPG noted that that SC had failed to reach consensus on these terms and had forwarded them to the SC-7 for consideration. The concerns had included the meaning of the phrase “structuring of raw data” and the terms “raw data” and “processed information”, the distinction between “data” and “information”, whether there was a need for a Glossary definition of general surveillance, whether to refer to “pests of concern” as in ISPM 6 (*Surveillance*) rather than simply “pests”, and the rationale for having a different structure to the definitions of “general surveillance” and “specific surveillance”.
- [103] The TPG noted the concerns expressed by the SC and discussed them, with the aim of providing the SC-7 with relevant information to inform their review of these terms.
- [104] **Structuring of raw data.** The assistant steward explained that this phrase had been derived from dictionary sources and had been used in an attempt to clarify the distinction between “data” and “information” in response to consultation comments. The assistant steward accepted, however, and the TPG concurred, that it was not widely understood and so would be best avoided.
- [105] Similarly, the TPG recognized that it was better to refer to “information” than “processed information”, as the intended meaning of “processed” may not be widely understood in this context.
- [106] **Data vs information.** The TPG recalled their rationale for distinguishing “data” from “information”, with the former referring to the raw material collected and the latter referring to that material once it has been verified, analysed and structured. However, they accepted that this distinction may not be readily understood by users of ISPMs, and that the attempts to clarify it by the use of “raw data” and “processed information” had also given rise to confusion. The TPG acknowledged that, in common every-day usage, “data” and “information” are often used interchangeably, and they noted that even in ISPM 6 the distinction between these two terms is not clear. For simplicity and to avoid confusion, the TPG therefore concluded that it would be advisable to use just one of these terms. They agreed that “information” would be preferable, as it was a broader concept that included the concept of “data” (whereas the concept of “data” did not include the concept of “information”) and hence it was a more flexible term.
- [107] **Analysis and verification.** The TPG recalled their rationale for referring to the analysis and verification of data in the draft definition of “general surveillance” but not in the draft definition of “specific surveillance”: whereas the process of specific surveillance relies on data collected by an NPPO, the data used in general surveillance may also be drawn from non-official sources and data from such sources need verifying to confirm that they are reliable. The TPG noted, however, that data collected during specific surveillance would be subject to quality assurance, and although the level of effort required for quality assurance would be substantially less than for verification of data from non-official sources, quality assurance could still be viewed as “verification”, which would prompt the question of why verification was required for general surveillance and not for specific surveillance. In addition, referring to analysis and verification in the definition of “general surveillance” but not in “specific surveillance” could give the impression that general surveillance was more rigorous than specific surveillance, which would be the opposite of the TPG’s intention with these two definitions.
- [108] The TPG noted that the rigour of data collected in specific surveillance was implicit in the draft definition of “specific surveillance”, as it referred to the data being collected from “surveys”, and the definition of “survey”, in turn, made it clear that a survey is an *official* procedure (i.e. it is carried out by an NPPO). The implication of this is that a survey is a controlled process. However, the TPG recognized that this was not explicit in the draft definition of “specific surveillance” and so could cause confusion in cases such as this where there were two parallel terms and hence an assumption of parallelism in their content.
- [109] Given the potential for confusion, the TPG considered whether it would be better to include reference to analysis and verification in both the definition of “general surveillance” and that for “specific surveillance”, or to omit it in both. They concluded that it would be preferable to omit it, given the

provisions in section 2.1 of ISPM 6 and as this was simpler and would not detract from the key distinction between these two definitions: the source of the data.

- [110] **Period of time over which surveillance is conducted.** The TPG noted that one of the differences between the descriptions of general surveillance and specific surveillance in ISPM 6 is that specific surveillance relates to a defined period. They concluded, however, that there was no need for this concept to be included in the Glossary definition of “specific surveillance”, as it was already included in the Glossary definition of “survey” and the term “survey” appeared in the draft definition of “specific surveillance”.
- [111] **Pests of concern.** The TPG considered the merits of referring to “pests of concern” as in ISPM 6 but concluded that “pests” was sufficient, as the descriptions in ISPM 6 are explanatory text, not definitions, and so can be more expansive.
- [112] **Consistency in parallel definitions.** The TPG recognized the benefits of having a consistent structure to, and terminology in, definitions where there are pairs of opposing terms. Omitting reference to analysis and verification (see above) would serve to provide a consistent structure, and referring to “information” in both definitions (also see above) would improve the consistency of terminology. The TPG agreed that further consistency of terminology could be achieved by using the preposition “through” in both definitions (in relation to sources of information), rather than “from” in one and “through” in the other, and by using the same verb for collecting, gathering or obtaining data.
- [113] With respect to collecting, gathering or obtaining data, the TPG noted that the description of general surveillance in ISPM 6 referred to *gathering* data, whereas the draft definition sent for second consultation referred to *collecting* data, and the description of specific surveillance in ISPM 6 referred to *obtaining* data as did the draft definitions of “specific surveillance” and “surveillance” sent for second consultation. The TPG agreed that “obtained” would be preferable, as this also included the concepts of analysis and verification and appeared to have been accepted by most countries.
- [114] **Surveillance.** Given the TPG’s earlier comments about omitting “processed”, the TPG agreed that it would be preferable to retain the draft definition of “surveillance” as sent for second consultation (i.e. not including “processed” before “information”).
- [115] **The need for Glossary definitions.** Regarding the concern raised at the SC meeting in November 2022 about whether there was a need for a Glossary definition of “general surveillance”, given that a description was available in ISPM 6, the TPG recalled that the terms “general surveillance” and “specific surveillance” had been added to the TPG’s work programme following the revision of ISPM 6, because the revised version referred to “specific surveillance” whereas the previous version had referred to “specific surveys”. Although good descriptions of general surveillance and specific surveillance were given in the revised ISPM 6, the aim of adopting Glossary definitions of these terms was to create a “shortcut”, providing clarity without the need to read ISPM 6 to understand the terms. However, the TPG accepted that, although it was still desirable to have Glossary definitions of “general surveillance” and “specific surveillance”, it was not essential. The TPG did emphasize, however, that even if these two terms were removed from the TPG’s work programme, the adopted definition of “surveillance” would still need amending as it was inadequate.
- [116] **Difference between specific surveillance and survey.** Noting that one consultation comment had sought clarification on the difference between the definitions of “specific surveillance” and “survey”, the TPG noted that the latter definition provides details on the objectives of surveys, with three further Glossary definitions (for “detection survey”, “delimiting survey” and “monitoring survey”) comprising subcategories of “survey” according to these objectives. Also, the term and definition of “specific surveillance” provide a direct contrast to those of “general surveillance”. The TPG noted that, although it is unusual to have two Glossary terms that are so closely related, it has proved beneficial to be able to use these two terms (“specific surveillance” and “survey”) in ISPMs.
- [117] **Final conclusions.** Considering the various issues discussed, the TPG concluded that the following definitions should satisfy the concerns expressed by the SC:

**general surveillance:**

An **official** process whereby information on **pests** in an **area** is obtained through various sources other than **surveys**

**specific surveillance:**

An **official** process whereby information on **pests** in an **area** is obtained through **surveys**

**surveillance:**

An **official** process whereby information on **pests** in an **area** is obtained through **general surveillance**, **specific surveillance** or a combination of both

[118] The TPG noted that these definitions were aligned with the descriptions in ISPM 6, with further detail being provided in ISPM 6, and that their simplicity and parallel structure made the distinction between the terms “general surveillance” and “specific surveillance” – the source of the information – obvious.

***Release (of a consignment) (2021-007)***

[119] The TPG noted that the SC had failed to reach consensus on this term and had forwarded it to the SC-7 for consideration. The concerns raised by the SC had revolved around making it clear that this term related only to the phytosanitary context because it is often used in a wider context, and also possibly allowing for multiple phytosanitary compliance procedures. The TPG noted the concerns expressed by the SC and discussed them, with the aim of providing the SC-7 with relevant information to inform their review of this term.

[120] The TPG noted that the draft definition included the term “official”, which linked it to NPPOs, and also included three other Glossary terms, which reinforced the phytosanitary context. They therefore concluded that the phytosanitary context of the term was implicit but obvious. Referring to the suggestion, made at the SC meeting, to change the term to “phytosanitary release” or “release (in a phytosanitary context)”, the TPG thought that this would cause confusion rather than provide clarification and it was not necessary. It could also lead to the same sort of change having to be made to many other terms for the sake of consistency.

[121] With regard to multiple compliance procedures, the TPG recalled that the plural is not used in Glossary definitions unless absolutely necessary.

[122] The TPG recalled that the TPG steward and assistant steward had modified the draft definition in response to a second-consultation comment to insert the term “official”, which was an important improvement to the definition.

[123] The TPG noted that bold should be applied to the term “official” in the draft definition.

[124] Considering the points made during their discussion, the TPG concluded that their suggestion to the SC-7 would be to retain the draft definition as presented to the SC in November (but with bold applied to the term “official”):

**Official** authorization for **entry** of a **consignment** after completion of the **compliance procedure**

***Discussion paper to the SC-7***

[125] The TPG agreed to prepare revised 2022 amendments to ISPM 5 to serve as discussion paper at SC-7 meeting in May 2023, based on the TPG’s discussion of all the terms considered under this agenda item, except “visual examination” that is recommended to SC meeting in May 2023 for approval for submission to the first consultation.

[126] The TPG agreed that Laurence BOUHOT-DELDUC (France) would draft the section on the “surveillance” package (but with Beatriz MELCHO (Uruguay) remaining as the TPG lead for these terms); Rajesh RAMARATHNAM (Canada) would draft the section on “test”, “inspection” and “visual examination”; Xuemei JI (Australia) would draft the section on “release (of a consignment)”; and Ebbe NORBDO (Denmark) would draft the general introduction.

[127] The TPG:

- (18) *recommended* to the SC-7 that:
- the draft definition of “inspection” (2017-005) as modified by the TPG stewards following second consultation and presented to the SC in November 2022 be retained unchanged and that it be sent to the SC for approval for adoption as part of the 2022 *Draft amendments to ISPM 5* (1994-001) without any further rounds of consultation;
  - the draft definition of “test” (2021-005) as modified in this meeting be approved for submission to an additional round of consultation as part of the 2022 *Draft amendments to ISPM 5* (1994-001), and
- (19) *invited* the SC-7 to consider the following suggestions:
- that the draft definition of “release (of a consignment)” (2021-007) as modified by the TPG stewards following second consultation and presented to the SC in November 2022 be retained unchanged, except to apply bold to “official” in the definition of “release (of a consignment)”, and that it be sent to the SC for approval for adoption with the 2022 *Draft amendments to ISPM 5* without any further rounds of consultation, and
  - that the draft definitions of “general surveillance” (2018-046), “specific surveillance” (2018-047) and “surveillance” (2020-009) as modified in this meeting be approved for submission to an additional round of consultation as part of the 2022 *Draft amendments to ISPM 5*;
- (20) *agreed* to prepare revised 2022 amendments to ISPM 5 to serve as discussion paper on all the above terms for the SC-7 meeting in May 2023, except “visual examination” that is recommended to SC meeting in May 2023 for approval for submission to the first consultation; and
- (21) *recommended* the draft definition of “visual examination” (2022-001) as modified in this meeting to the SC for approval for submission to the first consultation as part of the 2023 *Draft amendments to ISPM 5* (1994-001) (Appendix 4).

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

### 8.1 General recommendations on consistency

#### *General recommendations on use of terms in ISPMs*

[128] The TPG noted that the “General recommendations on use of terms in ISPMs”, as modified at the January 2021 TPG meeting and noted by the SC, had subsequently been incorporated into the *IPPC style guide*, which was scheduled to be published before the end of 2022.<sup>13</sup>

[129] No amendments had been proposed before this meeting and none were proposed during this meeting.

#### *Consistency issue in ISPM 23*

[130] Ebbe NORDBO (Denmark) presented a draft discussion paper to be presented to the SC regarding potential consistency amendments to ISPM 23 (*Guidelines for inspection*) in the event of the CPM adopting the revised definitions of “compliance procedure (for a consignment)”, “inspection”, “identity (of a consignment)” and “integrity (of a consignment)”.<sup>14</sup> He explained that the main inconsistency issue related to the term “inspection”, which is used in ISPM 23 in both a narrow sense (consistent with the Glossary definition of ‘inspection’, referring only to the official visual examination of plants, plant products and other regulated articles) and a broader sense (including the examination of documents and the verification of identity and integrity of the consignment). The intention was to restrict it to the narrower sense, i.e. retaining the scope as in the current definition. There were also inconsistency issues with the use of the terms “integrity” and “identity”. The discussion paper outlined concrete proposals for text changes for the SC to consider. Mr NORDBO added that the need for the consistency review was all the more urgent now that development of an annex on field inspection would soon be underway.

<sup>13</sup> 15\_TPG\_2022\_Nov.

<sup>14</sup> 07\_TPG\_2022\_Nov.



He also proposed that, if the annex is adopted as an annex to ISPM 23, the title of ISPM 23 should simply be “Inspection”, but if the annex is adopted as a stand-alone ISPM then the title of ISPM 23 should be “Inspection of consignments”.

[131] **Process for making the amendments.** The TPG noted that, as the proposed consistency changes were not substantive, they could be implemented as ink amendments. Other possible options noted by the TPG were a focused revision or asking the EWG for Annex on Field Inspection (2021-018) to identify the amendments as part of their task to identify consequential ink amendments. The TPG recognized, however, that this latter option would be too onerous for the EWG and that it was better to leave the decision about what process to use to the SC.

[132] The TPG noted that there was a possibility, if the annex on field inspection is adopted as an annex to ISPM 23, that a case would be made for revising ISPM 23 completely.

[133] **Revisions to the draft SC paper.** The TPG reviewed and revised the draft paper. They noted that the draft definitions for terms under development would need updating to take account of the decisions taken by the SC at their November 2022 meeting. They also noted instances of “phytosanitary risk” that needed changing to “pest risk” in accordance with the “General recommendations on use of terms in ISPMs”.

[134] The TPG noted that, in the section on inspection objectives, the word “laboratory” should be deleted from the phrase “the collection of samples for laboratory testing”, because some tests can now be done using a hand-held device in the field, so there is no need to qualify “testing” with “laboratory”. The TPG recognized, however, that the present consistency exercise was related to the revision of “test”, “inspection” and “compliance procedure”, and as the deletion of “laboratory” was not affected by these revisions it was outside the scope of the exercise.

[135] Mr NORDBO confirmed that, after the meeting, he would update the table that gave the rationale for the proposals in accordance with the revisions to the paper made at this meeting (Appendix 5).

[136] The TPG:

- (22) *invited* the SC to consider the consistency changes to ISPM 23 as proposed by TPG; and
- (23) *invited* the SC to discuss whether the proposed changes should be carried out through ink amendments, as part of a general revision of the standard or by any other procedure.

## 8.2 Consistency of adopted ISPMs

[137] The ink amendment to the definition of the Glossary term “area of low pest prevalence” had been agreed by the SC, noted by CPM-16 (2022), and applied to ISPM 5. The *List of proposed or approved ink amendments for ISPMs* had been updated accordingly.<sup>15</sup>

## 9. Explanation of Glossary terms

[138] This standing agenda item allows for TPG members to enquire about and discuss specific Glossary terms.

[139] The following terms were discussed.

