



# ***REPORT***

*(Revised on 2016-03-13  
to correct editorial errors)*

**Rome, Italy  
7-10 December 2015**

# **Technical Panel for the Glossary December, 2015**



**Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations**

## Contents

1.	Opening of the meeting .....	4
1.1	Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat .....	4
1.2	Selection of the Chairperson and Rapporteur.....	4
1.3	Review and adoption of the agenda .....	4
2.	Administrative Matters .....	4
3.	Reports.....	4
3.1	Previous meetings of the TPG (December 2014).....	4
3.2	Extracts from other meeting reports of relevance to the TPG (SC, CPM).....	4
3.3	Current work plan .....	5
4.	Review Relating to draft ISPMs Sent for Member Consultation in 2015 (1 Feb-30 June and 1 July-30 November) .....	5
4.1	Draft appendix to ISPM 20 – Arrangements for verification of compliance of consignments by the importing country in the exporting country (2005-003).....	6
4.2	Draft amendments to Annex 1 and 2 of ISPM 15 for inclusion of the phytosanitary treatment Sulphuryl fluoride fumigation of wood packaging material (2006-010A) and the revision of the dielectric heating section in Annex 1 of ISPM 15 (2006-010B).....	6
4.3	Draft annex to ISPM 28 – Sulphuryl fluoride fumigation of insects in debarked wood (2007-101A).....	7
4.4	Draft annex to ISPM 28 – Sulphuryl fluoride fumigation of nematodes and insects in debarked wood (2007-101B).....	8
4.5	Draft annex to ISPM 28 – Heat treatment of wood using dielectric heating (2007-114) .....	8
4.6	Draft annex to ISPM 28 – Vapour heat treatment for <i>Bactrocera tryoni</i> on <i>Mangifera indica</i> (2010-107).....	8
4.7	Draft annexes (diagnostic protocols) to ISPM 27 .....	9
4.9	Draft annex to ISPM 27 – DP for <i>Aphelenchoides besseyi</i> , <i>A. fragariae</i> and <i>A. ritzemabosi</i> (2006-025) .....	9
4.10	Draft annex to ISPM 27 – DP for <i>Xanthomonas fragariae</i> (2004-012).....	10
4.11	Draft annex to ISPM 27 – DP for <i>Tomato spotted wilt virus</i> , <i>Impatiens necrotic spot virus</i> and <i>Watermelon silver mottle virus</i> (2004-019).....	10
4.12	Draft annex to ISPM 27 – DP for <i>Citrus tristeza virus</i> (2004-021) .....	10
4.13	Draft annex to ISPM 27 – DP for Genus <i>Liriomyza</i> (2006-017) .....	10
5.	Consideration of New or Revised Terms/Definitions.....	11
5.1	Subjects on the TPG work programme.....	11
5.1.1	“confinement facility” (2015-001) and “quarantine” (2015-002).....	11
5.1.2	“containment” (2011-004), “control (of a pest)” (2011-005), “eradication” (2011-003), “exclusion” (2010-008), “suppression” (2011-002) .....	12
5.1.3	“country of origin” (2006-016) .....	13
5.1.4	“practically free” .....	14
5.1.5	“pre-clearance” (2013-016) in the context of “clearance (of a consignment)” .....	14
5.1.6	“test” (2015-003) in relation with “visual examination” (2013-010) and “inspection” (2015-012).....	15
5.1.7	Concept of “traceability” and its use in ISPMs.....	16

6.	Review of ISPMs for Consistency of Terms and Style .....	17
6.1	General recommendations on consistency .....	17
6.2	Consistency of adopted ISPM (standard by standard) .....	18
6.2.1	ISPM 5 in Spanish for noting by CPM .....	18
6.3	Consistency across standards .....	18
6.3.1	“Trading partner” (2013-009) .....	18
7.	Annotated Glossary: 2013/14/15 Amendments .....	18
7.1	Current revision of the Annotated Glossary .....	18
8.	Explanation of Glossary Terms .....	19
9.	TPG Work Plan .....	20
10.	Membership of the TPG (see agenda item 2.3) .....	21
11.	Other Issues .....	21
11.1	The use of “IPPC” (when referred to as taking action) .....	21
11.2	Concept of terminology .....	22
11.3	Discussion of other terms .....	22
11.4	Implementation facilitation of the Glossary .....	22
12.	Date and Venue of the Next Meeting .....	22
13.	Close .....	22

## Appendices

APPENDIX 1 - Agenda .....	24
APPENDIX 2 - Documents list .....	27
APPENDIX 3 - Participants list .....	30
APPENDIX 4 - Draft 2016 Amendments to ISPM 5 ( <i>Glossary of phytosanitary terms</i> ) (1994-001) .....	32
APPENDIX 5 - Proposed ink amendments to ISPM 3 to replace “quarantine facility” with the glossary term “quarantine station” .....	37
APPENDIX 6 - Proposed ink amendment to “practically free” .....	39
APPENDIX 7 - Recommendations on use of specific terms .....	40
APPENDIX 8 - Consistency changes across ISPMs: <i>trading partner</i> (2013-009) .....	44
APPENDIX 9 - TPG Work Plan 2015-2016 .....	55

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

### **1.1 Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat**

- [1] The IPPC Secretariat (hereafter “Secretariat”) welcomed the participants and wished them a fruitful meeting.
- [2] The IPPC Secretary made opening remarks informing the Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG) of his background and professional experience. He also outlined his strategic approach to enhance the role of the IPPC on a global level, for instance through the Strategic Planning Group-validated yearly themes where he stressed the need for all CPs to work collaboratively to achieve the desired results. Internally, he explained, the Secretariat will be reshaped in order to increase cross-unit coordination by having two main technical teams (Standard Setting Unit and Implementation Facilitation Unit).
- [3] He expressed his respect for the work carried out by the TPG stressing how essential it is that the IPPC community “speaks the same language”. He suggested that thought be given to capacity development of IPPC terminology and urged all TPG members to actively (i) Increase awareness of the work of the TPG and the Glossary; (ii) Find ways of expanding the influence of the Glossary (e.g. in relation to forestry-related terminology or trade-related terminology such as ePhyto); and (iii) Consider how to increase the use of Glossary terms and their agreed definitions.
- [4] He concluded hoping that the TPG members would provide active engagement in the meeting.

### **1.2 Selection of the Chairperson and Rapporteur**

- [5] The TPG selected Mr John HEDLEY (New Zealand) as Chairperson and Mr Ebbe NORDBO (Denmark) as Rapporteur.

### **1.3 Review and adoption of the agenda**

- [6] Two items were added under agenda item 11. The TPG adopted the agenda as modified in the meeting (Appendix 1).

## **2. Administrative Matters**

- [7] The Secretariat clarified local arrangements and introduced the documents list (Appendix 2) and the participants list, inviting the TPG members to verify their contact details (Appendix 3).

## **3. Reports**

### **3.1 Previous meetings of the TPG (December 2014)**

- [8] There were no comments on the report of the TPG 2014-12 meeting<sup>1</sup>.

