



UPDATE ON ACTIVITIES OF THE TECHNICAL PANEL FOR THE GLOSSARY FROM MAY 2019 TO MAY 2020

(Prepared by the IPPC Secretariat with input from the TPG Stewards)

1. BACKGROUND

1.1 Stewards

[1] The Stewards for the Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG) are:

- Ms Laurence BOUHOT-DELDUC (Steward)
- Mr Ebbe NORDBO (Assistant steward)

1.2 IPPC Secretariat support and TPG membership

[2] Mr Artur SHAMILOV is the current IPPC Secretariat lead for the Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG) with Aoife CASSIN as support. Ms Aixa DEL GRECO is a support for implementation of ink amendments and communication with FAO Translation Office (CPAM). Ms Sandra GORITSCHNIG was TPG lead until December 2019.

[3] Membership of the TPG as of April 2020:

Name	Language	End of term
Ms Beatriz MELCHO (Uruguay)	Spanish	2020 (1 st term: 2010-2015)
Mr Andrei ORLINSKI (EPPO)	Russian	2020 (1 st term: 2010-2015)
Ms Shaza Roshdy OMAR (Egypt)	Arabic	2022 (1 st term: 2012-2017)
Ms Hong NING (China)	Chinese	2022 (1 st term: 2012-2017)
Ms Asenath Abigail KOECH (Kenya)	English	2022
Ms Laurence BOUHOT-DELDUC (Steward) (France)	French	2023 (1 st term 2013-2018)
Mr Ebbe NORDBO (Assistant steward) (Denmark)	English	2024 (2 nd term: 2014-2019)
Mr Rajesh RAMARATHNAM (Canada)	English	2024

[4] It was noted that the terms of Ms Beatriz MELCHO (Uruguay) and Mr Andrei ORLINSKI (EPPO) would be ending in 2020. Ms MELCHO informed the TPG that she would be willing to continue as a member for a third term. Mr ORLINSKI informed the TPG that, pending approval by the SC and continued support by his employer, he would be willing to continue as a member for one further year. The TPG supported continuing the membership of Ms MELCHO and Mr ORLINSKI for a third term and for one year, respectively. In May 2020 Mr ORLINSKI confirmed his employer's support, until 1st July 2021 (retirement date of Mr ORLINSKI). Therefore, a Call for Russian language expert to take part in the TPG shall be issued to start the term of a new TPG member from 2021.

[5] ➔ Corresponding recommendations: (1) and (2).

1.3 Volume of work for the TPG from May 2019 to May 2020

[6] The Technical Panel for the Glossary met in Rome, Italy, on 18-20 November 2019. The report from the meeting is available on the IPP¹.

[7] Currently the TPG has **28 terms** on its work programme, as follows:

¹ 2019-11 TPG meeting report: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/88134/>

- **12 terms** are currently under development;
- **9 terms** have been submitted to the CPM-15;
- **6 terms** have been recommended for addition to the List of Topics for IPPC Standards;
- the consistency review of **1 term** has been submitted to the CPM-15 as ink amendments to adopted standards.

[8] The issues discussed are summarized below and references given to the relevant sections in the TPG report. All recommendations for SC decisions are at the end of the document, and links to proposed decisions are given under each section.

2. REVIEW OF DRAFT ISPMs SENT FOR THE FIRST CONSULTATION IN 2019

Draft ISPMs from the 2019 first consultation

[9] The TPG noted that, for the 8 draft phytosanitary treatments at the first consultation period, no comments on consistency had been received, neither from contracting parties nor from TPG members.

3. INDIVIDUAL TERMS AND DEFINITIONS AND AMENDMENTS TO THE GLOSSARY

3.1 Consideration of terms in the *List of topics for IPPC standards (Subjects on the TPG Work Programme)*

[10] The TPG discussed terms on the *List of topics for IPPC standards (Subjects on the TPG Work Programme)* based on proposals prepared by its members. The outcome of the discussions is summarized below, and details are given in section 6 of the TPG 2019-11 report. Proposals agreed by the TPG for new or revised terms and definitions, as well as justifications, are included in the 2020 *Amendments to the Glossary* as submitted to the SC for approval for consultation in 2020.

“Incidence” (2018-010)

[11] During the 2018 Call for topics, a proposal had been submitted to revise the definition of the term “incidence” and define the term “prevalence”, as their meaning can be confused in epidemiological and phytosanitary contexts. In response, the SC at its meeting in November 2018 had instead proposed that “incidence” be deleted from the Glossary and that the terms “incidence” and “prevalence” be used in their common, dictionary sense in ISPMs. The SC had therefore added the term “incidence” to the TPG work programme and requested that the TPG consider deleting it from the Glossary.