[140] **Treatment (as a phytosanitary measure).** One TPG member drew the attention of the TPG to a second consultation comment from the members’ region on the draft phytosanitary treatment (PT) Irradiation treatment for *Pseudococcus jackbeardsleyi* (2017-027). The comment had encouraged the TPG to reflect on whether non-viability needed to be included in the definition of “treatment” (along with killing, inactivating, removing, rendering infertile or devitalizing), given that the draft PT indicated that the

<sup>15</sup> *List of proposed or approved ink amendments for ISPMs*: [www.ippc.int/en/publications/82115](http://www.ippc.int/en/publications/82115)

presence of live but non-viable *P. jackbeardsleyi* during inspection would not necessarily imply a failure of the treatment.

[141] The TPG referred to the draft revision of ISPM 18, which used the following treatment objectives – inability to develop successfully, inability to reproduce, mortality, inactivation, devitalization – and noted that if non-viability was an acceptable outcome of the treatment, then it should fit with one of these objectives. They also noted, however, that the draft revision of ISPM 18 itself used the term “non-viable” later in the text, but without an explanation of its meaning. Referring to both the current Glossary definition of “treatment” and the treatment objectives in the draft revision of ISPM 18, the TPG noted that the Glossary terms “inactivation” and “devitalization” related specifically to microorganisms and plants, respectively, and not to insects, and they speculated that “non-viable” could therefore mean the same as “rendering infertile”, “inability to develop successfully”, “inability to reproduce” or even “killing” (the latter as the insect may be alive but incapable of surviving). The TPG recognized, however, that it did not have the expertise to draw a conclusion on this and therefore to determine whether the Glossary definition of “treatment” needed to be revised. The TPG member therefore agreed to consult further within their region.

[142] **Entry (of a consignment).** One TPG member suggested that “of a consignment” be inserted as an ink amendment into the definition of “entry (of a consignment)” to provide parallelism with the definition of “entry (of a pest)” and hence reduce potential confusion. The member recalled that the same approach had been taken for the definition of “release (of a consignment)”, where “of a consignment” had been included in the definition even though it was also a qualifier to the term itself. The member also explained that it was only necessary where there were pairs or groups of parallel definitions, and no further changes of this sort were anticipated.

[143] The TPG agreed to recommend the ink amendment to the SC (to be included in the TPG’s update to the SC May meeting):

movement of a consignment through a **point of entry** into an **area**

[144] **Corrections to ISPM 5 entries.** The TPG identified some minor typographical errors in ISPM 5 that needed correcting.

[145] The TPG:

- (24) *invited* the SC to consider applying an ink amendment to the definition of “entry (of a consignment)” as discussed at this meeting (Appendix 7); and
- (25) *requested* that the secretariat correct the typographical errors in ISPM 5 identified in this meeting.

## 9.1 Annotated Glossary: 2022 intermediate version

[146] Beatriz MELCHO (Uruguay) confirmed that the *Explanatory document on ISPM 5* (otherwise referred to as the “Annotated Glossary”), which had been finalized by the TPG meeting in December 2021, had been published in July 2022.<sup>16</sup> Subsequent amendments had been submitted by the assistant steward (see agenda item 9.2).

## 9.2 Proposals for amendments to the Annotated Glossary

[147] Ebbe NORDBO (Denmark) presented some proposals for amendments to the Annotated Glossary.<sup>17</sup> The TPG reviewed these proposals, together with suggestions made in the meeting, and agreed on the following changes to the Annotated Glossary, as well as some amendments to the front page and background sections to improve clarity and completeness and to update them.

[148] **Control (of a pest).** The TPG agreed that the note for this entry was incorrect and confusing. They considered the statement that containment is used as a phytosanitary measure to be circular and rather

---

<sup>16</sup> 2022 Annotated Glossary: [www.ippc.int/en/publications/87049](http://www.ippc.int/en/publications/87049)

<sup>17</sup> 05\_TPG\_2022\_Nov.

confusing, as “containment” is defined as the “application of phytosanitary measures”. They also noted that Supplement 1 (Guidelines on the interpretation of the concepts of “official control” and “not widely distributed”) to ISPM 5, referred to in the note, did not provide relevant reference to “control” or the three terms in its definition. The TPG therefore agreed to delete the note for this entry and to move the wording on “suppression” to the entry on that term and definition (see below).

- [149] **Ecosystem.** The TPG agreed to delete the historical references in the note for this entry.
- [150] **National plant protection organization.** The TPG corrected the title for Supplement 1 of ISPM 5 in the note for this entry.
- [151] **Pest risk analysis (agreed interpretation).** The TPG agreed to add a sentence to the note for this entry to explain the difference between the agreed interpretation and the definition provided in the convention, and the rationale for it.
- [152] **Quarantine.** The TPG considered the proposal to include reference to pre-entry quarantine in the note for this entry, as quarantine could, in principle, be applied before import if the NPPO of the importing country was in doubt about the pest risk posed by a consignment. The TPG concluded, however, that this change may cause confusion and hence did not implement it.
- [153] **Release (into the environment).** The TPG agreed to amend the note for this entry to better explain the context of the ISPM from which it was originally derived.
- [154] **Suppression.** The TPG agreed to a new note for this entry, incorporating some of the wording from the (now deleted) note for “control (of a pest)”.
- [155] **Treatment (as a phytosanitary measure).** The TPG noted that the definition in the Annotated Glossary needed correcting.
- [156] **Terms under revision.** Beatriz MELCHO confirmed that she would tentatively update the entries for those terms that were currently under revision.
- [157] **Note 2, phytosanitary measure.** The TPG agreed to expand the text to allow for the fact that definitions from the convention can be modified through an “agreed interpretation” adopted by the CPM.
- [158] **Note 10, actions and measures.** The TPG agreed to revise the third paragraph for consistency with the revised definition of “emergency action” adopted by CPM-16 (2022). The TPG also agreed to the addition of some new paragraphs to provide supplementary explanation of the concepts of “emergency action” and “emergency measure” and the difference between them, and to the amendment of the final paragraph for completeness, to provide additional explanation and to remove unnecessary text.
- [159] The TPG made some amendments to the proposed revisions for clarity, appropriate use of terminology and consistency with Glossary definitions.
- [160] **Note 11, presence and movement of pests.** The TPG agreed to remove unnecessary text and to add further explanation on the distinction between the terms “spread” and “dispersal”. With respect to dispersal, they considered whether to say that the movement was “by a vector, wind, soil or its own means” but concluded that these were just examples and were not necessary.
- [161] **Note 18.** The TPG deleted this note, as it was erroneous and superfluous.
- [162] **Intermediate version.** The TPG lead agreed to prepare a 2023 intermediate version based on the outcomes of the November 2022 SC meeting, 2022 TPG meeting, CPM-17 (2023) and the May 2023 SC meeting, and share it with the TPG after the May 2023 SC meeting.
- [163] The TPG:
- (26) *agreed* that the intermediate version of the Annotated Glossary would be modified after the meeting by Beatriz MELCHO (Uruguay).



### 9.3 TPG work on consistency with ISPMs: achievements and status

[164] Ebbe NORDBO (Denmark) presented a paper giving an overview of the achievements and status of the TPG's efforts since 2008 to enhance consistency within and among ISPMs.<sup>18</sup> This covered the standard-by-standard review of existing ISPMs other than ISPM 5 (which had been completed in 2013), the term-by-term review of existing ISPMs including ISPM 5 (which may be completed within the next few years) and the standard-by-standard review of draft ISPMs. He explained that he had drafted the paper with a view to annexing it, once reviewed and approved by the TPG, to the TPG's regular update to the SC meeting in May 2023.

[165] The TPG welcomed the paper and made some minor amendments to it. They also added a new paragraph to emphasize the importance of understanding the underlying concepts before proposing and developing new definitions, and added a new section on identifying translation issues to ensure consistency between languages.

[166] The TPG noted that the paper would be presented to the SC along with the recommendations on streamlining identified earlier in the meeting (agenda item 4.3).

[167] The TPG:

- (27) *thanked* Ebbe NORDBO for drafting the paper on "TPG work on consistency with ISPMs: achievements and status"; and
- (28) *agreed* to attach the paper on "TPG work on consistency with ISPMs: achievements and status" as modified at this meeting as an annex to the TPG update to the SC May 2023 meeting and to this report (Appendix 6).

### 10. TPG work plan for 2023–2024

[168] The TPG updated its work plan for 2023–2024 (Appendix 9) to be presented to the SC meeting in May 2023.

[169] The TPG:

- (29) *invited* the SC to note the TPG work plan for 2023–2024 (Appendix 9).

### 11. Any other business

[170] The secretariat informed the TPG that the secretariat planned to revise the brochure *Introduction to international phytosanitary terminology* and invited the TPG to suggest amendments.

[171] The TPG reviewed the existing text and suggested amendments to improve clarity and consistency, reduce repetition, and provide a better logical flow to the text. They suggested that the final section, headed "How easily do we understand each other", be deleted altogether, to make the brochure more concise and to avoid the risk of it sounding condescending. They also suggested that a short paragraph be added about the TPG.

[172] The secretariat confirmed that the brochure would be translated and that the TPG may be asked to review the translations.

### 12. Date and type of next meetings

[173] The next meeting of the TPG is scheduled for 27 November to 1 December 2023, with the venue tentatively agreed as FAO headquarters in Rome, Italy.

---

<sup>18</sup> 04\_TPG\_2022\_Nov.

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

[174] The secretariat thanked the TPG members for their contributions to the work of the TPG and invited them to respond to the evaluation survey, a link for which would be circulated after the meeting. The secretariat also thanked the TPG steward for hosting the meeting.

[175] The chairperson thanked everyone and closed the meeting.

**Appendix 1: Agenda**

N	Agenda item	Document number / link	Presenter / (IPPC Secretariat support)
<b>1.</b>	<b>Opening of the Meeting</b>		
1.1.	Welcome by Host Country Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat	–	Secretariat
<b>2.</b>	<b>Meeting Arrangements</b>		
2.1.	Selection of the Chairperson	–	–
2.2.	Election of the Rapporteur	–	<b>Chairperson</b>
2.3.	Adoption of the Agenda	01_TPG_2022_Nov	<b>Chairperson</b>
2.4.	Current specification: TP 5 (TPG) (2016) [Posted June 2016 in three languages]	<a href="#">Link to TP 5</a>	Secretariat
<b>3.</b>	<b>Administrative Matters</b>		
3.1.	Documents list	02_ TPG_2022_Nov	Secretariat
3.2.	Participants list	03_ TPG_2022_Nov <a href="#">TPG membership list</a>	Secretariat
<b>4.</b>	<b>Updates / reports</b>		
4.1.	Previous meeting report of the TPG (December 2021), including the TPG work plan	<a href="#">2021 December TPG Meeting Report (virtual)</a> <a href="#">Link to the TPG work plan 2022-2023</a>	<b>SEPULVEDA/ NORDBO</b>
4.2.	Extracts from other meeting reports of relevance to the TPG	11_ TPG_2022_Nov	Secretariat
4.3.	Strategic discussion on the TPG work - Streamlining TP processes - possible recommendations to the SC	<a href="#">Link to IPPC Strategic Framework 2020-2030</a> <sup>19</sup>	Secretariat/ <b>SEPULVEDA</b>
<b>5.</b>	<b>Addressing TPG-related comments on draft ISPMs submitted to the first consultation in 2022 (1 July-30 September).</b> The TPG will review member comments on terms and definitions, and will review the drafts for consistency in the use of terms. Recommendations will be transmitted to stewards and the SC-7 (May 2023). Draft answers to compiled comments proposed by the TPG members		
5.1.	Review of TPG-response to compiled comments (1994-001): - “phytosanitary action” (2020-006) - “phytosanitary procedure” (2020-007)	09_ TPG_2022_Nov	<b>NORDBO / ALL</b>
	2022 Draft Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms) (1994-001),	1994-001	
5.2.	Review of TPG-related compiled comments (2016-001)	08_ TPG_2022_Nov	<b>GREBENNIKOV</b>

<sup>19</sup> IPPC Strategic Framework 2020-2030 as presented to and endorsed by the SPG 2019.

	DRAFT ANNEX to ISPM 27: Genus Ceratitis (2016-001)	2016-001	
5.3.	Review of TPG-related compiled comments (2018-011)	10_ TPG_2022_Nov	KOECH
	DRAFT ANNEX to ISPM 37: Criteria for evaluation of available information for determining host status of fruit to fruit flies (2018-011)	2018-011	
5.4.	Issue of Spanish translation of draft ISPMs	Verbal update	MELCHO
6.	<b>Subjects on the TPG work programme</b> Proposals for new or revised terms/definitions will be compiled into new draft Amendments to the Glossary, to be submitted to the SC in May 2023.		
6.1.	- Emerging pest (2018-003)	06_ TPG_2022_Nov	NORDBO
7.	<b>2021 Draft Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms) (1994-001) Terms returned to TPG and forwarded to SC-7 by the SC November 2022</b>		
7.1.	to TPG: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- inspection (2017-005)</li><li>- test (2021-005)</li><li>- visual examinations (<b>2022-01</b>)</li><li>-</li></ul> to SC-7 <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- general surveillance (2018-046)</li><li>- specific surveillance (2018-047)</li><li>- surveillance (2020-009)</li><li>- release (of a consignment)" (2021-007)</li></ul> Compiled comments with steward's responses: 2021 Draft Amendments to ISPM5 (1994-001) – 2022 Second Consultation	1994-001 12_ TPG_2022_Nov 13_ TPG_2022_Nov 14_ TPG_2022_Nov	SEPULVEDA/ Secretariat
8.	<b>Review of ISPMs for consistency of terms and style</b>		
8.1.	'General recommendations on consistency (as modified following the TPG January 2021 and noted by the SC)	IPPC Style Guide to be published in December 2022: 15_ TPG_2022_Nov	NORDBO
	Consistency issue in ISPM 23	07_ TPG_2022_Nov	
8.2.	Consistency of adopted ISPMs (standard by standard): <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- List of proposed or approved ink amendments for ISPMs</li></ul>	List of proposed or approved ink amendments for ISPMs	Secretariat
9.	<b>Explanation of Glossary terms</b> Standing agenda item for TPG meetings. Members identify before the meeting some glossary terms/definitions requiring further explanations. These terms/definitions will be discussed during the TPG meeting and the need for additional explanations (e.g., in the annotated glossary) discussed.		