### **3.2 Extracts from other meeting reports of relevance to the TPG (SC, CPM)**

- [9] The Secretariat presented extracts of relevance to the TPG from meetings held by the Secretariat (CPM-10 (2015), SC May, SC-7 May, and SC November 2015)<sup>2</sup> since the last TPG meeting, noting that the TPG had received other updates via email.
- [10] The Secretariat also noted that the SC November 2015 had approved ink amendments to adopted phytosanitary treatments for the replacement of the abbreviation “ED” (for ‘Effective Dose’) with an appropriate wording. Some TPG members were concerned that the TPG was not involved in reviewing these ink amendments, considering the issue deriving from a former incorrect proposal for defining the term “effective dose”. However, being presented to the approved ink amendments, the TPG members fully supported those and the approach not to define ED.

---

<sup>1</sup> The reports from TPG meetings are available here: <https://www.ippc.int/core-activities/standards-setting/expert-drafting-groups/technical-panels/technical-panel-glossary-phytosanitary-terms-isp-5>

<sup>2</sup> 17\_TPG\_2015\_Dec

- [11] The TPG discussed the IPPC member comment suggesting to delete the term “mark” from the Glossary (in response to which the SC withdrew the term from the draft 2014 *Amendments to the Glossary*). Some TPG members questioned this suggestion, whilst others explained that there are currently many incorrect uses of this term in ISPMs, which would require numerous ink amendments, and that the explanation in ISPM 15 (*Regulation on wood packaging material in international trade*) the particular ISPM-15 mark seems sufficiently comprehensive to render useless any global definition. The term will be discussed in the next meeting.
- [12] The TPG also noted the SC discussion on the draft ISPM on the International movement of cut flowers and foliage (2008-005) whose scope had been modified to include foliage but not branches and that the SC acknowledged that the scope thus differed from the Glossary term and definition. The TPG reiterated that the scope of commodity-specific ISPMs obviously need to be well defined, but do not need to be identical to any definition in the Glossary. One TPG member suggested that perhaps some commodity and commodity class terms in the Glossary would need to be deleted, while another TPG member suggested such terms may need to be developed by other mechanisms and perhaps moved to another separate glossary.
- [13] As regards to the addition of “commodity class” to the work plan, some TPG members felt that the relation between harmonization of terms in ISPM 5 (*Glossary of Phytosanitary terms*) and ePhyto respectively needs thorough consideration and clarification. It was noted that the ePhyto commodity codes are built into a three-layer hierarchy. Also possible relations between ePhyto codes and customs codes may need to be considered.
- [14] This term will be discussed in the next meeting and the TPG felt that it would be very valuable to receive input on this from the ePhyto Steering group.
- [15] The TPG expressed appreciation for the fact that the TPG update from the SC May 2015 had been posted publicly.
- [16] The TPG:
- (1) *agreed* to invite a representative from the ePhyto Steering group to a dedicated part of the TPG 2016 meeting when dealing with the definition of “commodity”, “commodity class” and actual terms belonging to those two categories.

### 3.3 Current work plan

- [17] The current work plan, as decided by the TPG February 2013, was introduced. The work plan was updated during the meeting (see agenda item 9.1).

## 4. Review Relating to draft ISPMs Sent for Member Consultation in 2015 (1 Feb-30 June and 1 July-30 November)

- [18] The TPG reviewed member comments on terms and definitions, and the drafts for consistency in the use of terms.
- [19] The detailed TPG recommendations on member comments and consistency will be compiled by the Secretariat and Steward after the meeting, transmitted to the relevant ISPM stewards and posted as a meeting document for the SC-7 meeting in May 2016. For diagnostic protocols (DPs) and phytosanitary treatments (PTs), recommendations will be transmitted to the relevant TP steward. The tables of TPG recommendations are not attached to this report but will be posted on the TPG work area.
- [20] The proposals on translation of draft terms and definitions will be transmitted by the Secretariat to translators for their consideration when translating the standards.

#### 4.1 Draft appendix to ISPM 20 – Arrangements for verification of compliance of consignments by the importing country in the exporting country (2005-003)

- [21] The TPG Chairperson introduced the draft ISPM and the member comments on consistency in use of terms/definitions<sup>3</sup>.
- [22] The TPG discussed the following points:
- [23] **Annex, appendix or supplement.** The TPG noted that the recommendation on whether this document should be an annex or supplement (prescriptive) or an appendix (not prescriptive) was outside of the TPG’s mandate. However, the TPG recognized that the level of obligation in the text should conform with the type of document; currently it had several requirements while being an appendix.
- [24] **Arrangement vs agreement.** The TPG noted that an “agreement” with some countries has a particular legal connotation that may not be appropriate and for this reason agreed that “arrangement” should be used in this draft, and that appropriate translations should be used to reflect this term.
- [25] **Inclusion of “clearance” in the title.** Some TPG members suggested using “clearance” in the title because this is the Glossary term that encompasses the concept of “verification of compliance with phytosanitary regulations”.
- [26] Other TPG members felt that this change would anticipate the conclusion of the verification process, whereas focus should be on the facilitation of logistic arrangements with the possible outcome that compliance with phytosanitary regulations be verified. The TPG agreed that it would seem logical to use the Glossary term, but also acknowledged that some countries may not have the legislative foundations to carry out clearance in an exporting country.
- [27] The TPG considered other options, such as using “arrangements for inspection” instead because this would not entail envisaging any specific outcome. However, this was not deemed appropriate because it would limit the options for verification to only official visual examination.
- [28] **“Work plan”.** One member comment suggested that “work plan” be defined in the Glossary, but the TPG did not support this because the term does not have a particular IPPC related understanding, but is understandable in its normal dictionary sense.
- [29] **“Industry”.** One member comment suggested clarifying the meaning of “industry”. The TPG agreed that “industry” is clearly understood in English but that the term is not clear in all translations and thus suggested that the confusion may be due to translation issues. The TPG recommended that translations capture the intended meaning of the word instead of translating it literally.
- [30] The TPG:
- (2) *noted* that recommendations on member comments and consistency would be transmitted to the steward and SC-7 for their consideration.

#### 4.2 Draft amendments to Annex 1 and 2 of ISPM 15 for inclusion of the phytosanitary treatment Sulphuryl fluoride fumigation of wood packaging material (2006-010A) and the revision of the dielectric heating section in Annex 1 of ISPM 15 (2006-010B)

- [31] The Chairperson introduced the draft ISPM and the member comments on consistency in use of terms/definitions<sup>4</sup>.
- [32] The TPG discussed the following points:

---

<sup>3</sup> 2005-003; 18\_TPG\_2015\_Dec

<sup>4</sup> 2006-010A\_B; 19\_TPG\_2015\_Dec

- [33] **Consistency in describing the level of obligation.** The TPG noted that for consistency among the various treatments, the chapeau or introductory sentence should contain indication of the level of obligation whereas present tense should be used in the sentences in bulleted lists. In treatments so far adopted, the core requirement (e.g. the 56°C for 30 minutes) has been described using “must”, whereas various means of obtaining those requirements have been listed using “should consider”. However, the TPG acknowledged that there may be particular items (e.g. occupational safety) where a stronger level of obligation may be intended. In such cases it may be considered to rewrite and move such item to another section where a higher level of obligation could be added without affecting the consistency.
- [34] **Concentration-time.** The TPG discussed the use of “concentration-time”, “concentration-time product” and “concentration-time dosage”. The TPG agreed that “concentration-time” is the sum of the products of the “concentration” and “time” and for this reason found inappropriate to use “dosage”. The TPG also considered that because “CT” is the sum of the “concentration-time” products, repeating “product” after uses of the abbreviation was superfluous.
- [35] The TPG advised the steward and SC that the word “required” be inserted before “CT” in several instances, including in the “grey” text on the methyl bromide treatment, for consistency and clarity.
- [36] The TPG:
- (3) *noted* that recommendations on member comments and consistency would be transmitted to the steward and SC-7 for their consideration.