[12] The TPG discussed the relative merits of retaining “incidence” in the Glossary, replacing it by “prevalence”, or having both terms in the Glossary.

[13] Recognizing the direction set out by the SC, the TPG proposed that the term “incidence” be deleted from the Glossary, with no ink amendments to the definition of “tolerance level”, and that the words “incidence” and “prevalence” be used in ISPMs with their general, dictionary meaning.

“Emergency action” (2018-044)

[14] The TPG analyzed the use of the terms “emergency action” and “phytosanitary action” in adopted ISPMs and agreed that the definition of “emergency action” should be revised by:

- removing “phytosanitary” from “phytosanitary action” to clarify that an emergency action can target both regulated and non-regulated pests;
- replacing “phytosanitary” with “official” to emphasize that any emergency action should be taken under the authority of the NPPO; and
- replacing “action” with “operation”, for consistency with the definition for “phytosanitary action”.

[15] The TPG noted the need for some minor amendments to ISPM 18 (*Guidelines for the use of irradiation as a phytosanitary measure*), ISPM 20 (*Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system*) and ISPM 26 (*Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)*) at their future revision, mainly for the correct use of the terms “phytosanitary action” and “emergency action”. The TPG noted that when ISPMs are being drafted, care should be taken to use:

- the term “phytosanitary action” for actions taken to implement phytosanitary measures (e.g. in case of non-compliance of a consignment with phytosanitary import requirements);
- the term “emergency action” for new or unexpected phytosanitary situations, such as the detection in an imported consignment of a pest not previously assessed.

[16] ➔ Corresponding recommendation: (3).

“Clearance (of a consignment)” (2018-045)

[17] The TPG agreed that clearance should be understood as a process, and an official such. The TPG noted that adding in the definition that clearance “results in release or interception” would unnecessarily restrict the term to the import context only. For export, clearance would result either in issuance of a phytosanitary certificate or such issuance being declined, but neither the import nor export context needs to be mentioned.

[18] Accordingly, the TPG agreed to revised definition of “clearance (of a consignment)”.

[19] The TPG agreed that “by clearance” should be deleted from section 3.2.2 in ISPM 9 (*Guidelines for pest eradication programmes*) at its future revision, as the wording is redundant.

[20] ➔ Corresponding recommendation: (4).

“Inspection” (2017-005)

[21] The TPG discussed a proposal for a revised definition of “inspection” that explicitly would include all three elements outlined in ISPM 23 (*Guidelines for inspection*), i.e. the checking of documents, verification of consignment identity and integrity, and visual examination. The TPG decided to continue the discussion at their next meeting, in particular because the TPG work on the consignment-related terms “identity” and “integrity” may be restarted at that same occasion.

“General surveillance” (2018-046) and “specific surveillance” (2018-047)

[22] The TPG discussed proposals for definitions for “general surveillance” and “specific surveillance”, based on analyses of how they are explained and used in ISPMs, in particular the recently revised ISPM 6 (*Surveillance*), and how the terms relate to “survey”. The TPG clarified that apparently the only distinction between the two concepts is the data sources used. The TPG agreed to continue consideration of the two terms (and of the Glossary term “surveillance”, subject to SC agreement) at their next meeting.

3.2 Proposed additions to the List of Topics for IPPC Standards

“Surveillance”

[23] In the context of discussing the terms and definitions of “general surveillance” (2018-046) and “specific surveillance” (2018-047), the TPG discussed the current definition of the Glossary term “surveillance”, as compared to how surveillance is explained in the recently revised ISPM 6 (*Surveillance*), and how the three terms and definitions could inter-relate. The TPG felt that a revision of the definition of the term “surveillance” seems necessary and considered various possible definitions, ranging from modifications of the current Glossary definition to one that simply said that surveillance was “general surveillance and specific surveillance”.

[24] The TPG concluded by provisionally agreeing the following revised definition of “surveillance”:

- ~~An official process which collects and records data on pest presence or absence by using surveys, monitoring or other procedures~~ sources of information to collect and record data on pests

[25] This refers to “pests” rather than “pest presence or absence”, to allow for other surveillance of other characteristics of pests, and refers to “sources of information” rather than “other procedures”, to allow for sources that are not procedures.

[26] The TPG agreed to continue consideration of “general surveillance” (2018-046) and “specific surveillance” (2018-047) at their next meeting.

[27] ➔ Corresponding recommendation: (5).

“Germplasm”

[28] The TPG discussed the current definition of “germplasm” and suggested it may need a logic, yet minor revision to replace “plants” with “plants for planting”.