9.1	Annotated glossary: 2022 intermediate version <i>[The annotated glossary, was finalized at TPG 2021 and published in July 2022. The next version should be finalized for publication in 2024. The TPG considers yearly which amendments need to be made and produces an intermediate version. The 2023 intermediate version will be posted in the TPG work area.]</i>	<a href="#">Web link to the 2022 Annotated Glossary</a>  <a href="#">Web link to the 2023 intermediate version</a>  (work area; log on needed)	<b>MELCHO</b>
9.2	Proposals for amendments to the Annotated Glossary	05_ TPG_2022_Nov	<b>NORDBO</b>
9.3	TPG work on consistency with ISPMs: achievements and status	04_ TPG_2022_Nov	<b>NORDBO</b>
<b>10.</b>	<b>TPG work plan</b>		
10.1	TPG work plan for 2023-2024 The TPG will update its work plan for the coming year, based on discussions at the meeting, to be presented to the SC May 2023 for noting.	To be prepared during the meeting	Secretariat
<b>11.</b>	<b>Any other business</b>		<b>Chairperson</b>
<b>12.</b>	<b>IPPC Brochure on introduction to phytosanitary terminology</b>		<b>Secretariat</b>
<b>13.</b>	<b>Next meetings dates and types</b>		<b>Secretariat / Chairperson</b>
<b>14.</b>	<b>Close of the meeting</b>		<b>Chairperson</b>
	Evaluation	<a href="#">Link to survey</a>	

**Appendix 2: Documents list**

DOCUMENT NO.	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE	DATE POSTED / UPDATED
<b>Draft ISPMs</b>			
1994-001	5.1	2022 Draft Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms) (1994-001)	2022-11-10
2016-001	5.2	DRAFT ANNEX to ISPM 27: Genus Ceratitis (2016-001)	2022-11-10
2018-011	5.3	DRAFT ANNEX to ISPM 37: Criteria for evaluation of available information for determining host status of fruit to fruit flies (2018-011)	2022-11-10
1994-001	7.1	2021 Draft Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms) (1994-001)	2022-11-15
<b>Meeting documents</b>			
01_TPG_2022_Nov	2.3	Provisional agenda	2022-11-10
02_TPG_2022_Nov	3.1	Documents list	2022-11-10
03_TPG_2022_Nov	3.2	Participants list	2022-11-10
04_TPG_2022_Nov	9.3	TPG work on consistency with ISPMs: achievements and status	2022-11-10
05_TPG_2022_Nov	9.2	Proposals for amendments to the Annotated Glossary	2022-11-10
06_TPG_2022_Nov	6.1	Emerging pest (2018-003)	2022-11-10
07_TPG_2022_Nov	8.1	Consistency issue in ISPM 23	2022-11-10
08_TPG_2022_Nov	5.2	Review of TPG-related compiled comments (2016-001)	2022-11-10
09_TPG_2022_Nov	5.1	Review of TPG-response to compiled comments (1994-001): - “phytosanitary action” (2020-006) - “phytosanitary procedure” (2020-007)	2022-11-10
10_TPG_2022_Nov	5.3	Review of TPG-related compiled comments (2018-011)	2022-11-10
11_TPG_2022_Nov	4.2	Extracts from other meeting reports of relevance to the TPG	2022-11-10
12_TPG_2022_Nov	7.1	Extract from Draft Report Standards Committee November 2022	2022-11-15
13_TPG_2022_Nov	7.1	Stewards’ Notes on 2nd Consultation 2022 on Draft 2021 Amendments to ISPM 5 Glossary Of Phytosanitary Terms (1994-001)	2022-11-15
14_TPG_2022_Nov	7.1	Compiled comments with steward’s responses: 2021 Draft Amendments to ISPM5 (1994-001) – 2022 Second Consultation	2022-11-16
15_TPG_2022_Nov	8.1	IPPC Style Guide to be published in December 2022	2022-11-17

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

Links	Agenda item	Document link
Current specification: TP 5 (TPG) (2016) [Posted June 2016 in three languages]	2.4	<a href="#">Link to TP 5</a>
Participants list	3.2	<a href="#">TPG membership list</a>
Previous meeting report of the TPG (December 2020 – January 2021), including the TPG work plan	4.1	<a href="#">2020 December - 2021 January TPG Meeting Report (virtual)</a> <a href="#">Link to the TPG work plan 2022-2023</a>
IPPC Style Guide	8.1	<a href="#">Link to IPPC Style Guide</a>
List of ink amendments proposed or approved for ISPMs	8.2	<a href="#">List of proposed or approved ink amendments for ISPMs</a>
Annotated glossary: 2022 version	9.1	<a href="#">Web link to the 2022 Annotated Glossary</a> <a href="#">Web link to the 2023 intermediate version</a>
Strategic discussion on the TPG work	4.3	<a href="#">Link to IPPC Strategic Framework 2020-2030</a>
Evaluation	13	<a href="#">Link to survey</a>

### Appendix 3: Participants list

Participants details			TPG member's term	
Name, mailing, address, telephone	Participant role	Email address	begins	ends
<b>Mr Álvaro SEPULVEDA LUQUE</b> Servicio Agrícola y Ganadero División de Protección Agrícola y Forestal Av. Presidente Bulnes 140, 4 <sup>th</sup> floor, Santiago, <b>CHILE</b> Tel: + 56-2 234 5120	Steward	<a href="mailto:alvaro.sepulveda@sag.gob.cl">alvaro.sepulveda@sag.gob.cl</a>	May 2022	<b>2024</b>
<b>Ms Laurence BOUHOT-DELDUC</b> Ministry of Agriculture and Food, General directorate for food Europe, international and integrated risk management division 251 rue de Vaugirard 75732 Paris Cedex 15 <b>FRANCE</b> Tel: (+33) 149558437	French	<a href="mailto:laurence.bouhot-delduc@agriculture.gouv.fr">laurence.bouhot-delduc@agriculture.gouv.fr</a>	November 2013	<b>2023</b>  (1 <sup>st</sup> term: 2013 - 2018)
<b>Ms Asenath Abigael KOECH</b> Pest Risk Analysis expert/Plant health inspector Kenya Plant Health Inspectorate Service (KEPHIS) KEPHIS Headquarters OLOOLUA RIDGE , KAREN P.O. BOX 49592-00100, NAIROBI, <b>KENYA</b> Mobile: +254 -722973535 Office: +254 – 709891110 Fax: +254 -020 3536175	English	<a href="mailto:akoech@kephis.org">akoech@kephis.org</a> ; <a href="mailto:abigakoech@gmail.com">abigakoech@gmail.com</a>	May 2017	<b>2022</b>
<b>Ms Beatriz MELCHO</b> Ministry of Livestock, Agriculture and Fisheries, General Direction of Agricultural Services, Plant Protection Division Avda. Millan 4703 CP 12900 Montevideo, <b>URUGUAY</b> Tel: (+598) 2 309 8410 ext 267	Spanish	<a href="mailto:bmelcho@mgap.gub.uy">bmelcho@mgap.gub.uy</a> ; <a href="mailto:bemelcho@hotmail.com">bemelcho@hotmail.com</a>	November 2015	<b>2025</b>  (1 <sup>st</sup> term: 2010 - 2015)  (2 <sup>nd</sup> term: 2015 - 2020)
<b>Ms Xuemei JI</b> Assistant Director, Tropical Horticulture   Plant Sciences and Risk Assessment   Biosecurity Plant Division Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry <b>AUSTRALIA</b> Tel: +61 2 6272 5906 Mob: +61 412 418 490	Chinese	<a href="mailto:xuemei.ji@aff.gov.au">xuemei.ji@aff.gov.au</a>	Jul 2022	<b>2027</b>



Participants details			TPG member's term	
Name, mailing, address, telephone	Participant role	Email address	begins	ends
<b>Mr Ebbe NORDBO</b> <b>DENMARK</b> Mobile: (+45) 28740095	English	<a href="mailto:ebbenordbo@outlook.com">ebbenordbo@outlook.com</a>	Oct 2009	<b>2024</b>  (2 <sup>nd</sup> term: 2014 - 2019)
<b>Ms Shaza Roushdy OMAR</b> 8 Kamal El-Din Salah street Garden City, Cairo <b>EGYPT</b> Mobile: (+20) 227972454 Fax: (+20) 227963989	Arabic	<a href="mailto:shaza.rosdy@gmail.com">shaza.rosdy@gmail.com</a>	May 2017	<b>2022</b>  (1 <sup>st</sup> term: 2012 - 2017)
<b>Mr Konstantin GREBENNIKOV</b> Senior researcher, deputy head of the scientific-methodological and experimental center of FGBU "VNIKR" 140150, Moscow Region, Ramenskoye, Bykovo, Pogranichnaya str. 32 <b>RUSSIAN FEDERATION</b> Tel.: +74997072227 (ext.1669)	Russian	<a href="mailto:kgrebennikov@gmail.com">kgrebennikov@gmail.com</a>	November 2021	<b>2026</b>
<b>Mr Rajesh RAMARATHNAM</b> Senior Specialist (International Phytosanitary Standards): International Phytosanitary Standards Section Plant Protection Division, CFIA-ACIA 59 Camelot Drive, Ottawa ON K1A 0Y9 <b>CANADA</b> Tel: (+1) 613-773-7122 Fax: (+1) 613-773-7252	English	<a href="mailto:rajesh.ramarathnam@inspection.gc.ca">rajesh.ramarathnam@inspection.gc.ca</a>	January 2019	<b>2024</b>

IPPC Secretariat	
Name	Email address
<b>Mr Artur SHAMILOV</b> Standard Setting Officer	<a href="mailto:Artur.Shamilov@fao.org">Artur.Shamilov@fao.org</a>
<b>Mr Daniel TORELLA</b> Standard Setting Unit Intern	<a href="mailto:Daniel.torella@fao.org">Daniel.torella@fao.org</a>
<b>Ms Aixa DEL GRECO</b> Standard Setting Associate	<a href="mailto:Aixa.DelGreco@fao.org">Aixa.DelGreco@fao.org</a>
<b>Ms Karen ROUEN</b> Report Writer	<a href="mailto:karen@karenrouen.com">karen@karenrouen.com</a>

## Appendix 4: Draft 2023 amendments to ISPM 5: *Glossary of phytosanitary terms* (1994-001)

### Publication history

(This is not an official part of the standard)

[1]Date of this document	[2] 2023-03-01
[3]Document category	[4]Draft 2023 Amendments to ISPM 5 ( <i>Glossary of phytosanitary terms</i> ) (1994-001)
[5]Current document stage	[6]To SC May 2023
[7]Major stages	[8]CEPM (1994) added topic: 1994-001, Amendments to ISPM 5: Glossary of phytosanitary terms [9]2006-05 Standards Committee (SC) approved specification TP5 [10]2012-10 Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG) revised specification [11]2012-11 SC revised and approved revised specification, revoking Specification 1 [12]2022-12 TPG proposed 2023 amendments below [13]2023-03 TPG finalized the review of the terms and the recommendations to SC
[14]Notes	[15]Note to Secretariat formatting this paper: formatting in definitions and explanations (strikethrough, bold, italics) needs to remain.

### Introduction

- [1] IPPC Official Contact Points are asked to consider the following proposals for addition and revision of terms and definitions to ISPM 5 (Glossary of Phytosanitary Terms). A brief explanation is given for each proposal. For revision of terms and definitions, only the proposed changes are open for comments. In addition, comments are only sought on the terms and definitions, not on the associated explanatory text. For full details on the discussions related to the specific terms, please refer to the TPG meeting reports on the IPP.

## 1. ADDITION

### 1.1. “Emerging pest” (2018-003)

#### Note to SC

[2] Following a request from the RPPOs, the SC in May 2018 tasked the TPG with defining the term *emerging pest*. In January 2019, the TPG proposed to the SC a draft definition, reading: “A *pest* for which the *pest risk or impact for an area has recently increased substantially, due to changes in pest-intrinsic factors, hosts, pathways or environment related factors*”.

[3] The definition was discussed by the SC May 2019, where members “*thought that the need for a definition of ‘emerging pest’ is not clear because the real question is how the IPPC community is going to address the issue. It was suggested that it might be premature to send the definition for consultation for inclusion in ISPM 5, as the term is currently not used in ISPMs nor in the Convention and development of the concept is still incomplete*”.

[4] Invited by the SC to consider that feedback, the CPM Bureau in June 2019 discussed “*the need to clarify further the concepts of emerging pests or emerging issues, which in turn are different from the concept of emergency response*”.

[5] The CPM Focus Group on Pest Outbreak Alert and Response Systems (henceforward ‘FG/POARS’), as established in 2020, tentatively provided a draft definition based upon the 2019-proposal by TPG and advised the SC to request the TPG to again consider the term “emerging pest” and a definition to be included in ISPM 5.

[6] At CPM-2022 request, the SC in May 2022 requested the TPG to resume its work on a definition for “emerging pest” for inclusion into ISPM 5, considering the suggested definition provided by the FG/POARS.

[7] Seeking further clarification of the underlying concept of “emerging pest” and the intent of the proposed definition, the TPG Assistant steward, as agreed with the TPG Steward and the Secretariat, in August 2022 informally contacted the then Chair of FG/POARS who forwarded the TPG queries to FG/POARS subgroup members that had developed the proposed draft definition of March 2022. An informal dialogue ensued, aiming at creating a common understanding of, on one hand, the emerging pest concept and, on the other hand, existing IPPC terminology. Elements for improving the draft definition were exchanged between the FG/POARS subgroup members and the TPG. The outcome was presented to and discussed by the TPG in its November/December 2022 meeting and resulted in a TPG proposal for a definition.

[8] The TPG hereby submits its definition proposal and rationales to the SC. As usual, the proposal is formatted as an SC proposal for submission to a first consultation.

[9] The SC is *invited to*:

2. *consider* the draft definition of the term “emerging pest” and the associated detailed explanatory points, as presented below; and
3. *consider* to send the term and definition for first consultation.

[10] For several years, the CPM and several CPM bodies, including the Bureau, TC-RPPOs, SPG, SC and IC, have engaged in developing concepts on *emergency* and *emerging pest*. Following a request from the RPPOs, the SC in 2018 tasked the TPG with defining the term *emerging pest*. Based on earlier discussions in the various IPPC fora, the TPG discussed the concept and submitted its considerations and a proposed definition to the SC in January 2019.

[11] The TPG-2019 proposal was based on the presumption that the single outstanding characteristic of emerging pests is a recent, substantial increase in their pest risk. In concordance with other Glossary definitions, the definition of “emerging pest” should not include any *requirements*. Similarly, the definition should concisely describe the *concept* of an emerging pest, whereas possible *criteria* for evaluating pests as ‘emerging’ should be developed by another forum and process, if so desired.

[12] The TPG-2019 definition read: “*A pest for which the pest risk or impact for an area has recently increased substantially, due to changes in pest-intrinsic factors, hosts, pathways or environment related factors*”.

[13] Discussing the draft definition in 2019, SC members thought that the development of the concept was incomplete, the need for a definition unclear and that it was premature to send the definition for consultation for inclusion into ISPM 5, as the term was not used in ISPMs nor in the Convention. The CPM Bureau in 2019 discussed the need to clarify further the concept of emerging pests.

- [14] The Bureau in 2020 established a CPM Focus Group on Pest Outbreak Alert and Response Systems (henceforward ‘FG/POARS’). In its *‘Recommendations for an Effective Pest Outbreak Alert and Response System’* (Draft, March 2022, Sect 5.2.1), the FG/POARS stated that “...only pests that are quarantined or are qualifying to be regulated as quarantine pests should be considered under the POARS activities and this needs to be clear in the definition as well. The actions need to focus on pests that have, or can have if they enter in new areas, high impact in large areas.”
- [15] Based upon the TPG 2019 proposal, the FG/POARS provided a draft proposal for a definition reading: “A pest qualifying as a quarantine pest for which the pest risk or impact for an area has recently increased substantially, due to changes in pest-intrinsic factors, hosts, pathways or environment related factors with potential damage reaching epidemic proportions”.
- [16] The FG/POARS advised the SC to request the TPG to again consider the term and a definition of “emerging pest” to be included in ISPM 5. At CPM-2022 request, the SC in May 2022 requested the TPG to resume its work on a definition for inclusion into ISPM 5, considering the suggested draft definition provided by the FG/POARS.
- [17] Seeking further clarification of the underlying concept of “emerging pest” and the intent of the proposed definition, the TPG initiated an informal dialogue with subgroup members of the FG/POARS that had developed the proposed draft definition. Elements for improving the draft definition were exchanged between the FG/POARS subgroup members and the TPG. Subsequently, the concept and definition were discussed by the TPG November/December 2022 and its conclusions submitted to the SC. Following discussions in its 2023 May meeting, the SC is now submitting its proposal for first consultation.