### 4.3 Draft annex to ISPM 28 – Sulphuryl fluoride fumigation of insects in debarked wood (2007-101A)

- [37] The Chairperson introduced the draft PT and the member comments on consistency in use of terms/definitions<sup>5</sup>. The TPG made recommendations on consistency between PTs and the use of terms.
- [38] The TPG discussed the following point, relevant to treatments of wood and wood packaging material: ISPMs and annexes on treatments of wood and wood packaging material should consistently refer to pests *in* wood rather than *on* wood, because those treatments so far adopted or drafted deal with pests infesting wood and not with contaminating pests.
- [39] The TPG discussed the following points that are relevant to all PTs:
- [40] The TPG found that the four draft PTs reviewed in this meeting could be improved for consistency between them and between adopted PTs. In this respect, the TPG invited the TPPT Steward to ensure horizontal consistency between PTs, for instance as regards the titles.
- [41] One member comment suggested using “insect pest” to indicate the pests that are targeted with this treatment. The TPG discussed if this was correct terminology, and agreed that “insect pest” would clarify that it is a pest but also an insect. One TPG member suggested to use “pest insect” because the pest may otherwise be confused with pests that attack insects, just as ‘plant pests’ is normally understood to mean pests that attack plants. However, it was noted that no ISPMs use “pest insect” but that “insect pest” is mentioned once in ISPM 18 (*Guidelines for the use of irradiation as a phytosanitary measure*). Thus the TPG agreed to recommend the use “insect pest”.
- [42] The TPG acknowledged that the underlying data supporting the treatments may cover only the specific pests mentioned in the PT. According to general consistency rules, the Latin name should be used wherever possible. In some cases the TPPT may wish to add the type of pest (e.g. nematode, insect etc.) in front of the actual taxon as a courtesy to the reader
- [43] The TPG:
- (4) *noted* that recommendations on member comments and consistency would be transmitted to the TPPT for their consideration.

---

<sup>5</sup> 2007-101A; 20\_TPG\_2015\_Dec

#### 4.4 Draft annex to ISPM 28 – Sulphuryl fluoride fumigation of nematodes and insects in debarked wood (2007-101B)

[44] The Chairperson introduced the draft PT and the member comments on consistency in use of terms/definitions<sup>6</sup>. The TPG made recommendations on consistency between PTs and the use of terms.

[45] The TPG discussed the following points:

[46] **Mention of common names.** One member comment suggested adding the common name of the targeted pest before the Latin name. The TPG did not support this and noted that the IPPC Style guide allows for common names to be included in brackets after the Latin name if this is deemed particularly useful, but states that this practice should otherwise be avoided. However, the TPG suggested to indicate that *Bursaphelenchus xylophilus* is a nematode to clarify that it is not an insect pest. This change was also suggested for other treatments that target various types of pests, so that it is clear for instance which pests are insects and which are nematodes.

[47] The TPG recommended that common names should not be included in PTs because they do not improve understanding and in some cases may create confusion, as common names vary even within groups of languages (e.g. Anglo-Saxon languages).

[48] The TPG:

- (5) *noted* that recommendations on member comments and consistency would be transmitted to the TPPT for their consideration.

#### 4.5 Draft annex to ISPM 28 – Heat treatment of wood using dielectric heating (2007-114)

[49] The Chairperson introduced the draft PT and the member comments on consistency in use of terms/definitions<sup>7</sup>. The TPG made recommendations on consistency between PTs and the use of terms.

[50] The TPG discussed the following points:

[51] In response to member comments suggesting adding qualifying words to “fungi”, the TPG invited the steward to consider using “pathogenic fungi” in order to emphasize the pest aspect.

[52] The TPG:

- (6) *noted* that recommendations on member comments and consistency would be transmitted to the TPPT for their consideration.

#### 4.6 Draft annex to ISPM 28 – Vapour heat treatment for *Bactrocera tryoni* on *Mangifera indica* (2010-107)

[53] The Chairperson introduced the draft PT and the member comments on consistency in use of terms/definitions<sup>8</sup>. The TPG made recommendations on consistency and the use of terms.

[54] The TPG:

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

---

<sup>6</sup> 2007-101B; 21\_TPG\_2015\_Dec

<sup>7</sup> 2007-114; 22\_TPG\_2015\_Dec

<sup>8</sup> 2010-107; 23\_TPG\_2015\_Dec

#### 4.7 Draft annexes (diagnostic protocols) to ISPM 27

- [55] The TPG had the following general points relevant to all the draft DPs:
- [56] **Scientific names.** The TPG noted that some scientific names had not been italicized, specifically in the references, and recommended that all drafts be reviewed in this respect.
- [57] **Perceived importance of pests.** The TPG agreed that DPs should not include adjectives so as to describe certain pests as being “important”, “serious” etc., as pest risks differ geographically.
- [58] **Order of synonyms for pests.** The Secretariat clarified that synonyms are listed chronologically and the TPG recommended that the IPPC Style guide be consulted and followed to ensure consistency in this respect.
- [59] **No synonyms for host plants.** The TPG agreed that only the current internationally agreed name should be used.
- [60] **Brand name disclaimer.** The TPG noted some inconsistency in the application of the footnote cue referring to the disclaimer for brand names and recommended that it would be appropriately added to all relevant places, and that the in-text disclaimer is deleted.
- [61] **Test, method or assay.** Based on member comments suggesting that “assay” and “method” be replaced by “test”, some TPG members felt that “test” should be used instead of “assay” or “method”. However, it was not clear if indeed all the tests mentioned in the DPs were official, or if the Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocol (TPDP) had used the term in its normal dictionary sense. Some TPG members suggested that if test would be used in the Glossary sense, i.e. only for an official test, this should be stated (i.e. “official test”). Other TPG members disagreed, arguing that a test should only be used in its Glossary sense, and that other terms, such as “assay”, be used when not official.
- [62] Finally the TPG agreed that “test” should be used only when the intended meaning was the Glossary definition and suggested that the TPDP review all instances of “test”, “method” or “assay” to ensure that when the term referred to an official procedure, the Glossary term “test” is used and when not, other terms should be used. In many instances, the name of the method (e.g. “PCR”) would suffice without any further wording.
- [63] The TPG also noted that other languages may not have the different terms for test, assay and method making it difficult to translate the terms correctly.
- [64] **References.** The TPG noted that it should be ensured that all the listed references were mentioned in the text and that all references mentioned in the text are listed in the References section.
- [65] See also discussions under 9.1 regarding the future review of draft DPs by the TPG.