[29] Corresponding recommendation: (6).

“Emergency measure”, “provisional measure”, “phytosanitary procedure” and “phytosanitary action”

[30] In the context of discussing the term and definition of “emergency action” (2018-044), the TPG discussed the current Glossary terms and definitions “emergency measure”, “provisional measure”, “phytosanitary procedure” and “phytosanitary action”. The TPG considered whether the definition of “emergency measure” needed amending, because it refers to “phytosanitary measure” and “provisional measure”, which in turn relate to “phytosanitary regulation”, which relates to regulated pests, i.e. a complex series of highly convoluted definitions. The TPG also noted that “phytosanitary procedure” is not commonly used and may also benefit from review.

[31] With regard to “phytosanitary action”, the TPG recalled its earlier discussion on how the term “emergency action” would apply for a new or an emerging pest that is discovered – for instance a pest that is not yet regulated being discovered in an imported consignment. The TPG had considered it appropriate that this situation could be covered by “emergency action” but had noted that, since the definition of “emergency action” refers back to “phytosanitary action” and therefore to the implementation of a “phytosanitary measure”, it is directed against regulated pests only.

[32] In relation to the Glossary definition of “provisional measure”, the TPG discussed whether “procedure” should be set in bold, to indicate that it refers to a “phytosanitary procedure”. However, the TPG noted that it may not be a “phytosanitary procedure” and so the definition should be left as it is for now until further review as recommended. The TPG concluded, that the terms and definitions of “emergency measure”, “provisional measure”, “phytosanitary procedure” and “phytosanitary action” may need a major overhaul through analyzing their inter-relations and current use in ISPMs, with a view to possibly simplify the bouquet of terms.

[33] ➔ Corresponding recommendation: (7).

3.3 Preview EWG on *focused revision of ISPM 12 (Phytosanitary certificates) in relation to re-export (2015-011) and related subjects: “identity” (2011-001), “integrity (of a consignment)” (consequential) and “phytosanitary security (of a consignment)” (2013-008)*

[34] The TPG recalled, that, when adopting the revised ISPM 12 (*Phytosanitary certificates*) in 2011, the CPM had requested the SC to consider the need to define “identity (of a consignment)”, as being significant to the understanding of ISPM 12 and other ISPMs. In 2012 the TPG had initiated its analyses of the use in ISPMs of “identity” in the consignment context, and of the related terms “integrity (of a consignment)” and “phytosanitary security (of a consignment)”.

- [35] In 2015, the SC had decided upon a two-step approach of first arranging a focused revision of ISPM 12 in relation to re-export through a new expert drafting group (EDG) and subsequently finalizing definition issues with TPG assistance. In Specification 67, the EDG was asked to provide explanations in “plain wording” and avoid using the three terms under scrutiny.
- [36] The TPG identified inconsistencies in ISPM 12 beyond those in the re-export context and provided recommendations for amendments to the SC (see relevant SC e-decision background and Stewards notes).
- [37] The TPG agreed that, although “phytosanitary security” is under consideration, it is acceptable to retain it where currently used in ISPM 12.
- [38] The TPG recalled the proposal, prepared by the TPG and endorsed by the SC in 2015, on proposed changes to section 5 to avoid uses of “phytosanitary status”².
- [39] The TPG realized that a re-start of the process of considering the three terms “identity (of a consignment)” (2011-001), “integrity (of a consignment)” and “phytosanitary security (of a consignment)” (2013-008) may probably be requested by the SC in 2020. The TPG briefly discussed some initial, tentative thoughts on possible definitions for these three terms³ that may be of use in the further process.

4. REVIEW OF ISPMs FOR CONSISTENCY OF TERMS AND STYLE

4.1 General recommendations on consistency

- [40] The TPG noted that the *General recommendations on use of terms in ISPMs*, as modified by TPG in 2018, had subsequently been published in the *IPPC style guide*⁴ and the SC informed at their meeting in May 2019. Since then, no amendments had been proposed.
- [41] ➔ Corresponding recommendation: (8).

4.2 Consistency of adopted ISPMs

- [42] The Secretariat had informed the TPG that the *List of proposed or approved ink amendments for ISPMs* includes those standards which have been republished after the incorporation of approved ink amendments since the last TPG meeting⁵. The list will be updated again in 2020.

5. ANNOTATED GLOSSARY: 2019 INTERMEDIATE VERSION

- [43] The Annotated Glossary, version 5, had been finalized by the TPG in December 2018 and published in March 2019⁶. The next version is due for publication in 2022. The 2019 intermediate version had been prepared and submitted to the TPG for comments in June 2019⁷.
- [44] The TPG reviewed the comments and agreed on several changes.