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

(1) Re ‘A pest deemed to have the characteristics of a quarantine pest’.

- [18] The FG/POARS intent is clear that the pests in question should be limited to those that ‘...are quarantined or are qualifying to be regulated as quarantine pests’ (citing FG/POARS Recommendations Sect. 5.2.1). This implies that declaring a pest an emerging pest requires:
- technical justification (normally through a pest risk analysis), including the designation of an endangered area;
  - that there is at least a part of that area free from the pest;
  - that adequate pest risk management options are available, cost effective and feasible; and
  - that the pest is already regulated as a quarantine pest or there is an expectation that the pest will become regulated as such.

- [19] The word ‘deemed’ expresses that the relevant evaluation of the pest has been carried out. The wording ‘to have the characteristics of a quarantine pest’, as also used in e.g. ISPM 2 (2007) Framework for pest risk analysis, implies that the pest meets the criteria for being deemed a quarantine pest but without specifying its current regulatory status. Thus, the pest may already be regulated as a quarantine pest or there is an intention that it may become regulated.

(2) Re ‘for an area’

- [20] The wording ‘for an area’, thus referring to a country, part of a country, or all or parts of several countries, is needed in the definition, because the characteristics of a pest, such as its potential economic importance and its presence or absence, are always geographically specific. This holds true also in cases where an ‘emerging pest’ is of concern to extraordinarily large parts of the world. Even in that situation it is conceptually, strategically and operationally important that the pest can be analyzed, designated and managed at the appropriate geographical levels, as feasible and agreeable.

(3) Re ‘pest risk’

- [21] Basically, the very concept ‘emerging’ denotes that a change is taking or has taken place. The change regards *pest risk* in its comprehensive IPPC sense. Such change is not necessarily intrinsic to the *pest* itself (such as biology or behavior), but may regard all factors making up or influencing the *pest risk*. Therefore, it is appropriate and important that the definition explicitly points to the change of *pest risk*.
- [22] Pest risk (for quarantine pests) is defined as “*the probability of introduction and spread of a pest and the magnitude of the associated potential economic consequences*”. Being one of the most fundamental IPPC terms, it is used very frequently in ISPMs and not only for the categorization of pests as quarantine pests. The definition aligns with the common understanding of ‘risk’ as being the combined probability of an event and the possible consequences of that event, thus aligning it to the analogue risk definitions with the other standard-setting organizations (World Organization for Animal Health and Codex Alimentarius) under the World Trade Organization Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (WTO/SPS Agreement).
- [23] It should be recalled that the understanding of ‘economic consequences’ and its synonym ‘*economic impact*’ includes environmental considerations (see ISPM 2 core text, ISPM 5 Suppl. 2, and ISPM 11 core text and Annexes 1 and 4) and social considerations (see ISPM 5 Suppl. 2, and ISPM 11 core text and Annex 4).
- [24] The comprehensive term *pest risk* is the most appropriate for defining *emerging pest*, avoiding that the definition be unnecessarily exclusive. Indeed, using *pest risk* in the definition avoids that the definition consists of a range of criteria and a ‘formula’ on how many of and to what extent such criteria should be fulfilled. Such criteria rather belong in a screening and risk assessment process.
- (4) Re ‘*recently*’
- [25] The word ‘recently’ highlights, on one hand, the acute character of the situation caused by the pest in question, and on the other hand, the temporary nature of designating a pest as ‘emergent’. Indeed, ‘recently’ implies that, after some time and following the application of appropriate measures and re-assessments of the pest situation, the designation of the pest as ‘emerging’ may be withdrawn.
- (5) Re ‘*increased substantially*’
- [26] The wording ‘increased substantially’ for the pest risk is a major distinguishing characteristic of ‘emerging pests’ as compared to other pests, highlighting the extraordinary seriousness and acute character of the pest risk increase. Notably, the increase could be from a perceived zero pest risk, i.e. with an organism not previously known as a pest, which means that the definition of an ‘emerging pest’ could also include what is sometimes called a ‘new pest’.
- (6) Re ‘*because of...etc.*’
- [27] Starting with the wording ‘because of’, the definition carries on by stating in general terms the factors that can have contributed to the increased pest risk. While it may seem obvious that such factors contribute to pest risk and their mention may therefore seem unnecessary, it is important that the definition underlines the multitude of factors that may trigger a sudden, dramatic increase in pest risk, and not just for example a change in the pest’s biology.
- (7) Re ‘*pest-intrinsic factors*’
- [28] ‘Pest-intrinsic factors’ covers factors pertaining to the pest’s biology in broad terms, e.g. its virulence or aggressiveness, its host range or vector range, its reproduction rate, etc.
- (8) Re ‘*hosts, pathways or environment related factors*’
- [29] This wording covers pest-extrinsic factors, changes in which may increase *pest risk*, including e.g. host susceptibility, increase in the value of crops or ecosystem services, changes of crops or in plant production practices, trade, climate or others.
- (9) Re ‘*or*’
- [30] As with all ISPMs, in the definition ‘*or*’ includes the accumulative ‘and’. ‘Or’ does not mean the exclusive ‘either...or’, when not written that way.

(10) Re ‘*potential introduction, spread and economic impact are likely to reach a pandemic level*’

[31] This sentence states that, supplementary to the actual, already manifested increase of pest risk in an area, an emerging pest carries an aggravating *potential* for introduction, spread and economic impact that are *likely* to reach a pandemic level.

[32] The words ‘*introduction*’ and ‘*pandemic*’ implicitly convey the meaning that the pest may affect other, far larger areas than the area referred to in the first sentence.

[33] Use of the wording ‘*potential*’ and ‘*are likely to*’ provide for a degree of judgement uncertainty.

[34] Noteworthy, no indication is provided of the entity or procedure by which the judgement should be made on whether a pest may be deemed as ‘emerging’. Such issues are beyond the scope of this Glossary definition.

(11) Re ‘*introduction*’

[35] As the IPPC Glossary term ‘spread’ refers only to the expansion *within* an area, the word-pair ‘introduction’ and ‘spread’ here, as in numerous other IPPC contexts, is used to denote the entire expansion process.

(12) Re ‘*economic impact*’

[36] As referred in point (3), ‘*economic impact*’ includes environmental as well as social considerations.

(13) Re ‘*pandemic*’

[37] The adjective ‘pandemic’, as inserted following the FG/POARS proposal of being in line with its global approach, is used to emphasize the extraordinary rate and level of the pest’s potential spread over multiple countries or continents and the extraordinarily severe impact.

[38] Despite its etymology in ancient Greek (relating it to humans) and its use by World Health Organization for infectious diseases, the term ‘pandemic’ is adequate for use in this definition, as it is used already in animal health and colloquially also in plant health (although so far not in ISPMs). Whilst it may be argued that common definitions of ‘pandemic’ relate only to the *rate* or *level of spread* of an infestation, in practice the term is always used in connection with infestations with very serious impact.

[39] (14) The term “*emerging pest*” has so far not been used in ISPMs, neither in the Convention.

### Proposed addition

<b>Emerging pest</b>	A <b>pest</b> deemed to have the characteristics of a <b>quarantine pest</b> for an <b>area</b> , for which the <b>pest risk</b> has recently increased substantially, because of changes in <b>pest</b> -intrinsic factors, hosts, <b>pathways</b> or environment-related factors, and for which the potential <b>introduction</b> , <b>spread</b> and economic impact are likely to reach a pandemic level.
----------------------	---

## 2. REVISION

### 2.1 “visual examination” (2022-001)

#### Note to SC

[40] Following the SC November 2022 request to TPG, the following text on “visual examination”, subject to SC review, has been prepared by TPG in the format for first consultation.

[41] The SC at their November 2022 meeting had been satisfied with the definition for “inspection” (2017-005) proposed by the steward and assistant steward following second consultation, but had failed to reach consensus on “test” (2021-005). As these two terms were interconnected, the SC had therefore returned both terms to the TPG for further consideration. The



SC further added the term “visual examination” (2022-001) to the TPG’s work programme, so that SC/SC-7 could consider all three related terms together as a package. The SC had not suggested any changes to the term “visual examination” or its definition.

[42] The TPG invites the SC to submit the revised definition of “visual examination” to a first round of consultation.

[43] The Standards Committee (SC) at its November 2022 meeting had discussed the definitions of “inspection” and “test” and had returned both terms to the TPG for further consideration. The SC further added the interconnected term “visual examination” to the TPG’s work programme.

[44] The TPG discussed the definition of “visual examination” during its November/December 2022 meeting. The TPG indicated that “visual examination” does not encompass every action involving sight. For example: when using PCR methods in a test, looking at PCR bands would not constitute visual examination.

[45] The TPG did recognize that visual observations may be a component of some tests: for example, in a tetrazolium test for seed viability, seeds are soaked in a chemical solution and then examined under the microscope to determine whether there has been a colour change in the embryo, but the overall procedure would be deemed a (chemical) test rather than an inspection, even though it involves a microscope and a microscope is referred to in the definition of “visual examination” upon which “inspection” relies.

[46] The following explanatory point may be considered when reviewing the proposal: “only” is inserted after “using” to make clear that this term referred to examination that was only visual.

#### Current definition

<b>Visual examination</b>	Examination using the unaided eye, lens, stereoscope or other optical microscope [ISPM 23, 2005; revised CPM, 2018]
---------------------------	---

#### Proposed definition

<b>Visual examination</b>	Examination using <u>only</u> the unaided eye, lens, stereoscope or other optical microscope
---------------------------	--

## Appendix 5: Consistency issues with ISPM 23

### Note

In case the revised consignment-related definitions of ‘*compliance procedure*’, ‘*identity*’ and ‘*integrity*’ not be adopted by CPM-17 in 2023, this document should be reviewed/revised by TPG.

### Introduction

Given the recent CPM adoption of the revised consignment-related definitions of ‘*compliance procedure*’, ‘*identity*’ and ‘*integrity*’, the objective of this document is to provide, at request, the SC with timely and concrete proposals for consistency amendments to ISPM 23 *Guidelines for inspection*, as necessary to overcome the current discrepancy *vis-a-vis* the definition of ‘*inspection*’ and other inconsistencies.

### Background

In 2017, the SC added the term and definition of ‘*inspection*’ to the List of topics for IPPC standards for a possible revision. A revised definition as proposed by the TPG was considered by the SC in 2018. At that occasion, the SC noted that ISPM 23 deals with the inspection of *consignments* only, and (as already recognized by the SC in 2004) that two different uses of ‘*inspection*’ appear within ISPM 23:

- in far the most parts, ‘*inspection*’ is used congruent to its current definition, i.e., referring only to the official visual examination of plants etc. (‘narrow sense’); and
- in other parts, inspection is taken to also include the processes of examination of documents and verification of identity and integrity of the consignment (‘broad sense’).

The SC did not reach consensus on the way forward and referred the term ‘*inspection*’ back to the TPG, to particularly *evaluate the uses of ‘inspection’ in ISPM 23 and the possible future revision of that standard*.

The TPG continued its discussion in 2019 and 2021, awaiting the parallel considerations of the consignment-related terms ‘*identity*’, ‘*integrity*’ and ‘*phytosanitary security*’.

The TPG considered ways to overcome the discrepancy between the definition of ‘*inspection*’ and the broad sense use of the term in certain parts of ISPM 23. Given that:

- the definition of ‘*inspection*’ in its current narrow sense is being used widely in many ISPMs, including in far the most of the cases within ISPM 23; and
- the Glossary term ‘*compliance procedure (for a consignment)*’ would fit as the overarching term to be used instead of ‘*inspection*’ in those parts of ISPM 23 where the latter has been used inconsistently with its definition,

the TPG concluded and the SC agreed that:

- the current, narrow sense definition of ‘*inspection*’ should be retained (although slightly modified for other consistency reasons); and
- (30) the cases in ISPM 23 where ‘*inspection*’ had been used beyond its current definition should be adjusted by referring instead to ‘*compliance procedure*’, the definition of which should be revised, to become more explicit on its wide scope.

The SC in 2019 therefore added that term and definition to the List of topics for IPPC standards for revision, and sent revised definitions for ‘*inspection*’ and ‘*compliance procedure (for a consignment)*’ for first consultation in 2021 and amended proposals for second consultation in 2022.



The definition of ‘*compliance procedure (for a consignment)*’ has now been adopted by CPM in 2023 in its revised form, expanding on the possible elements (as outlined in ISPM 23) of a compliance procedure by explicitly including and linking to ‘*inspection*’, ‘*test*’, and the examination of documents and verification of the consignment’s ‘*integrity*’. The definition now reads:

<b>Compliance procedure (for a consignment)</b>	<p><b>Official</b> process of document checks, verification of <b>consignment integrity, inspection or testing</b> to verify if a <b>consignment</b> complies with <b>phytosanitary import requirements</b> or phytosanitary requirements related to <b>transit</b></p> <p><a href="#">In comparison to its pre-CPM 2023 definition:</a></p> <p><del>Official procedure used to verify that</del> <u>process of document checks, verification of <b>consignment integrity, inspection or testing</b> to verify if a <b>consignment</b> complies with <b>phytosanitary import requirements</b> or phytosanitary <del>measures</del> <u>requirements</u> related to <b>transit</b></u></p>
---	--

The narrow-sense definition of ‘*inspection*’ has been confirmed by the SC and two consultations. While some minor modifications for consistency with other Glossary terms are pending final steps, the current version as endorsed by the SC November 2022 reads as:

<b>Inspection</b>	<p><b>Official visual examination</b> of <b>plants, plant products</b> or other <b>regulated articles</b> to determine if <b>pests</b> are present or to verify conformity with phytosanitary requirements</p> <p><a href="#">In comparison to its current definition:</a></p> <p><b>Official visual examination</b> of <b>plants, plant products</b> or other <b>regulated articles</b> to determine if <b>pests</b> are present or to <del>determine compliance</del> <u>verify conformity</u> with phytosanitary <u>requirements</u> <del>regulations</del></p>
-------------------	--

Following CPM adoption in 2023, the recently added term “*identity (of a consignment)*” is defined as:

<b>identity (of a consignment)</b>	The components of a <b>consignment</b> as covered by its <b>phytosanitary certificate</b> and described in the sections “name of produce and quantity declared”, “botanical name of <b>plants</b> ” and “place of origin”
------------------------------------	---

and the definition of “*integrity (of a consignment)*” was revised to become:

<b>Integrity (of a consignment)</b>	<p>Condition of a <b>consignment</b> as described by its <b>phytosanitary certificate</b> or other <b>officially</b> acceptable document when its <b>identity</b> is unchanged, its <b>packaging</b> undamaged and it shows no signs of tampering</p> <p><a href="#">In comparison to its pre-CPM 2023 definition:</a></p> <p><del>Composition</del> <u>Condition</u> of a <b>consignment</b> as described by its <b>phytosanitary certificate</b> or other <b>officially</b> acceptable document when its <b>identity</b> is unchanged, its <b>packaging</b> undamaged and it shows no signs of tampering, <del>maintained without loss, addition or substitution</del></p>
-------------------------------------	--

### Proposed adjustments to ISPM 23

With those definitions in place, adjustments to ISPM 23 for consistency can now be pursued and progressed. The TPG suggests it may benefit the overall process if the SC could consider and, as appropriate, endorse the proposed adjustments before the drafting work by the prospective Expert Working Group on the Annex on Field Inspection begins.