#### 4.8 Draft annex to ISPM 27 – DP for *Sorghum halepense* (2006-027)

The Chairperson introduced the draft DP and the member comments on consistency in use of terms/definitions<sup>9</sup>.

[66] The TPG:

- (8) *noted* that recommendations on member comments and consistency would be transmitted to the TPDP for their consideration.

#### 4.9 Draft annex to ISPM 27 – DP for *Aphelenchoides besseyi*, *A. fragariae* and *A. ritzemabosi* (2006-025)

[67] The Chairperson introduced the draft DP and the member comments on consistency in use of terms/definitions<sup>10</sup>.

---

<sup>9</sup> 2006-027; 24\_TPG\_2015\_Dec

[68] As to the suggestion by a member comment that European Plant Protection Organization (EPPO) Pictorial glossary of morphological terms in nematology be consulted for the morphological terms<sup>11</sup>, the TPG noted that this proposal was outside of the TPG's mandate as regards the draft DP, but that the Secretariat, in consultation with the TPDP, may consider whether this would be a useful resource to share with drafting groups and FAO translation services.

[69] The TPG:

- (9) *noted* that recommendations on member comments and consistency would be transmitted to the TPDP for their consideration.
- (10) *invited* the Secretariat in consultation with the TPDP to consider whether the EPPO Pictorial glossary of morphological terms in nematology would be a helpful tool for drafters and translators.

#### **4.10 Draft annex to ISPM 27 – DP for *Xanthomonas fragariae* (2004-012)**

[70] The Chairperson introduced the draft DP and the member comments on consistency in use of terms/definitions<sup>12</sup>.

[71] The TPG:

- (11) *noted* that recommendations on member comments and consistency would be transmitted to the TPDP for their consideration.

#### **4.11 Draft annex to ISPM 27 – DP for *Tomato spotted wilt virus, Impatiens necrotic spot virus and Watermelon silver mottle virus* (2004-019)**

[72] The Chairperson introduced the draft DP and the member comments on consistency in use of terms/definitions<sup>13</sup>.

[73] The TPG:

- (12) *noted* that recommendations on member comments and consistency would be transmitted to the TPDP for their consideration.

#### **4.12 Draft annex to ISPM 27 – DP for *Citrus tristeza virus* (2004-021)**

[74] The Chairperson introduced the draft DP and the member comments on consistency in use of terms/definitions<sup>14</sup>.

[75] The TPG:

- (13) *noted* that recommendations on member comments and consistency would be transmitted to the TPDP for their consideration.

#### **4.13 Draft annex to ISPM 27 – DP for Genus *Liriomyza* (2006-017)**

[76] The Chairperson introduced the draft DP and the member comments on consistency in use of terms/definitions<sup>15</sup>.

[77] The TPG:

---

<sup>10</sup> 2006-025; 25\_TPG\_2015\_Dec

<sup>11</sup> EPPO Pictorial glossary of morphological terms in nematology  
[http://www.eppo.int/QUARANTINE/diag\\_activities/EPPO\\_TD\\_1056\\_Glossary.pdf](http://www.eppo.int/QUARANTINE/diag_activities/EPPO_TD_1056_Glossary.pdf)

<sup>12</sup> 2004-012; 26\_TPG\_2015\_Dec

<sup>13</sup> 2004-019; 16\_TPG\_2015\_Dec

<sup>14</sup> 2004-021; 14\_TPG\_2015\_Dec

<sup>15</sup> 2006-017; 15\_TPG\_2015\_Dec

- (14) *noted* that recommendations on member comments and consistency would be transmitted to the TPDP for their consideration.

## 5. Consideration of New or Revised Terms/Definitions

### 5.1 Subjects on the TPG work programme

- [78] 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 2016.

#### 5.1.1 “confinement facility” (2015-001) and “quarantine” (2015-002)

- [79] The TPG lead introduced the paper<sup>16</sup> explaining that the terms had been added by the Standards Committee (SC) May 2015, based on a TPG proposal from December 2014 suggesting to delete mention of the purposes “observation and research” because some TPG members noted that this would not normally be understood to be done under quarantine. As “quarantine station” is used for holding regulated articles in “quarantine” the TPG had considered it would be necessary to define the term “confinement facility” if the definition of “quarantine” was revised to delete “observation and research”, so that there would be two distinct terms for the different purposes.
- [80] Explanations are given in the draft 2016 Amendments to the Glossary (Appendix 4). In addition the following points were discussed for the revision of “quarantine”:
- The TPG agreed that in ISPM 3 (*Guidelines for the export, shipment, import and release of biological control agents and other beneficial organisms*) the official confinement of pests or beneficial organisms for the purpose of observation and research is called “quarantine”, and added that approach explicitly to the definition because pests are not, and beneficial organisms not always, included under “regulated articles”.
  - “for observation and research” was moved to follow logically “pests or beneficial organisms” because observation and research is normally carried out on these and not on regulated articles.
  - “further” was deleted because the TPG deemed that there may be cases where inspection, testing or treatment has not been carried out before the regulated article is placed in quarantine. The TPG considered that the previous definition might have required “further” because the intended meaning could have been that “observation and research” would be carried out first and, depending on the result, “further inspection, testing or treatment” would take place. But given the proposed revision of the term, this would not apply anymore.
- [81] As the TPG agreed to retain “observation or research” there was no need for a definition for “confinement facility”.
- [82] One TPG member felt that “confinement” should be revised, or possibly deleted from the Glossary, due to the proposed revision of “quarantine” as this term is a subset of “confinement” and because the revision of “quarantine” would make the two definitions inconsistent. Indeed “confinement” relates only to pests whereas “quarantine”, in the proposed revision, refers also to beneficial organisms. The current definition of “confinement” is not precise, in that ‘application of phytosanitary measures’ is almost as broad as the definition of “phytosanitary procedure” and curiously does not refer to any means of enclosure; thus, e.g. a treatment would count as confinement. It was also noted that the motivation for defining “confinement” (dealing with regulated articles) had been to provide a contrast to “containment” (dealing with pests in an infested area). However, it seemed sufficient that “quarantine” and “containment” were defined, whereby, if “confinement” was not defined, that term would be used in its common dictionary meaning.
- [83] It was recalled that, according to Appendix 5 of the TPG 2014-02 report containing the 2013 draft *Amendments to the Glossary*, ISPM 3 could be adjusted to use “quarantine station” for consistency

---

<sup>16</sup> 04\_TPG\_2015\_Dec

when the revised definition of “quarantine station” would be adopted. It was adopted in 2015 and the TPG agreed that the ink amendments should be presented.

[84] The TPG:

- (15) *proposed* the revision of “quarantine” (2015-002) in the draft 2016 *Amendments to the Glossary* (1994-001) (Appendix 4) to be presented to SC May 2016.
- (16) *invited* SC to add “confinement” to the *List of topics for IPPC standards*.
- (17) *invited* the SC to approve the ink amendments to ISPM 3 (Appendix 5) to replace “quarantine facility” with “quarantine station” (see report of TPG 2014-02, Appendix 5, para 77).
- (18) *invited* the SC to delete “confinement facility” (2015-001) from the *List of topics for IPPC standards* as the TPG agreed that this term should not be added to the Glossary.