² Appendix 3 of 08_TPG_2019_Nov

³ Appendix 2 of 08_TPG_2019_Nov

⁴ *IPPC style guide*: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/132/>

⁵ List of ink amendments proposed or approved for ISPMs: <https://www.ippc.int/en/work-area-pages/technical-panel-for-the-glossary-tpg/>

⁶ 2019 Annotated Glossary: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/87049/>

⁷ 2019 intermediate version of Annotated Glossary: <https://www.ippc.int/en/work-area-pages/technical-panel-for-the-glossary-tpg/>

- [45] The TPG lead shall prepare a 2020 intermediate version based on the outcomes of the 2019 TPG meeting, CPM-15 (2020) and the May 2020 SC meeting, and subsequently share it with the TPG.

6. EXPLANATION OF GLOSSARY TERMS

- [46] This standing agenda item at TPG meetings allows for TPG members to enquire about and discuss specific Glossary terms. The following terms were discussed:
- [47] **Pest reporting.** One TPG member had suggested that a definition of this term may be useful, to avoid having to refer to ISPM 17 (*Pest reporting*) for an explanation and to highlight the fact that pest reporting is exclusively official, in contrast to the elaboration of “pest records” (as defined in the Glossary) by others (academic researchers, foresters, etc.). The TPG agreed to not recommend this subject to the SC at this stage, but to wait until the IPPC pest status guide has been further developed, and to review the matter at their next meeting.
- [48] **Free from.** One TPG member queried why the qualifier for this term in the Glossary mentions consignments, fields or places of production, but not areas, given that there can be pest free areas (another Glossary term). The TPG considered that the existence of the Glossary term “pest free area” means that areas do not need to be covered by the term “free from”.
- [49] **Invasive species.** One TPG member queried whether greater clarity is needed on this term, but the TPG recalled that guidance already exists in Appendix 1 to the Glossary (Terminology of the Convention on Biological Diversity in relation to the *Glossary of phytosanitary terms*).
- [50] **Pest risk.** One TPG member highlighted concerns with the qualifiers to the two “pest risk” terms for quarantine pests and regulated non-quarantine pests, respectively: the pest risk terms and definitions, with the current qualifier preposition “for”, could be understood as applying only to pests once they had become regulated, whereas in fact the pest risk is actually most often evaluated prior to any decision on whether and how to possibly regulate the pest. The TPG noted, however, that “for” means “in relation to” in this context and so agreed that no changes were necessary.

6.1 Draft explanatory document on ISPM 16 (Regulated non-quarantine pests: concept and application)

- [51] The TPG recalled that the SC in May 2018 had tasked the TPG with reviewing and finalizing the draft explanatory document on ISPM 16 (*Regulated non-quarantine pests: concept and application*) in collaboration with the IC, with a view to having it published. The TPG finalized its review of the document by making some additional minor changes.
- [52] The TPG agreed that the document could be shared with the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC), but asked that the Secretariat undertake an editorial review of the text beforehand.
- [53] ➔ Corresponding recommendation: (9).

7. TPG WORK PLAN

7.1 TPG work plan for 2020-2021

- [54] The TPG updated its work plan for 2020 to be presented to the SC meeting in May 2020⁸.
- [55] ➔ Corresponding recommendation: (10).

⁸ TPG work plan: <https://www.ippc.int/en/work-area-publications/5988/>

7.2 Inclusion of terms in the Glossary if only in one standard

[56] The TPG queried the sentence in the SC May 2019 report that referred to terms not normally being included in the Glossary if used only in one standard. It was recalled that the *Guidelines for a consistent ISPM terminology* in the *IPPC procedure manual for standard setting*, as agreed by the TPG and endorsed by the SC, did not include such a restriction; terms can be defined in the Glossary even if they appear in only one standard, because they may well be used in future standards and be useful as globally harmonized terms. In the rare cases where the CPM decides that a definition should only apply to one particular ISPM, the term will be defined only in and for that ISPM. Thus, decisions on this are made on a case-by-case basis.

[57] ➔ Corresponding recommendation: (11).

8. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

[58] **Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety.** The Secretariat updated the TPG on progress with the compilation of selected terms used in the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety or its associated agreements and the IPPC. In 2016, the Secretariat had been invited by the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) to collaborate in the development of this document and the TPG had worked on it. The compilation had been finalized in 2018 and was published on the CBD website in February 2019⁹.