In the following, the TPG provides its recommendations on concrete adjustments, as

- (1) full ISPM text; and
- (2) in a Table explaining the rationales.

All the below terminological adjustments proposed by TPG endeavor to overcome discrepancies and ensure consistency within and between ISPMs and Glossary definitions, **while maintaining the original, intended meaning unchanged.**

From that perspective, TPG suggests that adjusting ISPM 23 through ink amendments may be a possible option, if so desired.

Most critically needed are the proposed **substitutions** of ‘*inspection*’ when used in its broad sense beyond its definition, to become ‘*compliance procedure*’ and as a logical consequence the proposed **substitutions** of ‘*visual examination*’ to become ‘*inspection*’.

Given the revised definition of the consignment’s ‘*integrity*’, some current rather imprecise and unclear text parts are proposed clarified by simply **deleting** reference to the redundant ‘*identity*’, the concept of which being already covered by ‘*integrity*’.

Finally, some other, general consistency issues are proposed dealt with by **deletions** or **substitutions**.

**The SC is invited to:**

- *consider* the consistency adjustments as proposed by the TPG;
- (1) *discuss* whether the proposed changes should be carried out through ink amendments, as part of a focused or general revision of the standard, or by any other procedure.

Colour legend:

TPG proposals for amendments in respect of

- ‘*compliance procedure*’ to replace ‘*inspection*’ when used in its broad sense beyond its definition, or ‘*inspection*’ to replace ‘*visual examination*’.
- **amendments to avoid redundant use of ‘*identity*’, as covered already by ‘*integrity*’**
- **other consistency issues**

For convenience and overview: **consistent and correct uses of the term ‘*inspection*’, that should NOT be changed**

## ISPM 23

(based upon version published 2019)

### **Guidelines for Inspection of consignments**

#### Adoption

This standard was adopted by the Seventh Session of the Interim Commission on Phytosanitary Measures in April 2005.



#### INTRODUCTION

##### Scope

This standard describes **compliance procedures for the, in particular inspection, of** consignments of plants, plant products and other regulated articles at import and export. It is focused on the determination of compliance with phytosanitary regulations, based on **inspectionvisual examination**, documentary checks, and **identity and integrity** checks.

## References

The present standard refers to International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPMs). ISPMs are available on the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP) at <https://www.ippc.int/core-activities/standards-setting/ispms>.

IPPC. 1997. *International Plant Protection Convention*. Rome, IPPC, FAO.

## Definitions

Definitions of phytosanitary terms used in the present standard can be found in ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*).

## Outline of Requirements

National plant protection organizations (NPPOs) have the responsibility for “the **inspection** of consignments of plants and plant products moving in international traffic and, where appropriate, the **inspection** of other regulated articles, particularly with the object of preventing the introduction and/or spread of pests” (Article IV.2(c) of the IPPC).

Inspectors determine compliance of consignments with phytosanitary regulations, based on **inspectionvisual examination** for detection of pests and regulated articles, and documentary checks, and **identity** and integrity checks. The result of **inspection the compliance procedure** should allow an inspector to decide whether to accept, detain or reject the consignment, or whether further analysis is required.

NPPOs may determine that consignments should be sampled during **inspection**. The sampling methodology used should depend on the specific **inspection** objectives.

## REQUIREMENTS

### [1] General Requirements

The responsibilities of a national plant protection organization include “the **inspection** of consignments of plants and plant products moving in international traffic and, where appropriate, the **inspection** of other regulated articles, particularly with the object of preventing the introduction and/or spread of pests” (Article IV.2(c) of the IPPC).

Consignments may consist of one or more commodities or lots. Where a consignment comprises more than one commodity or lot, the **inspection** to determine compliance may have to consist of several separate visual examinations. Throughout this standard, the term “consignment” is used, but it should be recognized that the guidance provided for consignments may apply equally to individual lots within a consignment.

### 1.1 **Inspection** objectives

The objective of **inspection** of consignments is to confirm compliance with import or export requirements relating to quarantine pests or regulated non-quarantine pests. It often serves to verify the effectiveness of other phytosanitary measures taken at a previous stage in time.

An export **inspection** is used to ensure that the consignment meets the phytosanitary import requirements of the importing country at the time of **inspection**. An export **inspection** of a consignment may result in the issuance of a phytosanitary certificate for the consignment in question.

**Inspection** at import is used to verify compliance with phytosanitary import requirements. **Inspection** may also be carried out generally for the detection of organisms for which the **phytosanitary pest** risk has not yet been determined.

The collection of samples for laboratory testing or the verification of pest identity may be combined with the **inspection** procedure.

**Inspection** can be used as a risk management procedure.

## 1.2 Assumptions involved in the application of inspections

As **inspection** of entire consignments is often not feasible, **phytosanitary inspection** is consequently often based on sampling<sup>20</sup>.

The use of **inspection** as a means to detect the presence of pests in, or to determine or verify the pest incidence in, a consignment is based on the following assumptions:

1. The pests of concern, or the signs or symptoms they cause, are visually detectable.
2. **Inspection** is operationally practical.
3. Some probability of pests being undetected is recognized.

There is some probability of pests being undetected when **inspection** is used. This is because **inspection** is usually based on sampling, which may not involve visual examination of 100% of the lot or consignment, and also because **inspection** is not 100% effective for detecting a specified pest on the consignment or samples examined. When **inspection** is used as a risk management procedure, there is also a certain probability that a pest which is present in a consignment or lot may not be detected.

The size of a sample for **inspection** purposes is normally determined on the basis of a specified regulated pest associated with a specific commodity. It may be more difficult to determine the sample size in cases where **inspection** of consignments is targeted at several or all regulated pests.

## 1.3 Responsibility for inspection

NPPOs have the responsibility for **inspection**. **Inspections should be** carried out by NPPOs or under their authority (see also ISPM 7 (*Phytosanitary certification system*), ISPM 20 (*Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system*), and Articles IV.2(a), IV.2(c) and V.2(a) of the IPPC).

## 1.4 Requirements for inspectors

As authorized officers or agents by the NPPO, inspectors should have:

- authority to discharge their duties and accountability for their actions,
- technical qualifications and competencies, especially in pest detection,
- knowledge of, or access to capability in, identification of pests, plants and plant products and other regulated articles,
- access to appropriate **inspection** facilities, tools and equipment,
- written guidelines (such as regulations, manuals, pest data sheets),
- knowledge of the operation of other regulatory agencies where appropriate, and
- objectivity and impartiality.

The inspector may be required to **inspect** consignments for:

- compliance with specified import or export requirements,
- specified regulated pests, and
- organisms for which the **phytosanitary pest** risk has not yet been determined.

<sup>20</sup> Guidance on sampling is provided in ISPM 31 (*Methodologies for sampling of consignments*).

## 1.5 Other considerations for inspection

The decision to use inspection as a phytosanitary measure involves consideration of many factors, including in particular the phytosanitary import requirements of the importing country and the pests of concern. Other factors that require consideration may include:

- the mitigation measures taken by the exporting country
- whether inspection is the only measure or combined with other measures
- commodity and intended use
- place or area of production
- consignment size and configuration
- volume, frequency and timing of dispatchshipments
- experience with origin or shipper
- means of conveyance and packaging
- available financial and technical resources (including pest diagnostic capabilities)
- previous handling and processing
- sampling design characteristics necessary to achieve the inspection objectives
- difficulty of pest detection on a specific commodity
- experience and the results of previous inspections
- perishability of the commodity (see also Article VII.2(e) of the IPPC)
- effectiveness of the inspection procedure.

## 1.6 Inspection in relation to pest risk analysis

Pest risk analysis (PRA) provides the basis for technical justification for phytosanitary import requirements. PRA also provides the means for developing lists of regulated pests requiring phytosanitary measures, and identifies those for which inspection is appropriate or identifies commodities that are subject to inspection. If new pests are reported during inspection, emergency actions may be undertaken, as appropriate. Where emergency actions are taken, a PRA should be used for evaluating these pests and developing recommendations for appropriate further actions when necessary.

When considering inspection as an option for risk management and the basis for phytosanitary decision-making, it is important to consider both technical and operational factors associated with a particular type and intensity of inspection. Such an inspection may be required to detect specified regulated pests at the desired detection level and confidence level depending on the risk associated with them (see also ISPM 11 (*Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests*) and ISPM 21 (*Pest risk analysis for regulated non-quarantine pests*)).

## 1. Specific Requirements

The technical requirements for inspection a compliance procedure involve three distinct procedures elements that should be designed with a view to ensuring technical correctness while also considering operational practicality. These procedures elements are:

- examination of documents associated with a consignment
- verification of consignment identity and integrity
- inspectionvisual examination for pests and other phytosanitary requirements (such as freedom from soil).

Certain aspects of inspection the compliance procedure may differ depending on the purpose, such as for import or export purposes, or verification or risk management purposes.

### 2.1 Examination of documents associated with a consignment

Import and export documents are examined to ensure that they are:

- complete
- consistent
- accurate
- valid and not fraudulent (see ISPM 12 (*Phytosanitary certificates*)).

Examples of documents that may be associated with import or export certification include:

- phytosanitary certificate or phytosanitary certificate for re-export
- manifest (including bills of lading, invoice)
- import permit
- treatment documents or certificates, marks (such as provided for in ISPM 15 (*Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade*)) or other indicators of treatment
- certificate of origin
- field inspection certificates or reports
- producer or packing records
- certification programme documents (e.g. seed potato certification programmes, pest free area documentation)
- inspection reports
- commercial invoices
- laboratory reports.

Problems encountered with either import or export documents should, where appropriate, be investigated first with the parties providing the documents before further action is taken.

## 2.2 Verification of consignment identity and integrity

The inspection for verification of identity and integrity involves checking to ensure that the consignment is accurately described by its documents, i.e. The identity check verifies whether the type of plant or plant product or species is in accordance with the phytosanitary certificate received or to be issued. The integrity check verifies if the consignment is clearly identifiable and the quantity and status is as declared in the phytosanitary certificate received or to be issued. This may require a physical examination of the consignment to confirm the identity and integrity, including checking for seals, safety conditions and other relevant physical aspects of the shipment consignment that may be of phytosanitary concern. Actions taken based on the result will depend on the extent and nature of the problem encountered.

## 2.3 Inspection Visual examination

Related aspects of inspection visual examination include its use for pest detection and for verifying compliance with phytosanitary regulations.

### 2.3.1 Pests

A sample is taken from consignments or lots to determine if a pest is present, or if it exceeds a specified tolerance level. The ability to detect in a consistent manner the presence of a regulated pest with the desired confidence level requires practical and statistical considerations, such as the probability of detecting the pest, the number of units making up the lot, the desired confidence level, and the sample size (i.e. the intensity of inspection) (see ISPM 31 (*Methodologies for sampling of consignments*)).

If the objective of inspection is the detection of specified regulated pests to meet phytosanitary import requirements, then the sampling method should be based on a probability of detecting the pest that satisfies the corresponding phytosanitary requirements.

If the objective of the inspection is the verification of the general phytosanitary condition of a consignment or lot, such as when:

2. no regulated pests have been specified



3. no tolerance level has been specified for regulated pests
4. the aim is to detect pests when there has been a failure of a phytosanitary measure, then sampling methodology should reflect this.

The sampling method adopted should be based on transparent technical and operational criteria, and should be consistently applied (see also ISPM 20).

### 2.3.2 Compliance with phytosanitary regulations

**Inspection** can be used to verify the compliance with some phytosanitary regulations. Examples include:

- treatment
- degree of processing
- freedom from contamination (e.g. leaves, soil)
- required growth stage, variety, colour, age, degree of maturity etc.
- absence of unauthorized plants, plant products or other regulated articles
- consignment packaging and shipping requirements
- origin of consignment or lots
- point of entry.

## 2.4 **Inspection** methods

The **inspection** method should be designed either to detect the specified regulated pests on or in the commodity being examined, or to be used for a general **inspection** for organisms for which the **phytosanitary pest** risk has not yet been determined. The inspector visually examines units in the sample until the target or other pest has been detected or all sample units have been examined. At that point, the **inspection** may cease. However, additional sample units may be examined if the NPPO needs to gather additional information concerning the pest and the commodity, for example if the pest is not observed, but signs or symptoms are. The inspector may also have access to other non-visual tools that may be used in conjunction with the **inspection** process.

It is important that:

- examination of the sample be undertaken as soon as reasonably possible after the sample has been drawn and that the sample is as representative of the consignment or lot as possible
- techniques are reviewed to take account of experience gained with the technique and of new technical developments
- procedures are put in place to ensure the independence, integrity, traceability and security of samples for each consignment or lot
- results of the **inspection** are documented.

**Inspection** procedures should be in accordance with the PRA where appropriate, and should be consistently applied.

## 2.5 **Inspection** outcome

The result of the **inspection** contributes to the decision to be made as to whether the consignment meets phytosanitary regulations. If phytosanitary regulations are met, consignments for exports may be provided with appropriate certification, e.g. phytosanitary certificates, and consignments for import should be released.

If phytosanitary regulations are not met, further actions can be taken. These actions may be determined by the nature of the findings, considering the regulated pest or other **inspection** objectives, and the circumstances. Actions for non-compliance are described in detail in ISPM 20.

In many cases, pests or signs of pests that have been detected may require identification or a specialized analysis in a laboratory or by a specialist. It may be decided that emergency measures are needed where new or previously unknown pests are found. A system for properly documenting and maintaining

samples or specimens should be in place to ensure trace-back to the relevant consignment and to facilitate later review of the results if necessary.

In cases of repeated non-compliance, amongst other actions, the intensity and frequency of inspections for certain consignments may be increased.

Where a pest is detected in an import, the inspection report should be sufficiently detailed to allow for notifications of non-compliance (in accordance with ISPM 13 (*Guidelines for the notification of non-compliance and emergency action*)). Certain other record-keeping requirements may also rely on the availability of adequately completed inspection reports (e.g. as described in Articles VII and VIII of the IPPC, ISPM 8 (*Determination of pest status in an area*) and ISPM 20).

## 2.6 Review of inspection systems compliance procedures

NPPOs should conduct periodic reviews of import and export inspection systems compliance procedures to validate the appropriateness of their design and to determine any course of adjustments needed to ensure that they are technically sound.

Audits should be conducted in order to review the validity of the inspection systems compliance procedures. An additional inspection may be a component of the audit.

## 2.7 Transparency

As part of the inspection systems, information concerning inspection systems the compliance procedure for a commodity should be documented and made available on request to the parties concerned in application of the transparency principle (ISPM 1 (*Phytosanitary principles for the protection of plants and the application of phytosanitary measures in international trade*)). This information may be part of bilateral arrangements covering the phytosanitary aspects of a commodity trade.