### 5.1.2 “containment” (2011-004), “control (of a pest)” (2011-005), “eradication” (2011-003), “exclusion” (2010-008), “suppression” (2011-002)

[85] The TPG lead introduced the paper<sup>17</sup>.

[86] TPG in its October 2010 meeting proposed that the terms be added to the work programme to consider the use of “phytosanitary measures” in their definition. The TPG proposed revisions in the 2013 Amendments to replace “phytosanitary measures” with “official measures”, and the SC in May 2013 agreed to send them for member consultation. The TPG reviewed member comments in 2014 and presented a recommendation to the SC May 2014 to withdraw the terms from the Amendments because member comments suggested that contracting parties had different understandings of “phytosanitary measure”, namely a narrow understanding which would include only measures established by the importing country (*official measures* would be used in the exporting country), or a broad understanding which would include measures established by either the importing or the exporting country to manage pests regulated by the importing country. Phytosanitary measures should, in any case, be used in relation with regulated pests only, as explicitly stipulated in the agreed interpretation. The SC in May 2015 discussed the understanding of the term “phytosanitary measure” and did not agree which interpretation should be used.

[87] The TPG lead expressed his concern with the SC recommendation, as the terms under review depended on a clear understanding of “phytosanitary measure”.

[88] The TPG discussed further the understanding of “phytosanitary measure” and the related terms. They reviewed the use of “phytosanitary measure” in the IPPC and in adopted ISPMs and noted that in some cases the term was used in the narrow understanding, in other cases it was used in the broad understanding, and that there were cases for which it could be argued which understanding was meant. Referring to the WTO Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS Agreement), some TPG members added that whilst “phytosanitary measures” in the preamble and Annex A (1) is used in the narrow understanding, in article 4 (Equivalence) it also refers to measures taken by the exporting country, consistently with the broad understanding. Besides, applying the narrow understanding to the SPS Agreement may also mean that official measures other than phytosanitary measures may not need to be scientifically justified. The TPG discussed the possible impact of a decision to implement the narrow understanding and found that a number of Glossary definitions would need to be modified because they were actually used in ISPMs in the broad sense.

[89] The TPG did not agree on the issue of the narrow or broad understanding of “phytosanitary measures”. As a result, following the Chairperson’s proposal, the TPG decided (as per default, as there was no agreements for changing to “official”) to not propose changes to the definitions of the terms “containment”, “control (of a pest)”, “eradication” and “suppression”. The initial changes (i.e. those other than replacing “phytosanitary measures” by “official measures”) that were proposed for the terms and submitted to the 2013 member consultation will be archived to be considered if future revisions of the terms are proposed.

---

<sup>17</sup> 08\_TPG\_2015\_Dec

[90] The TPG agreed to propose the addition of “exclusion”, defined in consistency with the other four terms. Explanations are given in the draft 2016 Amendments to the Glossary (Appendix 4).

[91] The TPG:

(19) *proposed* the inclusion of “exclusion” in the draft 2016 Amendments to the Glossary (1994-001) (Appendix 4) to be presented to SC May 2016.

(20) *invited* the SC to delete the terms “containment” (2011-004), “control (of a pest)” (2011-005), “eradication” (2011-003) and “suppression” (2011-002) from the *List of topics for IPPC standards*.

### 5.1.3 “country of origin” (2006-016)

[92] The Secretariat introduced the paper<sup>18</sup> and provided an overview of the work done in relation to this term. It was explained that the Glossary Working Group (GWG) in their 2004 meeting had decided that the use of “country of origin” in ISPMs should be checked, in relation with the three definitions currently in the Glossary: “country of origin (of a consignment of plant products)”, “country of origin (of a consignment of plants)” and “country of origin (of regulated articles other than plants and plant products)”. In the GWG meeting in 2005, the group reviewed ISPMs for the use of “origin” or “country of origin” and noted that the three definitions of “country of origin” in the Glossary relate to the country where the plants are grown (or where the regulated articles originate). However, in three standards (ISPM 7 (*Phytosanitary certification system*), ISPM 11 (*Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests*), ISPM 20 (*Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system*)), it was used to mean the country where the phytosanitary certificate is issued, i.e. the country of export. There was therefore inconsistency between the definitions in the Glossary and the use of the term in some of the standards.

[93] The GWG first envisaged that “country of origin” could be redefined and used as the country where the phytosanitary certificate is issued, since this corresponded to the use of this term in some standards. However, the group then agreed that the intuitive understanding of the term “country of origin” is the one in the Glossary, i.e. the country where the plants were grown. In addition, the “place of origin” as written on the phytosanitary certificate sometimes needs to be more precise than the country, i.e. a place in the country of origin.

[94] The GWG concluded that there were three separate concepts: “country of origin” (country where the plants were grown/articles originate), “place of origin” (where the consignment gets its phytosanitary status, which might be a country or a place in a country) and “country of export/certification”.

[95] The GWG proposed some simple corrections to the standards in which country of origin was used to mean country of export/certification (ISPM 7, ISPM 11, ISPM 20), and proposed that ISPM 12 (*Phytosanitary certificates*) would be reviewed.

[96] The Standards Committee in May 2006 approved Specification 37 for the review of the term “country of origin” in ISPMs. The SC decided that changes to be made to ISPM 7 and ISPM 12 should be taken up by the expert working group on the revision of those ISPMs.

[97] The EWG for the revision of ISPM 7 and 12 in 2008 established that “place of origin” referred to the place where plants were grown (which could refer to a country, or a more specific area within a country). It was agreed that when a consignment is exported or re-exported, the country of origin should always be noted on the phytosanitary certificate under the heading “place of origin”.

[98] The SC May 2010 agreed for ISPM 11 and 20 that the review was to be considered under Specification 32 (*Review of ISPMs*). Additionally, ISPM 20 has been reviewed for consistency “standard by standard”, but this specific point was not addressed in the changes proposed. ISPM 11 was not on the list of standards identified for consistency review.

---

<sup>18</sup> 05\_TPG\_2015\_Dec

[99] Based on this background information, the TPG discussed whether the term should be reviewed in ISPM 11 and ISPM 20 (consistency review).

[100] The TPG did not feel that the term caused particular confusion in ISPM 11 and ISPM 20 and considered that changes to the ISPMs could possibly change their intended meaning. For this reason the TPG did not find it appropriate to suggest changes and preferred that the term be taken off the work programme.

[101] The TPG:

(21) *invited* the SC to delete the term “country of origin” from the *List of topics for IPPC standards*.

#### 5.1.4 “practically free”

[102] The Secretariat introduced the paper<sup>19</sup> recalling that the TPG in their December 2014 meeting discussed the term “practically free” (under section 8 “Explanation of Glossary Terms”) and agreed adding the qualifier “of a consignment, field or place of production” to the term, and consequently remove this text from the definition, which would also align with the term “*free from (of a consignment, field or place of production)*”.

[103] The TPG reviewed and agreed on the proposed revision of the definition of the term “practically free”, which would constitute an ink amendment.

[104] The TPG:

(22) *invited* the SC to approve ink amendments in ISPM 5 to the term “practically free” (Appendix 6).

#### 5.1.5 “pre-clearance” (2013-016) in the context of “clearance (of a consignment)”

[105] The TPG lead introduced the paper<sup>20</sup> that provided several options for revising the definition of the term “pre-clearance”, based upon the assumption that it should reflect the current draft Appendix to ISPM 20.