9. TPG RECOMMENDATIONS FOR SC DECISIONS

[59] The SC is invited to:

- (1) *Support* continuation of the membership of Ms MELCHO and Mr ORLINSKI for a third term and for one year, respectively;
- (2) *Agree to* issue a call for expert for Russian language for the TPG starting the term from 2021;
- (3) *Note* the TPG's proposed amendments to ISPM 18 (*Guidelines for the use of irradiation as a phytosanitary measure*), ISPM 20 (*Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system*) and ISPM 26 (*Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)*) and request that the Secretariat archive these amendments for future revision of these ISPMs (Appendix 1);
- (4) *Note* the TPG's suggested amendment to ISPM 9 (*Guidelines for pest eradication programmes*) and request that the Secretariat archive this amendment for future revision of ISPM 9 (Appendix 1);
- (5) *Consider* adding the term "surveillance" to the TPG work programme in the *List of topics for IPPC standards*;
- (6) *Consider* adding the term "germplasm" to the *List of topics for IPPC standards*;
- (7) *Consider* adding the terms "emergency measure", "provisional measure", "phytosanitary procedure" and "phytosanitary action" to the TPG work programme in the *List of topics for IPPC standards*;
- (8) *Note* that the *General recommendations on use of terms in ISPMs* remain unchanged;
- (9) *Share* the draft explanatory document on ISPM 16 (*Regulated non-quarantine pests: concept and application*) with the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee for their comments;
- (10) *Note* the *TPG work plan for 2020*;

⁹ Compilation of selected terms used in the Cartagena Protocol and the IPPC: <https://bch.cbd.int/protocol/whathasbeendone/Art18/paragraph3.shtml>; <https://bch.cbd.int/article%2018/compilation%20of%20terms.pdf>

- (11) *Note that terms may be included in ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms) even if used in only one ISPM, provided they meet the criteria set out in the Guidelines for a consistent ISPM terminology in the IPPC procedure manual for standard setting.*

Appendix 1: Proposed Amendments to ISPMs (for noting by the Standards Committee and archiving by the Secretariat for future revision of these ISPMs)

ISPM 18 (<i>Guidelines for the use of irradiation as a phytosanitary measure</i>), section 8.3 on Import inspection:		Rationale
First paragraph	NPPOs should clearly identify the contingency actions to be taken if live pests are found	Because “contingency” relates to both emergency actions and phytosanitary actions, but is not defined and is redundant (as the rest of the sentence and bullet points explain the meaning)
ISPM 20 (<i>Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system</i>), section 5.1.6.2 on Emergency action:		Rationale
Heading for 5.1.6.2	5.1.6.2 Emergency or <u>phytosanitary</u> action	To reflect amendments later in this section
Second chapeau	Commonly encountered situations requiring emergency action <u>or phytosanitary action</u> include:	To allow for both emergency and phytosanitary actions
<i>Pests not previously assessed</i> , first sentence	Non-listed organisms may require emergency phytosanitary actions because they may not have been previously assessed.	The term “emergency phytosanitary action” is confusing
<i>Pests not regulated for a particular pathway</i> , first sentence	Emergency phytosanitary actions may be applied for pests that are not regulated with respect to particular pathways.	The term “emergency phytosanitary action” is confusing
Heading for <i>Lack of adequate identification</i>	<i>Lack of adequate identification or taxonomic description</i>	To reflect better the content of this section
<i>Lack of adequate identification</i> , first sentence	In some instances, a pest may justify <u>emergency or phytosanitary</u> action because the pest cannot be adequately identified or is inadequately described taxonomically.	The title of section 5.1.6.2 and the chapeau “Commonly encountered situations ...” refer to “emergency action”
<i>Lack of adequate identification</i> , first paragraph, last sentence	Where identification is not feasible, the NPPO should have a sound technical basis for the phytosanitary actions taken.	The meaning of “technical basis” in this context is unclear; it is also questionable whether technical justification is needed for emergency action
ISPM 26 (<i>Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)</i>), section 3.2.1 on Ground application:		Rationale
First sentence	In FF-PFAs, as part of an emergency <u>corrective</u> action plan to eliminate an outbreak, the insecticide bait can also be applied to non-host plants or other	Because in this situation, phytosanitary actions are urgently taken to implement existing phytosanitary measures

	appropriate surfaces around the detection site.	
ISPM 9 (<i>Guidelines for pest eradication programmes</i>), section 3.2.2 on Containment:		Rationale
Second paragraph	Arrangements should be made for the release of plants, plant products or other regulated articles from the quarantine area, by clearance following verification of compliance with phytosanitary measures such as inspection, treatment or destruction.	The reference to “release ... following verification of compliance” makes “by clearance” redundant.