**Table: Rationale for TPG proposals for consistency amendments in ISPM 23**

Locus	TPG text proposal	Rationale
Title	Guidelines for Inspection of consignments	Although the ISPM covers the entire concept of a compliance procedure for consignments, the text put emphasis and provides details on <i>inspection</i> of consignments in far its larger part. Therefore, and for pragmatic reasons, it is appropriate to retain ‘inspection’ in the title, rather than introducing ‘compliance procedure’ there. However, the original title failed to explain that the ISPM does <i>not</i> cover inspections etc. for the non-consignment cases, and therefore adding ‘of consignments’ is appropriate and necessary to delimit the title with the actual scope.

		In case the prospective new text on Field Inspection shall appear as an Annex to ISPM 23, the words ‘of consignments’ could be omitted from the title.
Scope	This standard describes <b>compliance procedures for the, in particular inspection, of</b> consignments of plants, plant products and other regulated articles at import and export. It is focused on the determination of compliance with phytosanitary regulations, based on <b>inspection visual examination</b> , documentary checks and <b>identity and integrity</b> checks.	<p>Although the ISPM covers the entire concept of a compliance procedure for consignments, the text put emphasis and provides details on <i>inspection</i> of consignments in far its larger part.</p> <p>General: replacing ‘visual examination’ with the more comprehensive term ‘inspection’.</p> <p>Checking of ‘identity’ is redundant, as per definition included in checking of ‘integrity’.</p>
Outline of requirements, para 2	Inspectors determine compliance of consignments with phytosanitary regulations, based on <b>inspection visual examination</b> for detection of pests and regulated articles, and documentary checks <b>and identity</b> and integrity checks. The result of <b>inspection the compliance procedure</b> should allow an inspector to decide whether to accept, detain or reject the consignment, or whether further analysis is required.	<p>General: replacing ‘visual examination’ with the more comprehensive term ‘inspection’.</p> <p>Checking of ‘identity’ is redundant, as per definition included in checking of ‘integrity’.</p> <p>General: ‘compliance procedure’ to replace ‘inspection’, see introduction.</p>
Sect. 1.1, para 3	<b>Inspection</b> at import is used to verify compliance with phytosanitary import requirements. <b>Inspection</b> may also be carried out generally for the detection of organisms for which the <b>phytosanitary pest</b> risk has not yet been determined.	General consistency issue: ‘Phytosanitary risk’ to be avoided and ‘pest risk’ be used, as per SC decision 2005.
Sect. 1.2, title	<b>Assumptions involved in the application of inspections</b>	Singular should be used for consistency.
Sect. 1.2, para 1	As <b>inspection</b> of entire consignments is often not feasible, <b>phytosanitary inspection</b> is consequently often based on sampling	‘Phytosanitary’ is unnecessary and confusing, since ‘inspection’ is the defined term.
Sect. 1.3	NPPOs have the responsibility for <b>inspection</b> . <b>Inspections should be</b> carried out by NPPOs or under their authority (see also ISPM 7 ( <i>Phytosanitary certification system</i> ), ISPM 20 ( <i>Guidelines for a</i>	‘Should’, and not the present tense ‘are’, to be used for expressing the level of obligation,

	<i>phytosanitary import regulatory system</i> ), and Articles IV.2(a), IV.2(c) and V.2(a) of the IPPC).	according to the general IPPC rules of terminology.
Sect. 1.4, last indent	- organisms for which the <b>phytosanitary pest</b> risk has not yet been determined.	‘Phytosanitary risk’ to be avoided and ‘pest risk’ be used, as per SC decision 2005.
Sect. 1.5, indents 4, 6, 7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>place <b>or</b> area of production</li> <li>volume, frequency and timing of <b>dispatchshipments</b></li> <li>experience with origin <b>or</b> shipper</li> </ul>	Avoid ‘/’ in ISPMs, using ‘or’ instead. The ambiguous ‘shipment’ to be avoided, using ‘dispatch’ instead, see ‘General recommendations on use of terms in ISPMs’.
Sect. 1.6, para 2	When considering <b>inspection</b> as an option for risk management and the basis for phytosanitary decision-making, it is important to consider both technical and operational factors associated with a particular type and intensity of <b>inspection</b> . Such an <b>inspection</b> may be required to detect specified regulated pests at the desired <b>detection</b> level and confidence <b>level</b> depending on the risk associated with them (see also ISPM 11 ( <i>Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests</i> ) and ISPM 21 ( <i>Pest risk analysis for regulated non-quarantine pests</i> )).	‘Detection level’ and confidence level’ are the correct statistical terms.
Sect. 2	<p>The technical requirements for <b>inspection a compliance procedure</b> involve three distinct <b>procedures elements</b> that should be designed with a view to ensuring technical correctness while also considering operational practicality. These <b>procedures elements</b> are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- examination of documents associated with a consignment</li> <li>- verification of consignment <b>identity and integrity</b></li> <li>- <b>inspectionvisual examination</b> for pests and other phytosanitary requirements (such as freedom from soil).</li> </ul> <p>Certain aspects of <b>inspection the compliance procedure</b> may differ depending on the purpose, such as for import <b>or</b> export purposes, or verification <b>or</b> risk management purposes.</p>	<p>General: ‘compliance procedure’ to replace ‘inspection’, see introduction.</p> <p>‘Elements’ to replace ‘procedures’ to avoid confusing double-use of ‘procedures’.</p> <p>Verification of ‘identity’ is redundant, as per definition included in checking of ‘integrity’.</p> <p>General: replacing ‘visual examination’ with the more comprehensive term ‘inspection’.</p> <p>‘/’ to be avoided in ISPMs, using ‘or’ instead.</p>
Sect. 2.2	<p><b>2.2 Verification of consignment <del>identity and integrity</del></b></p> <p>The <b>inspection for verification of <del>identity and integrity</del></b> involves checking to ensure that the consignment is accurately described by its documents, <b>i.e. The identity check verifies</b> whether the type of plant or plant product or species is in accordance with the phytosanitary certificate received or to be issued. <b>The integrity check verifies</b> if the consignment is clearly identifiable and</p>	<p>Verification of ‘identity’ is redundant, as per definition included in checking of ‘integrity’.</p> <p>The Glossary term ‘inspection’ is used incorrectly here, see introduction.</p>

	<p>the quantity and status is as declared in the phytosanitary certificate received or to be issued. This may require a physical examination of the consignment to confirm the <del>identity and</del> integrity, including checking for seals, safety conditions and other relevant physical aspects of the <del>shipment</del> <b>consignment</b> that may be of phytosanitary concern. Actions taken based on the result will depend on the extent and nature of the problem encountered.</p>	<p>The ambiguous ‘shipment’ to be avoided, using ‘consignment’ instead, see ‘General recommendations on use of terms in ISMPs’.</p>
Sect. 2.3	<p><b>2.3 <del>Inspection</del> Visual examination</b></p> <p>Related aspects of <del>inspection</del> visual examination include its use for pest detection and for verifying compliance with phytosanitary regulations.</p>	<p>General: replacing ‘visual examination’ with the more comprehensive term ‘inspection’.</p>
Sect. 2.4, 1 <sup>st</sup> sentence	<p>The <b>inspection</b> method should be designed either to detect the specified regulated pests on or in the commodity being examined, or to be used for a general <b>inspection</b> for organisms for which the <del>phytosanitary pest</del> risk has not yet been determined.</p>	<p>‘Phytosanitary risk’ to be avoided and ‘pest risk’ be used, as per SC decision 2005.</p>
Sect. 2.6	<p><b>2.6 Review of <del>inspection systems</del> compliance procedures</b></p> <p>NPPOs should conduct periodic reviews of import and export <del>inspection systems</del> <b>compliance procedures</b> to validate the appropriateness of their design and to determine any course of adjustments needed to ensure that they are technically sound.</p> <p>Audits should be conducted in order to review the validity of the <del>inspection systems</del> <b>compliance procedures</b>. An additional <b>inspection</b> may be a component of the audit.</p>	<p>General: ‘compliance procedure’ to replace ‘inspection’, see introduction.</p>
Sect. 2.7	<p><del>As part of the inspection systems, information</del> concerning <del>inspection systems</del> the <b>compliance procedure</b> for a commodity should be documented and made available on request to the parties concerned in application of the transparency principle (ISPM 1 (<i>Phytosanitary principles for the protection of plants and the application of phytosanitary measures in international trade</i>)). This information may be part of bilateral arrangements covering the phytosanitary aspects of a commodity trade.</p>	<p>General: ‘compliance procedure’ to replace ‘inspection’, see introduction.</p> <p>The word ‘systems’ is not needed, and ‘inspection systems’ does not fit in the beginning of the sentence, and cannot and need not be replaced with similar wording using ‘compliance procedure’. No substance is lost by simply deleting the first 6 words.</p>

## Appendix 6: TPG work on consistency with ISPMs: achievements and status

### Introduction

The intent of this paper is to provide the SC with an overview of achievements and status of the TPG's efforts since 2008 on enhancing consistency within and among ISPMs.

The *specification* (TP 5, 2016) for the work of TPG includes various tasks to ensure consistent use of terminology within and among ISPMs.

As stated in the *Scope* of ISPM 5, the IPPC Glossary contains “*terms and definitions with specific meaning for phytosanitary systems worldwide.... developed to provide a harmonized internationally agreed vocabulary associated with the implementation of the IPPC and ISPMs*”.

As stated in the *Introduction* to ISPM 5, the purpose of the agreed IPPC glossary is “*to increase clarity and consistency in the use and understanding of terms and definitions which are used by contracting parties for official phytosanitary purposes, in phytosanitary legislation and regulations, as well as for official information exchange.*”

The continuous development of the IPPC Glossary on one hand and assurance of its consistent use in ISPMs on the other hand both aim at ensuring clarity and unambiguity of ISPMs, recognized by the WTO/SPS Agreement as the exclusive instruments for international harmonization in the plant health domain.

This paper briefly informs the SC on achievements and the current status of TPG *consistency* work since 2008.

### Three approaches to TPG consistency work

Three distinct approaches have been used in the TPG consistency work:

- Standard-by-standard for *existing* ISPMs (other than ISPM 5)
- Term-by-term with *existing* ISPMs, including ISPM 5
- Standard-by-standard for *draft* ISPMs
- *Standard-by-standard for existing ISPMs (other than ISPM 5)*

This approach to consistency work was kicked off by the external consultant report in 2008 on ‘*Review of ISPMs for consistency of terms and style*’. Reviewing the report, the TPG then for several years made recommendations to SC on text amendments for batches of ISPMs, and a mechanism was established for the SC to adopt the so-called ink amendments to be noted by CPM. This type of consistency review was completed in 2013.

- *Term-by-term with existing ISPMs, including ISPM 5*

In 2010, the TPG recognized that the use in ISPMs of certain terms (both Glossary and non-defined terms) often was rather inconsistent, in that e.g.:

- (1) a Glossary term had been used beyond or contrary to its definition
- (2) a non-defined term had been used where a Glossary term would be appropriate
- (3) several non-defined terms had been used to express the very same concept
- (4) one non-defined term had been used for several differing concepts
- (5) the definition of a Glossary term was imprecise, ambiguous or unnecessarily restrictive.

Therefore, a new phase of consistency work with existing ISPMs through a ‘term-by-term’ approach was initiated, and a process for dealing with inconsistencies formalized in 2014 by the SC. With this, some particular terms and definitions on one hand, and their actual use in existing ISPMs on the other hand, have been scrutinized to seek alignment.

Based on this exercise, a range of definitions (approx. 20) have been revised, others deleted (approx. 15) and 3 complementary terms and definition added to the Glossary. At the same time, necessary consistency amendments to existing ISPMs have been recommended by TPG and agreed by the SC, either as immediate ink amendments or as amendments to be considered at any next revision of the ISPM.

Consistency work with existing ISPMs may come to a completion within the next few years. Some expected outstanding tasks include considerations of:



- A. amendments to ISPM 23, in particular to recognize ‘inspection’ as a part of a ‘compliance procedure’
- B. minor amendments to certain ISPM 20 text, in particular to clarify the difference between ‘phytosanitary action’ and ‘emergency action’
- C. review of the use of ‘phytosanitary measure’, ‘phytosanitary procedure’ and ‘phytosanitary action’ in all ISPMs
- D. consistency review of ISPM 5 Supplements and Appendix.

- *Standard-by-standard for draft ISPMs*

Since 2008, the consistency review of all draft ISPMs sent for 1<sup>st</sup> consultation has been a regular TPG task, whereby TPG provides recommendations to the SC-7 and the ISPM steward on consistency issues, in particular on comments received from countries during consultation.

As an overall conclusion on the TPG consistency work, the TPG suggests that the concerted effort by the SC and the TPG to ensure consistency within and among ISPMs has led to increased awareness of the issue at all steps and with all parties involved in the chain of ISPM production, and therefore to improved quality of ISPMs. Experience of this prolonged consistency review also underscores that, prior to proposing and developing definitions of a new Glossary term, the underlying *concept* should be thoroughly substantiated and understood.

### Supporting documents initiated by the TPG

In support or as part of the continuous consistency work, the TPG has:

- A. continuously developed the Annotated Glossary/Explanatory document to ISPM 5<sup>21</sup> which explains the relationship between the almost 200 Glossary terms and definitions. A list with explanations are also accumulated on terms previously considered by the TPG or deleted by CPM. The TPG annually updates the Annotated Glossary for internal use, and submit it to the SC for endorsement and publication every 3<sup>rd</sup> year;
- B. elaborated the “Guidelines for a consistent terminology of ISPMs”, where six principles for defining and using Glossary terms in ISPMs have been established, reflecting discussions in the SC and TPG. The Guidelines were adopted by the SC in 2018 and appears in the IPPC Procedure Manual for Standard Setting<sup>22</sup>; and
- C. since 2010 continuously developed the “General recommendations on consistency”<sup>23</sup>, in which the consistent use of certain Glossary and non-defined terms is promoted and the use of certain other non-defined terms discouraged. The document is revised on an ad hoc basis by TPG, subsequently noted by the SC and made available to Expert Drafting Groups.

### Identifying translation issues to ensure consistency between languages

In relation to languages, the main role of the TPG is to ensure consistency of terms and definitions in languages. Therefore, as part of the consistency work, the TPG identifies translation issues at several stages in the standard setting process and provides recommendations on translations of such terms and definitions. TPG members for the language concerned revise comments received from contracting parties in languages other than English, after the consultation periods. Preliminary translations for terms and definitions, as well as recommendations after consultation periods, are transmitted to the FAO translation service.

Some of the language issues are ultimately addressed during the language review group (LRG) process, and some TPG members for the language concerned participate in such groups.

<sup>21</sup> Available on the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP) at <https://www.ippc.int/en/work-area-pages/technical-panel-for-the-glossary-tpg/>

<sup>22</sup> **IPPC Secretariat**. 2022. *IPPC Manual for Standard Setting*. Rome, IPPC Secretariat, FAO. 196 pp. <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/85024/>

<sup>23</sup> **IPPC Secretariat**. 2022. *IPPC Manual for Standard Setting*, p. 103. Rome, IPPC Secretariat, FAO. 196 pp. <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/85024/>

**Terminology used within the Convention**

The TPG takes this opportunity to note that, throughout the Convention text, some terms (defined as well as non-defined) has been used inconsistently. The TPG recommends that, at any future revision of the Convention text, consistency of use of terms within the Convention text, as well as vis-à-vis the Glossary, should be ensured.

*The SC is invited* to recognize the achievements and current status of the TPG consistency work and note the supporting documents available for that work.