[106] Explanations are given in the draft 2016 *Amendments to the Glossary* (Appendix 4). In addition the following points were discussed (see also discussions under 4.1):

[107] **Deletion or revision of the term.** Some TPG members suggested the deletion of the term because it is currently used in many different countries with very different meanings. They argued that a revised Glossary term may not help improve harmonization in the use of the term, and also stressed that the expert working group meeting and numerous SC meetings had not been able to find agreement on the meaning of the term. They noted that without a Glossary definition, countries would be able to use the term according to the meaning intended, and pointed out that a proposed revision would still leave space for different interpretations because they did not think it would currently be possible to develop a definition, which would encompass all the different meanings.

[108] The TPG noted that the draft Appendix to ISPM 20 does not use the term “preclearance”. Furthermore, some TPG members suggested that ISPM 20 could be amended to not include the term because the meaning as used in that standard is unclear. It is the only ISPM that uses the term, and by applying ink amendments to exclude the term from the ISPM, there would not be an argument to define the term in the IPPC context, as it would not be used in ISPMs.

[109] Other TPG members felt it would be helpful to have a definition that would more adequately purvey the meaning and try to harmonize the term in order to facilitate international communication. They pointed out the term is used frequently by some countries and that the term may have different meanings in different countries, but stressed that the IPPC community should agree to one definition to be used in an IPPC context.

---

<sup>19</sup> 06\_TPG\_2015\_Dec

<sup>20</sup> 07\_TPG\_2015\_Dec

- [110] The TPG agreed that it would not be possible to revise the definition to adequately reflect all the various meanings of the term allowing for international harmonization and agreement. Thus, the TPG felt that the only viable solution at this point in time would be to delete the term and definition from the Glossary as the SC unanimously has recognized that the current definition is incorrect when indicating that phytosanitary certification can be performed by or under the regular supervision of the national plant protection organization of the country of destination (contrary to the IPPC).
- [111] As regards to the use of the term in ISPM 20, the TPG felt that it would be premature proposing ink amendments at this point where the concept of the draft appendix was still not fully clear and agreed, and because the relationship between the ISPM 20 core text and its draft Appendix is not clear either.
- [112] The TPG felt it is essential that the SC agree on the concept of the term and provide clear instructions if again requesting the TPG to revise or define “pre-clearance” or any similar term. For instance, it was not clear if the SC would wish that the definition be a reflection of the concept outlined in the draft appendix to ISPM 20, in which case that concept should be fully agreed to by contracting parties before using it as a basis for the definition of the term. .
- [113] Should the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) agree to delete the term, the TPG agreed to add the following note to be included in the General recommendations on consistency:
- [114] *Pre-clearance*: Due to the many interpretations of the term “pre-clearance”, this term should be avoided in ISPMs and instead the concept envisaged described appropriately.
- [115] Lastly, the TPG noted that the deletion of the term “pre-clearance” would not affect the meaning of “clearance (of a consignment)” which was considered to be clear.
- [116] The TPG:
- (23) *proposed* the deletion of the term “pre-clearance” (2013-016) in the draft 2016 Amendments to the Glossary (1994-001) (Appendix 4) to be presented to SC May 2016.

### **5.1.6 “test” (2015-003) in relation with “visual examination” (2013-010) and “inspection” (2015-012)**

- [117] The TPG lead introduced the paper<sup>21</sup>. The term “visual examination” was added to the *List of topics for IPPC standards* by the SC in May 2013, based on a TPG proposal. A revised definition was proposed by the TPG in February 2014 and approved for member consultation by the SC in May 2014. At their December 2014 meeting, the TPG discussed whether “visual examination”, “testing” and “inspection” should be reviewed in combination, as suggested by a member comment on “visual examination”. The TPG did not find that the three terms create immediate confusion but that the issue might arise from the definition of “test” and invited the SC to add the term to the *List of topics for IPPC standards*. Based on this discussion, the TPG found that “without testing” should be deleted from the definition of the term “visual examination” to avoid confusion. In May 2015, the SC added the term “test” to the *List of topics for IPPC standards*. In May 2015, the SC-7 withdrew “visual examination” from the 2014 Draft Amendments to ISPM 5 *Glossary of Phytosanitary Terms* (1994-001) because of the IPPC member comment suggesting that definitions of “visual examination”, “testing”, and “inspection” should be considered by the TPG at the same time to ensure they are consistent and useful. The SC-7 felt that it was not clearly understood what the terms covered, for instance whether sending a sample to an expert for identification would be considered “testing” or “visual examination”, or whether visual examination in a laboratory (e.g. in the case where the identification of a pest at the point of entry is difficult) would actually be testing. According to the Glossary, “visual examination” is not a “test” (even if performed in a laboratory), but possibly an “inspection”. In November 2015, the SC added the term “inspection” (2015-012) to the *List of topics for IPPC standards*.

<sup>21</sup> 09\_TPG\_2015\_Dec

[118] Explanations are given in the draft 2016 Amendments to the Glossary (Appendix 4). In addition the following points were discussed:

- The current definition of “inspection” is clear and useful and reflects appropriately the concept described in ISPM 23 (*Guidelines for inspection*). The term therefore should not be revised.
- The definition of “test” clearly separates such methods from “visual examination”. However, the definition does not exclude that “visual examination” may be done before or after testing. In the proposed revision of “test”, the mention “of plants, plant products, or other regulated articles” is added to clearly indicate that “inspection” and “testing” are two different methods on the same hierarchical level.
- The definition of “visual examination” should describe the process of visual examination, but not its purpose (“to detect pests or contaminants without testing or processing”). The purpose is covered in the definition of “inspection”. Both definitions are needed with “visual examination” simply describing the process, whilst “inspection” describes its application in the phytosanitary context (i.e. it is official and to determine if pests are present or to determine compliance with phytosanitary regulations). The original wording in the definition of visual examination was confusing (as contamination covers both pests and regulated articles). Although “processing” is often necessary and more elaborate prior to “testing”, some simple processing (e.g. dyeing) may also be carried out prior to visual examination, so need not be mentioned. “Without testing” was also deleted because it does not add clarification, and the contrast to “testing” is already well covered under the definition of “test”.
- ISPM 23 states that certain tools may be used in conjunction with the inspection process. The simple use of a microscope can be considered part of the inspection process, and should be maintained in the definition of “visual examination” for clarification.
- Collecting and sending samples to a laboratory for the verification of the pest’s identity may be combined with the inspection process, independent if the verification is made visually or by testing.
- The current definition of “inspection” and the proposed revisions for “test” and “visual examination” adequately reflect the uses in adopted ISPMs. The definitions are general; any particular requirements that would differ from those described in the definitions should be clarified in the ISPM text.

[119] The TPG :

- (24) *proposed* the revision of “test” (2015-003) and “visual examination” (2013-010) in the draft 2016 Amendments to the Glossary (1994-001) (Appendix 4) to be presented to SC May 2016.
- (25) *invited* the SC to delete the term “inspection” (2015-012) from the *List of topics for IPPC standards*.