**Appendix 7: Proposed ink amendments to ISPM 5 in relation to the term “entry (of a consignment)”**

ISPM	Current text	Proposed text	Rationale
5	Movement through a point of entry into an area [FAO, 1995]	movement <u>of a consignment</u> through a <b>point of entry</b> into an <b>area</b>	<p>TPG suggested that “of a consignment” be inserted as an ink amendment into the definition of “entry (of a consignment)” to provide parallelism with the definition of “entry (of a pest)” and hence reduce potential confusion.</p> <p>The same approach had been taken for the definition of “release (of a consignment)”, where “of a consignment” had been included in the definition even though it was also a qualifier to the term itself.</p> <p>TPG also explained that it was only necessary where there were pairs or groups of parallel definitions, and no further changes of this sort were anticipated.</p>

## Appendix 8: TPG Work Plan 2023-2024

**TABLE 1 - REGULAR TASKS**

Regular tasks		Detailed task	Responsible	Deadline	Comments
<b>1. Meeting reports: preparation and update to SC</b>	<b>January-February 2023</b>	Draft report to Steward, Chairperson and rapporteur	Secretariat	2023-01-25	
		Steward, Chairperson and rapporteur send back draft report	Steward, Chair & rapporteur	2023-02-15	
		Secretariat finalizes report and sends to editor	Secretariat	2023-02-18	
		Editor reviews report and send comments	Editor	2023-02-25	
		Final report	Secretariat	2023-02-28	(To allow review in Secretariat)
	<b>Update for SC May 2023</b>	Prepare update (incl. decisions) from TPG December 2022 meetings for SC May 2023	Secretariat with stewards	2023-03-25	Secretariat to draft; steward to respond by 25/03 tent.
<b>2. Draft ISPMs in 1<sup>st</sup> consultation (except Amendments, see 3)</b>	Going to SC-7 / 2 <sup>nd</sup> consultation	Terms and consistency comments extracted.	Secretariat	2022-10-07	
		Review for possible inconsistencies and consideration of comments	All	At the TPG meeting	
		Reactions to comments/consistency review integrated in tables: all drafts, and send to stewards via Secretariat	Secretariat with stewards	2023-02-15	Comments from TPG on these will not be solicited, documents will be finalized by Secretariat and Steward
		Review translation comments and provide suggestions to FAO Translation Services	French, Spanish	2023-02-15	These will be submitted to translation-services
<b>3. Terms and definitions (incl. Amendments to the Glossary)</b>	<b>2021 Amendments</b>	Volunteers sends draft meeting papers to Secretariat	ALL, as allocated in Table 3	2020-10-02	TPG 2020 (in fact January 2021)
		Draft 2021 Amendments compiled based on discussions at TPG 2021-01	Secretariat and steward	2021-01-21	Back to Secretariat by 2021-02-10
		TPG members' help to translate new terms proposed for the draft amendments in languages for the List of topics (LOT)	Secretariat	TPG meeting	N/A

Regular tasks	Detailed task	Responsible	Deadline	Comments
	Draft 2021 Amendments finalized	ALL	2021-02-26	
	Amendments processed for SC	Secretariat	2021-02-26	Posting deadline for SC May 2021 is 1 March
	Proposed translation of the terms going for 1st consultation	French, Spanish	2021-05-01	These will be submitted to translation-services
	Draft amendments to 1 <sup>st</sup> Consultation		2021-07 to 09	
	Draft amendments and 1 <sup>st</sup> Cons. comments reviewed		TPG 2021-12	
	Finalize amendments and responses	Secretariat and steward	2021-12-21	Back to Secretariat by 2022-01-09
	Amendments and responses for TPG comments	ALL	2022-01-28	Draft Amendments and responses to compiled comments to be posted by 1 March for SC-7 / 2 <sup>nd</sup> Cons.
	Review translation comments and provide suggestions to FAO Translation Services	French, Spanish	2022-01-28	These will be submitted to translation-services
	Draft amendments in 2 <sup>nd</sup> Consultation		2022-07 to 09	
	Consultation by email on 2 <sup>nd</sup> Cons. comments	ALL	in 2022-10	If Steward feels consultation is needed. The draft Amendments and responses to 2nd Cons. comments are submitted to SC November
	Check of translations of draft Amendments going for adoption (i.e. after SC November and when it has been revised/translated into all languages)	French, Spanish, Russian, Arabic, Chinese	TBD, in 2023-02-01	The translations will be ready for review around the beginning of January and must be posted by 1 March for CPM.
<b>2022 Amendments</b>	Volunteers sends draft meeting papers to Secretariat	ALL, as allocated in Table 3	2021-10-01	TPG Dec 2021
	Draft 2022 Amendments compiled based on discussions at TPG 2021-12	Secretariat and steward	2021-12-16	Back to Secretariat by 2022-01-10

Regular tasks	Detailed task	Responsible	Deadline	Comments
	TPG members' help to translate new terms proposed for the draft amendments in languages for the List of topics (LOT)	Secretariat	TPG meeting	N/A
	Draft 2022 Amendments finalized	ALL	2022-02-28	
	Amendments processed for SC	Secretariat	2022-02-28	Posting deadline for SC May 2022 is 1 March
	Proposed translation of the terms going for 1 <sup>st</sup> consultation	French, Spanish	2022-05-01	These will be submitted to translation-services
	Draft amendments to 1 <sup>st</sup> Consultation		2022-07 to 09	
	Draft amendments and 1 <sup>st</sup> Cons. comments reviewed		TPG 2022	
	Finalize amendments and responses	Secretariat and steward	2022-12-06	Back to Secretariat by 2023-01-10
	TPG Virtual Meeting	ALL	2023-03-01	Approval of amendments by TPG
	Amendments and responses for TPG comments	ALL	2023-03-01	Draft Amendments and responses to compiled comments to be posted by 1 March for SC-7 / 2 <sup>nd</sup> Cons.
	Review translation comments and provide suggestions to FAO Translation Services	French, Spanish	2023-03-01	These will be submitted to translation-services
	Draft amendments in 2 <sup>nd</sup> Consultation		2023-07 to 09	
	Consultation by email on 2 <sup>nd</sup> Cons. comments	ALL	in 2023-10	If Steward feels consultation is needed. The draft Amendments and responses to 2 <sup>nd</sup> Cons. comments are submitted to SC November
	Check of translations of draft Amendments going for adoption (i.e. after SC November and when it has been revised/translated into all languages)	French, Spanish, Russian, Arabic, Chinese	TBD, in 2024-01	The translations will be ready for review around the beginning of January and must be posted by 1 March for CPM.



Regular tasks	Detailed task	Responsible	Deadline	Comments
<b>2023 Amendments</b>	Volunteers sends draft meeting papers to Secretariat	ALL, as allocated in Table 3	2022-10-01	TPG Nov 2022
	Draft 2023 Amendments compiled based on discussions at TPG 2022-12	Secretariat and steward	2022-12-06	Back to Secretariat by 2023-01-10
	TPG members' help to translate new terms proposed for the draft amendments in languages for the List of topics (LOT)	Secretariat	TPG meeting	N/A
	Draft 2023 Amendments finalized	ALL	2023-02-15	Back to Secretariat
	TPG Virtual Meeting	ALL	2023-03-01	Approval of amendments by TPG
	Amendments processed for SC	Secretariat	2023-03-01	Posting deadline for SC May 2023 is 1 March
	Proposed translation of the terms going for 1 <sup>st</sup> consultation	French, Spanish	2023-05-01	These will be submitted to translation-services
	Draft amendments to 1 <sup>st</sup> Consultation		2023-07 to 09	
	Draft amendments and 1 <sup>st</sup> Cons. comments reviewed		TPG 2023	
	Finalize amendments and responses	Secretariat and steward	2023-12-21	Back to Secretariat by 2024-01-08
	Amendments and responses for TPG comments	ALL	2024-01-28	Draft Amendments and responses to compiled comments to be posted by 1 March for SC-7 / 2 <sup>nd</sup> Cons.
	Review translation comments and provide suggestions to FAO Translation Services	French, Spanish	2024-01-28	These will be submitted to translation-services
	Draft amendments in 2 <sup>nd</sup> Consultation		2024-07 to 09	
	Consultation by email on 2 <sup>nd</sup> Cons. comments	ALL	in 2024-10	If Steward feels consultation is needed. The draft Amendments and responses

Regular tasks	Detailed task		Responsible	Deadline	Comments
					to 2 <sup>nd</sup> Cons. comments are submitted to SC November
		Check of translations of draft Amendments going for adoption (i.e. after SC November and when it has been revised/translated into all languages)	French, Spanish, Russian, Arabic, Chinese	TBD, in 2025-01	The translations will be ready for review around the beginning of January and must be posted by 1 March for CPM.
<b>4. Annotated Glossary – (to be published every 3 years, last published in July 2022)</b>	2019 (intermediate)	To prepare intermediate update based on TPG comments, outcomes of CPM 2019, SC May 2019	Beatriz Melcho	2019-06-15	
		To review intermediate update	All	2019-06-30	
	2020 (intermediate)	To prepare intermediate update based on TPG comments, outcomes of TPG 2019, including updates from SC Nov. 2019, CPM 2020, SC May 2020	Beatriz Melcho	After SC 2020-05	All to review / provide comments by end June 2020
	2021 (intermediate)	To prepare intermediate update based on TPG comments, outcomes of TPG 2020, including updates from SC Nov. 2020, CPM 2021, SC May 2021	Beatriz Melcho	After SC 2021-05	All to review / provide comments by end June 2021
	2022 (for publishing)	To prepare update based on TPG comments, outcomes of TPG 2021, including updates from SC Nov. 2021.	Beatriz Melcho	2022-02-15	All to review / provide comments during TPG 2021 meeting
		To review update	All	TPG meeting	Approved by SC via e-decision in 2022
	2023 (intermediate)	To prepare intermediate update based on TPG comments, outcomes of TPG 2022, including updates from SC Nov. 2022, CPM-17 (2023), SC May 2023	Beatriz Melcho	After SC 2023-05	All to review / provide comments by end June 2023
	2024 (for publishing)	To prepare update based on TPG comments, outcomes of TPG 2023, including updates from SC Nov. 2023, SC-7 May 2023, CPM-18 (2024), SC May 2024.	Beatriz Melcho	After SC 2024-05	All to review / provide comments during TPG 2024 meeting due to many amendments.
<b>5. Explanation of Glossary terms</b>	Members to identify before the meeting some Glossary terms/definitions requiring further explanations (and not already explained in other places, such as the Annotated Glossary)		All	2023-10-01	

Regular tasks	Detailed task	Responsible	Deadline	Comments
6. Review of membership	Annual review of membership to make recommendations to SC on new members needed		TPG meeting	

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

One-off tasks	Detailed task	Responsible	Deadline	Comments
<b>7. Review of ISPMs for consistency and style (other than in draft ISPMs)</b>	Ongoing consistency review	All during TPG meeting		TPG meeting
	Present all ink amendments / proposals for revision made so far	Secretariat	Ongoing	TPG meeting
<b>8. Other tasks</b>	General recommendations on consistency: yearly updates as needed	Secretariat with stewards	2023-01-07	
	General recommendations on consistency	ALL	2023-01-28	Appended to TPG report

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

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

N	Term	Status	Lead	Comments & next steps
1.	clearance (of a consignment) (2018-045)	To CPM-17 (2023)	Abigael Koech	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- TPG 2018-12: proposed to add to the LOT following discussions on the definition of inspection</li> <li>- SC 2019-05: added to LOT</li> <li>- TPG 2019-11: proposed the revision to be presented to SC May 2020 as a draft 2020 Amendments to ISPM 5</li> <li>- TPG 2020-12: proposed the deletion of the term and definition from the Glossary as draft 2021 Amendments to ISPM 5</li> <li>- SC 2021-05: approved the deletion for submission to the 1<sup>st</sup> consultation</li> <li>- TPG 2021-12: recommended the deletion be maintained as proposed at the 1<sup>st</sup> consultation</li> <li>- SC 2022-11: agreed for adoption</li> </ul>

N	Term	Status	Lead	Comments & next steps
2.	compliance procedure (for a consignment) (2021-006)	To CPM-17 (2023)	Ebbe Nordbo	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- TPG 2020-12: discussed 1<sup>st</sup> consultation comments on clearance (of a consignment) and proposed to add to work programme “Compliance procedure (for a consignment) and presented revised definition to SC May 2021 as draft 2021 Amendments to ISPM 5 for 1<sup>st</sup> consultation</li> <li>- SC 2021-05: agreed to add the subject to the TPG work programme and approved as modified at the meeting for submission to the 1<sup>st</sup> consultation</li> <li>- TPG 2021-12: recommended a revised definition as slightly changed in comparison to the version sent for the 1<sup>st</sup> consultation</li> <li>- SC 2022-11: agreed for adoption with no changes made following 2<sup>nd</sup> consultation</li> </ul>
3.	emergency measure (2020-004)	To CPM-17 (2023)	Rajesh Ramarathnam	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- TPG 2019-11: invites the SC to add it to the work programme</li> <li>- SC 2020-11: via e-decision agreed to add it to the LOT</li> <li>- TPG 2021-01: revised definition and presented to SC May 2021 as draft 2021 Amendments to ISPM 5 for 1<sup>st</sup> consultation</li> <li>- SC 2021-05: approved as modified at the meeting for submission to the 1<sup>st</sup> consultation</li> <li>- TPG 2021-12: recommended a revised definition as slightly changed in comparison to the version sent for the 1<sup>st</sup> consultation</li> <li>- SC 2022-11: agreed for adoption with changes made following 2<sup>nd</sup> consultation</li> </ul>
4.	emerging pest (2018-003)	To SC for 1 <sup>st</sup> consultation	Ebbe Nordbo	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- SC 2018-05: considered proposal from TC-RPPOs and agreed to include the term in the TPG work programme</li> <li>- SC 2018-05: considered TPG proposal and agreed to not send the definition for consultation for inclusion in ISPM 5 at this time. Discussions on the topic were forwarded to CPM Bureau as input into the wider discussion on the concept of “emerging pests”</li> <li>- TPG 2018-12: TPG proposed a draft definition of “emerging pest” – for SC to consider future steps</li> <li>- TPG 2022-12: developed definition and recommended for 1<sup>st</sup> consultation</li> </ul>
5.	visual examination (2022-001)	To SC for 1 <sup>st</sup> consultation	Rajesh Ramarathnam	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- SC 2022-11: added the term to the TPG work programme</li> <li>- TPG 2022-12: revised the term and recommended for 1<sup>st</sup> consultation</li> </ul>
6.	general surveillance (2018-046)	To SC-7 2023	Beatriz Melcho	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- TPG 2018-12: proposed to add to the LOT following discussions on the note on “surveillance” in the Annotated Glossary</li> <li>- SC 2019-05: added to LOT</li> <li>- TPG 2019-11: agreed to continue working on term</li> <li>- TPG 2021-01: elaborated definition and presented to SC May 2021 as draft 2021 Amendments to ISPM 5 for 1<sup>st</sup> consultation</li> <li>- SC 2021-05: approved as modified at the meeting for submission to the 1<sup>st</sup> consultation</li> </ul>