### 5.1.7 Concept of “traceability” and its use in ISPMs

[120] The TPG lead introduced the paper<sup>22</sup>. She explained that the concept of traceability had been discussed by various IPPC bodies (SC November 2013 in connection with discussions on the draft specification on the *International movement of grain* (2008-007); CPM-9 (2014) that stressed that these issues should be dealt with as cross-cutting issues, not only related to grain; Strategic Planning Group (SPG) 2014 and SC May 2015 that decided the TPG should consider the concept). The SC would then decide whether harmonization of terms and definitions would be needed.

[121] She pointed out that “traceability” is a general term with a common understanding, namely the ability to verify and document the history, origin or movement of a commodity. However, when used in the phytosanitary context, it may also encompass the ability to verify that certain phytosanitary import requirements have been achieved.

[122] The TPG acknowledged that there are numerous understandings and types of traceability in the phytosanitary context, for instance related to phytosanitary certificates or to phytosanitary actions and

---

<sup>22</sup> 13\_TPG\_2015\_Dec

therefore trying to gain one common understanding of the concept of traceability may be very challenging. The TPG noted that although the use and meaning of the concept varies between different ISPMs, those uses are all clear in the context and do not cause confusion.

[123] The TPG felt that ISPM 12 provides adequate guidance in relation to traceability on a general level. One TPG member felt that, in respect to the draft ISPM on the *International movement of grain* (2008-007), traceability is not particularly important for grain in a phytosanitary context because of the lower level of pest risk.

[124] For future draft ISPMs, the TPG urged drafting groups to ensure that whenever traceability or similar terms are being used, the concept and requirements should be clearly described. The TPG felt that an excellent example of this was the use in ISPM 34 (*Design and operation of post-entry quarantine stations for plants*), section 2.3.2 "...a system to enable full traceability of the consignments, through the post-entry quarantine (PEQ) station (the traceability system should use a unique identifier from plant consignment arrival through handling, treatment and testing, until release or destruction of the infested consignment)".

[125] Additionally, the TPG highlighted that should the SC wish to proceed with defining the term, numerous ink amendments would likely be needed to ISPMs to ensure that the meaning of the standards would be retained.

[126] The TPG recommended that should the SC wish to discuss in-depth the concept of traceability, the table outlining the current use in ISPMs of "traceability" and related terms presented in this meeting could be used as basis for the discussions.

[127] The TPG:

(26) *invited* the SC to note the TPG discussions on the concept of "traceability", notably that the different meanings of the term are clear in those ISPMs that use the term.

## 6. Review of ISPMs for Consistency of Terms and Style

### 6.1 General recommendations on consistency

[128] The Secretariat introduced the paper<sup>23</sup> noting that minor editorial changes had been implemented by the Secretariat. The guidance on *General recommendations on consistency* is included in the IPPC procedure manual for standard setting, and the full list of terms are consultable in the IPPC Style guide<sup>24</sup>.

[129] Regarding the note to not use "contaminant", one TPG member queried if "contaminant" could be used to indicate other organisms that may or may not be contaminating pests, such as snails, slugs, snakes and spiders. The TPG agreed that the current guidance stating that "contaminant" should not be used was still valid, and that other terms should be used. The TPG did not discuss what other terms could be used.

[130] The TPG added a note on the use of "IPPC" (see section 11.1 of this report) and agreed to the edits made to several notes on terms to increase consistency.

[131] The TPG:

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

---

<sup>23</sup> 10\_TPG\_2015\_Dec

<sup>24</sup> IPPC Style guide: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/ippc-style-guide/>

## 6.2 Consistency of adopted ISPM (standard by standard)

### 6.2.1 ISPM 5 in Spanish

[132] The TPG lead introduced the review of ISPM 5 in Spanish to align it with the current English version, noting that FAO Translation services had reviewed the proposed changes<sup>25</sup>.

[133] The Secretariat suggested that the ink amendments should be reviewed by the Language review group for Spanish. Normally, ink amendments are presented to the SC in English for approval, and, resources permitted, translated into the other languages and applied by the Secretariat. In this case, the ink amendments pertained solely to the Spanish version of ISPM 5 and thus had not been presented to the SC in English. For this reason, the TPG in consultation with the Secretariat considered that the LRG would be the most appropriate group to review the proposals and validate them. The Spanish version of ISPM 5 would then be published with a note in the publication history for transparency purposes.

[134] In this context, the Secretariat informed the TPG that all the French and Spanish versions of the ISPMs were having ink amendments previously approved in English incorporated. The Secretariat had translated the ink amendments and the Language Review Group (LRG) for Spanish and the TPG member for French respectively had reviewed them. The Secretariat noted that there would still be consistency issues in the language versions but that this was in any case a major milestone towards aligning the language versions.

[135] The TPG:

(28) *asked* the Secretariat to forward to the Language review group for Spanish the translation adjustments of ISPM 5 in Spanish for validation.

## 6.3 Consistency across standards

### 6.3.1 “Trading partner” (2013-009)

[136] The TPG lead introduced the paper which outlined the proposals for consistency changes across standards<sup>26</sup>. He noted that the proposals had been presented to the SC on two occasions and lately discussed by the TPG in an e-forum (TPG\_2015-06\_e-decision\_02) but that consensus had not been reached.

[137] The TPG reviewed and modified the proposals.

[138] One TPG member pointed out that there were some inconsistency in the use of “contracting party” and “country” in the Glossary. The TPG agreed to discuss this further in their next meeting.

[139] The TPG:

(29) *invited* the SC to review and approve ink amendments to replace the term “trading partner” (2013-009) where used in ISPMs (Appendix 8).

(30) *agreed* to review whether “contracting party”, “country” and similar terms have been used consistently throughout ISPM 5 in the TPG 2016 meeting.

## 7. Annotated Glossary: 2013/14/15 Amendments

### 7.1 Current revision of the Annotated Glossary

[140] The TPG lead introduced the Annotated Glossary as revised from the last version (version 3), published in 2013. The TPG reviewed all the changes.

---

<sup>25</sup> 11\_TPG\_2015\_Dec

<sup>26</sup> 12\_TPG\_2015\_Dec

[141] Additionally, the TPG agreed:

- that “revised” should be included only at the mention of the first source of revision and that this should be applied also to ISPM 5.
- that ink amendments should not be listed in the sources of terms in ISPM 5, and that in the Annotated Glossary they should be listed in the note column only.
- not to retain the asterisks indicating terms on the TPG work programme. In the TPG 2014 meeting, the TPG had felt it was useful to have the asterisks not only in ISPM 5 but also in the Annotated Glossary to indicate the terms on the TPG work programme. However, the TPG reconsidered this, agreeing not to include them because there would be divergence between ISPM 5 (revised almost annually) and the Annotated Glossary (published only every three years).

The TPG:

- (31) *agreed* that the 2015 version of the Annotated Glossary would be modified after the meeting by Ms Beatriz MELCHO and sent to the TPG for final agreement.
- (32) *invited* the SC to review the 2015 version of the Annotated Glossary and asked the Secretariat to publish it on the IPP.
- (33) *asked* the Secretariat to mention “revised” only once in the sources of terms that have been revised, noting that ink amendments would not constitute revisions, and thus delete repeated mentions of “revised” and not relevant sources of terms in ISPM 5.