N	Term	Status	Lead	Comments & next steps
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- TPG 2021-12: to more correctly capture that data may be collected from various, also non-official sources, the TPG recommended a revised definition as slightly changed in comparison to the version sent for the 1<sup>st</sup> consultation</li> <li>- SC 2022-11: sent to SC-7 2023 for additional work</li> <li>- TPG 2022-12: provided suggestions for sending for 3<sup>rd</sup> consultation</li> </ul>
7.	germplasm (2020-005)	To CPM-17 (2023)	Abigael Koech	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- TPG 2019-11: invites the SC to add it to the work programme</li> <li>- SC 2020-11: via e-decision agreed to add it to the LOT</li> <li>- TPG 2021-01: revised definition and presented to SC May 2021 as draft 2021 Amendments to ISPM 5 for 1<sup>st</sup> consultation</li> <li>- SC 2021-05: approved as modified at the meeting for submission to the 1<sup>st</sup> consultation</li> <li>- TPG 2021-12: recommended the revised definition be retained exactly as worded in the version sent for the 1<sup>st</sup> consultation</li> <li>- SC 2022-11: agreed to delete the term as submitted for adoption</li> </ul>
8.	identity (of a consignment) (2011-001)	To CPM-17 (2023)	Ebbe Nordbo	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- SC 2011-05: added based on CPM-6 discussion. At CPM-6, in relation to the revised ISPM 12, some members suggested that the SC consider whether there is a need to define the term “identity”, and the SC added the term to the work programme as TPG subject</li> <li>- TPG 2012: suggested an approach, but asked SC to validate before further work</li> <li>- SC 2013-05: agreed (see TPG 2012-10 report and SC 2013-05 report)</li> <li>- TPG 2014: discussed and incorporated into Amendments (2014)</li> <li>- SC 2014-05: withdrew from Amendments (2014) for TPG to reconsider identity, integrity (of a consignment), phytosanitary security (of a consignment) and section 6.1 of ISPM 12 be reviewed together, and possibly propose revised definitions of the terms and possible consistency changes to section 6.1 of ISPM 12</li> <li>- TPG 2014-12: reviewed; deferred final decision to e-forum discussion but agreed that terms and ISPM 12 will be processed combined only (for SC May 2015)</li> <li>- SC 2015-05: reviewed but asked TPG to prepare draft specification for the review of ISPM 12 in combination with this term, as not consistency changes or ink amendments</li> <li>- TPG 2015-06: prepared specification via TPG_2015-06_e-decision_03: Draft specification for the revision of ISPM 12 and submitted to 2015-08 Call for topics</li> <li>- SC 2015-11: recommended addition of topic to LOT to be approved by CPM-11 (2016). If approved, focused revision of ISPM 12 will be prepared. (Consider if apply “phytosanitary status” revisions as well)</li> <li>- Secretariat suggesting waiting with further work pending revision of ISPM 12 (SC not made pending)</li> </ul>



N	Term	Status	Lead	Comments & next steps
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- CPM-11 (2016): approved the addition of the Revision of ISPM 12 on Phytosanitary certificates (2015-011), with priority 2. The draft specification will be submitted to consultation in July 2017.</li> <li>- SC 2017-11: agreed to review the comments and consider the draft specification by SC e-decision</li> <li>- SC approved Specification 67: Focused revision of ISPM 12 (Phytosanitary certificates) in relation to re-export by e-decision (2018_eSC_May_03)</li> <li>- TPG 2019-11: TPG Steward and TPG Assistant Steward prepared discussion paper for EWG on sections 4 and 6 of ISPM 12 and agreed to continue working on term</li> <li>- TPG 2021-01: revised definition and presented to SC May 2021 as draft 2021 Amendments to ISPM 5 for 1<sup>st</sup> consultation</li> <li>- SC 2021-05: approved as modified at the meeting for submission to the 1<sup>st</sup> consultation</li> <li>- TPG 2021-12: recommended the revised definition be retained exactly as worded in the version sent for the 1<sup>st</sup> consultation</li> <li>- SC 2022-11: agreed for adoption</li> </ul>
9.	inspection (2017-005)	To SC-7 2023	Rajesh Ramarathnam	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- TPG 2016-12: invited the SC to consider if inspection should be revised to adequately reflect current inspection practices that may also include examination methods other than visual and if so add this term to the LOT</li> <li>- SC 2017-05: added “inspection” to the LOT</li> <li>- TPG 2017-12: proposed a revision of the term in the 2018 Amendments</li> <li>- SC 2018-05: discussed TPG proposal and agreed to further consider this term in an SC e-forum.</li> <li>- 2018_eSC_Nov_01: SC decided that the term requires further discussion during SC November 2018 and TPG 2018-12</li> <li>- TPG 2018-12: discussed the term and agreed to continue discussion during TPG 2019 based on current TPG working definition to potentially include meaning as in ISPM 23</li> <li>- TPG 2019-11: agreed to continue working on it</li> <li>- TPG 2021-01: revised definition and presented to SC May 2021 as draft 2021 Amendments to ISPM 5 for 1<sup>st</sup> consultation</li> <li>- SC 2021-05: approved as modified at the meeting for submission to the 1<sup>st</sup> consultation</li> <li>- TPG 2021-12: recommended the revised definition be retained exactly as worded in the version sent for the 1<sup>st</sup> consultation</li> <li>- SC 2022-11: returned to TPG after 2<sup>nd</sup> consultation asking for additional work</li> <li>- TPG 2022-12: reviewed and made recommendation for adoption with no change</li> </ul>
10.	integrity (of a consignment) (consequential) (2021-008)	To CPM-17 (2023)	Ebbe Nordbo	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- See identity</li> <li>- SC 2014-05: withdrew from Amendments (2014), TPG to reconsider</li> <li>- TPG 2014-12: reviewed; deferred final decision to e-forum discussion but agreed that terms and ISPM 12 will be processed combined only (for SC May 2015)</li> </ul>

N	Term	Status	Lead	Comments & next steps
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- SC 2015-05: reviewed but asked TPG to prepare draft specification for the review of ISPM 12 in combination with this term, as not consistency changes or ink amendments</li> <li>- TPG 2015-06: prepared specification via TPG_2015-06_e-decision_03: Draft specification for the revision of ISPM 12 and submitted to 2015-08 Call for topics</li> <li>- SC 2015-11: recommended addition of topic to the LOT to be approved by CPM-11 (2016). If approved, focused revision of ISPM 12 will be prepared</li> <li>- CPM-11 (2016): approved the addition of the Revision of ISPM 12 on Phytosanitary certificates (2015-011), with priority 2. The draft specification will be submitted to consultation in July 2017</li> <li>- SC 2017-11: agreed to review the comments and consider the draft specification by SC e-decision</li> <li>- SC approved Specification 67: Focused revision of ISPM 12 (Phytosanitary certificates) in relation to re-export by e-decision (2018_eSC_May_03)</li> <li>- TPG 2019-11: TPG Steward and TPG Assistant Steward prepared discussion paper for EWG on sections 4 and 6 of ISPM 12 and agreed to continue working on term</li> <li>- TPG 2021-01: revised definition and presented to SC May 2021 as draft 2021 Amendments to ISPM 5 for 1<sup>st</sup> consultation</li> <li>- SC 2021-05: agreed to add the subject to the TPG work programme and approved as modified at the meeting for submission to the 1<sup>st</sup> consultation</li> <li>- TPG 2021-12: given that countries' comments had mainly requested clarity as regards seals, the TPG recommended a revised definition as slightly changed in comparison to the version sent for the 1<sup>st</sup> consultation</li> <li>- SC 2022-11: agreed for adoption with no changes made following 2<sup>nd</sup> consultation</li> </ul>
11.	phytosanitary action (2020-006)	To SC-7 2023	Rajesh Ramarathnam	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- TPG 2019-11: invites the SC to add it to the work programme</li> <li>- SC 2020-11: via e-decision agreed to add it to the LOT</li> <li>- TPG 2021-01: agreed to continue working on it</li> <li>- TPG 2021-12: revised and agreed to propose the amended definition to SC May 2022 for 1<sup>st</sup> consultation</li> <li>- TPG 2022-12: recommended to SC-7 for second consultation with no changes</li> </ul>
12.	phytosanitary procedure (2020-007)	To SC-7 2023	Rajesh Ramarathnam	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- TPG 2019-11: invites the SC to add it to the work programme</li> <li>- SC 2020-11: via e-decision agreed to add it to the LOT</li> <li>- TPG 2021-01: agreed to continue working on it</li> <li>- TPG 2021-12: revised and agreed to propose the amended definition to SC May 2022 for 1<sup>st</sup> consultation</li> <li>- TPG 2022-12: recommended to SC-7 for second consultation linking it to the definition of phytosanitary action</li> </ul>

N	Term	Status	Lead	Comments & next steps
13.	phytosanitary security (of a consignment) (2013-008)	To CPM-17 (2023)	Ebbe Nordbo	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- See identity</li> <li>- TPG 2012, added SC 2013-05: Details in TPG 2012-10 report</li> <li>- SC 2013-05: added term to List of topics</li> <li>- TPG 2014: incorporated to Amendments (2014)</li> <li>- SC 2014-05: withdrew from Amendments (2014), TPG to reconsider</li> <li>- TPG 2014-12: reviewed; deferred final decision to e-forum discussion but agreed that terms and ISPM 12 will be processed combined only (for SC May 2015)</li> <li>- SC 2015-05: reviewed but asked TPG to prepare draft specification for the review of ISPM 12 in combination with this term, as not consistency changes or ink amendments</li> <li>- TPG 2015-06: prepared specification via TPG_2015-06_e-decision_03: Draft specification for the revision of ISPM 12 and submitted to 2015-08 Call for topics</li> <li>- SC 2015-11: recommended addition of topic to LOT to be approved by CPM-11 (2016). If approved, a focused revision of ISPM 12 will be prepared</li> <li>- CPM-11 (2016): approved the addition of the Revision of ISPM 12 on Phytosanitary certificates (2015-011), with priority 2. The draft specification will be submitted to consultation in July 2017</li> <li>- SC 2017-11: agreed to review the comments and consider the draft specification by SC e-decision</li> <li>- SC approved Specification 67: Focused revision of ISPM 12 (Phytosanitary certificates) in relation to re-export by e-decision (2018_eSC_May_03)</li> <li>- TPG 2019-11: TPG Assistant Steward and TPG Steward prepared discussion paper for EWG on sections 4 and 6 of ISPM 12 and agreed to continue working on term</li> <li>- TPG 2021-01: revised definition and presented to SC May 2021 as draft 2021 Amendments to ISPM 5 for 1<sup>st</sup> consultation</li> <li>- SC 2021-05: approved as modified at the meeting for submission to the 1<sup>st</sup> consultation</li> <li>- TPG 2021-12: recommended keeping the definition simple by retaining the amendment exactly as worded in the version sent for the 1<sup>st</sup> consultation</li> <li>- SC 2022-11: agreed for adoption with slight change compared to the version sent for 2<sup>nd</sup> consultation</li> </ul>
14.	provisional measure (2020-008)	To CPM-17 (2023)	Rajesh Ramarathnam	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- TPG 2019-11: invites the SC to add it to the work programme</li> <li>- SC 2020-11: via e-decision agreed to add it to the LOT</li> <li>- TPG 2021-01: revised definition and presented to SC May 2021 as draft 2021 Amendments to ISPM 5 for 1<sup>st</sup> consultation</li> <li>- SC 2021-05: approved as modified at the meeting for submission to the 1<sup>st</sup> consultation</li> <li>- TPG 2021-12: recommended the revised definition be retained exactly as worded in the version sent for the 1<sup>st</sup> consultation</li> <li>- SC 2022-11 agreed for adoption with two changes compared to the version sent for 2<sup>nd</sup> consultation</li> </ul>

N	Term	Status	Lead	Comments & next steps
15.	release (of a consignment) (2021-007)	To SC-7 2023	Ebbe Nordbo	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- TPG 2020-12: discussed 1<sup>st</sup> consultation comments clearance (of a consignment) and proposed to add to work programme Release (of a consignment) and presented revised definition to SC May 2021 as draft 2021 Amendments to ISPM 5 for 1<sup>st</sup> consultation</li> <li>- SC 2021-05: agreed to add the subject to the TPG work programme and approved as modified at the meeting for submission to the 1<sup>st</sup> consultation</li> <li>- TPG 2021-12: recommended a revised definition as slightly changed in comparison to the version sent for the 1<sup>st</sup> consultation</li> <li>- SC 2022-11: sent it to SC-7 for additional work</li> <li>- TPG 2022-12: provided recommendations for adoption with no changes.</li> </ul>
16.	specific surveillance (2018-047)	To SC-7 2023	Beatriz Melcho	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- TPG 2018-12: proposed to add to the LOT following discussions on the note on “surveillance” in the Annotated Glossary</li> <li>- SC 2019-05: added to LOT</li> <li>- TPG 2019-11: agreed to continue working on it</li> <li>- TPG 2021-01: elaborated definition and presented to SC May 2021 as draft 2021 Amendments to ISPM 5 for 1<sup>st</sup> consultation</li> <li>- SC 2021-05: approved as modified at the meeting for submission to the 1<sup>st</sup> consultation</li> <li>- TPG 2021-12: recommended the revised definition be retained exactly as worded in the version sent for the 1<sup>st</sup> consultation</li> <li>- SC 2022-11: sent to SC-7 2023 for additional work</li> <li>- TPG 2022-12: provided suggestions for sending for 3<sup>rd</sup> consultation</li> </ul>
17.	surveillance (2020-009)	To SC-7 2023	Beatriz Melcho	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- TPG 2019-11: agreed to recommend to SC to add it to the work programme</li> <li>- SC 2020-11: via e-decision agreed to add it to the LOT</li> <li>- TPG 2021-01: revised definition and presented to SC May 2021 as draft 2021 Amendments to ISPM 5 for 1<sup>st</sup> consultation</li> <li>- SC 2021-05: approved as modified at the meeting for submission to the 1<sup>st</sup> consultation</li> <li>- TPG 2021-12: recommended a revised definition as slightly changed in comparison to the version sent for the 1<sup>st</sup> consultation</li> <li>- SC 2022-11: sent to SC-7 2023 for additional work</li> <li>- TPG 2022-12: provided suggestions for sending for 3<sup>rd</sup> consultation</li> </ul>
18.	test (consequential to “inspection”) (2021-005)	To SC-7 2023	Ebbe Nordbo	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- TPG 2020-12: discussed revision of “inspection” and agreed to proposed to add to work programme “test” consequential revision and presented revised definition to SC May 2021 as draft 2021 Amendments to ISPM 5 for 1<sup>st</sup> consultation</li> <li>- SC 2021-05: agreed to add the subject to the TPG work programme and approved as modified at the meeting for submission to the 1<sup>st</sup> consultation</li> <li>- TPG 2021-12: recommended a revised definition as slightly changed in comparison to the version sent for the 1<sup>st</sup> consultation</li> </ul>

N	Term	Status	Lead	Comments & next steps
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- SC 2022-11: sent to back to TPG for additional work</li> <li>- TPG 2022-12: made recommendation to SC-7 for 3<sup>rd</sup> consultation</li> </ul>
<b>Related to consistency</b>				
19.	Review of the use of and/or in adopted ISPMs (2010-030)	Ongoing	Stays on the work programme to be implemented during the consistency review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- TPG discussion 2009</li> <li>- Modified SC November 2010</li> <li>- Consistent with general recommendations on consistency, but require a review of every occurrence. Will be considered during consistency study</li> </ul>