## 8. Explanation of Glossary Terms

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

[143] The following terms were discussed.

[144] **Compliance procedure (for a consignment) vs clearance (of a consignment).** One TPG member pointed out that the definitions of “compliance procedure (for a consignment)” and “clearance (of a consignment)” overlap significantly, which may make their correct application difficult. The Annotated Glossary explains that “clearance is followed by release and entry”, but this is not clearly stated in the definition of the term in ISPM 5. The TPG did not agree to recommend the addition of this term to the work programme at this moment, but would consider the need in the future.

[145] **Controlled areas and protected area.** The TPG recalled that consequential changes in ISPMs to replace “controlled area” and “protected area” with “regulated area” should be done following the CPM-10 (2015) deletion of the two terms (except for where “protected area” means environmental protection). The TPG agreed to prepare the ink amendments for presentation to the SC.

[146] **Ecosystems, habitat, modern biotechnology.** The TPG discussed whether to propose the deletion of these terms which some TPG members felt did not have particular IPPC meanings. The TPG agreed to recommend that the terms be considered in a future meeting.

[147] **Growing season vs growing period.** One TPG member queried the difference between these two terms especially because of the links of “area, place of production or production site” to “growing season” and not to “growing period”, which seemed odd because a “growing period” was supposed to be more specific than a “growing season”. The TPG agreed to request the SC to add these terms to the *List of topics for IPPC standards* for review.

[148] **Host range.** One TPG member queried why “host range” is defined when “host” is not defined and whether the draft ISPM on *Determination of host status of fruit to fruit flies (Tephritidae)* (2006-031) submitted for adoption at CPM-11 (2016) would affect the definition. The TPG agreed that the term is widely used and correctly defined, that the draft ISPM did not affect the term “host range”, and that “host” does not warrant a definition because its meaning is clear.

- [149] **International standards vs International Standard for Phytosanitary Measures.** One TPG member queried what other standards than ISPMs the IPPC allows for. It was pointed out that both terms are used in the Convention although there is no clear reason for the difference in the use of them. The TPG did not believe that the terms should be reviewed.
- [150] **Pathway.** One TPG member queried if “introduction” should be included in the definition of “pathway” because pest risk analysts in her country had trouble using the term only in its Glossary definition. If a commodity is a pathway for a pest, the pest may enter but the concern for the importing country is really whether the pest will establish. If the commodity is a pathway for a specific pest of concern, but the pest does not establish, this is not a concern for the importing country.
- [151] Other TPG members did not agree with the proposal pointing out that in the pest risk analysis process, the question on whether a pest can establish is a different step from the question of a pest’s association with a specific commodity. Therefore, modifying the definition would make it inconsistent from ISPM 11. The TPG decided that the definition did not need revision.
- [152] **Process load.** The TPG considered if this term should be deleted, but it was not clear if there is an IPPC-related meaning of the term that would warrant its continued inclusion in the Glossary (it is used only once in ISPM 18 (*Guidelines for the use of irradiation as a phytosanitary measure*) and in ISPM 5 definitions of “dose mapping” and “minimum absorbed dose”). If so, perhaps the term could be used also for other treatment types than irradiation. The TPG suggested that the TPPT could consider this question.
- [153] **Official control.** One TPG member pointed out that in contrast to “control (of a pest)” the definition of “official control” does not mention “suppression”. The TPG agreed that the current definition is correct because “suppression” applies to different scenarios, such as areas of low pest prevalence, but is not appropriate for quarantine pests. On the contrary “official control” is linked to the definition of “quarantine pest” and is a short version of the definition clarified in Supplement 1 of ISPM 5 on *Guidelines on the interpretation and application of the concepts of “official control” and “not widely distributed”*.
- [154] **Quarantine pest.** A TPG member queried whether the definition should be modified to mention that quarantine pests are regulated pests. As per definition, “regulated pests” are quarantine pests and regulated non-quarantine pests, the TPG deemed that it would be appropriate for the definition of “quarantine pest” to read “a regulated pest of potential...”. However, it was pointed out that the current definition stems from the IPPC and the TPG therefore agreed not to recommend the definition be revised.
- [155] The TPG:
- (34) *invited* the SC to add the terms “growing season” and “growing period”, “ecosystems”, “habitat” and “modern biotechnology” to the *List of topics for IPPC standards*.
  - (35) *invited* the SC to ask the TPPT to consider if “process load” is a useful term in the IPPC context, whether it is useful and commonly used with other treatment types than irradiation, and whether it could be used more frequently in ISPMs in the future.
  - (36) *agreed* to produce ink amendments across ISPMs to replace “controlled area” and “protected area” with “regulated area” as appropriate in an e-forum for presentation to the SC May 2016.

## 9. TPG Work Plan

- [156] The TPG updated its work plan for 2015 (Appendix 9).
- [157] The Secretariat reminded TPG members that the work plan is posted on the TPG restricted work area and is updated throughout the year. TPG members should refer to the online version for the latest updates, and the Secretariat also circulates the work plan by email when needed. The work plan will be presented to SC May 2016 for information.

- [158] The TPG discussed whether to discontinue the review of draft DPs. Based on the review of the draft DPs (see sections 4.7 to 4.13), the TPG concluded that the issues raised in member comments in relation to terminology were often too technical for the TPG to recommend solutions on them. Also, the TPG deemed that many comments identified as consistency issues were actually editorial issues, which should be corrected by the IPPC Secretariat editor. In addition to these points, the Secretariat informed the TPG that some draft DPs had not been included on the TPG agenda as they had been processed for adoption directly, having been submitted to member consultation in February.
- [159] Due to the difficulty in providing adequate guidance on the terminology and consistency issues in DPs and considering that only some DPs would be submitted for review by the TPG, the TPG decided to suggest the SC that the TPG review of draft DPs should be discontinued and instead be carried out by the TPDP steward.
- [160] The TPG suggested that the TPDP Steward may then contact the TPG for specific advice on terminology and consistency in the use of terms, as the need would occur (i.e. via email throughout the year).
- [161] The TPG:
- (37) *invited* the SC to note the TPG work plan 2015 (Appendix 9).
  - (38) *invited* the SC to modify the TPG specification to state that the review of draft ISPMs for consistency and use of terms following member consultation would exclude draft diagnostic protocols.
  - (39) *invited* the SC to agree that the TPDP may contact the TPG directly (through the IPPC Secretariat) for any query related to terminology or consistency in the use of terms.

## 10. Membership of the TPG (see agenda item 2.3)

- [162] The TPG members all confirmed their continued engagement with the TPG.

## 11. Other Issues

### 11.1 The use of “IPPC” (when referred to as taking action)

- [163] The Secretariat pointed out that various texts prepared by the Secretariat and others often use “IPPC” as an actor doing something. The Secretariat queried the TPG if this would be acceptable. The TPG suggested that the IPPC (that may also be referred to as the Convention) should not be referred to as an “executor” of anything. Rather, any text should clearly and accurately explain who (whether the IPPC Secretariat, the CPM, the CPM Bureau, the IPPC community, or other) was meant to take the action.
- [164] In this regard, it was recalled that the responsibilities of national plant protection organizations (NPPOs) noted in the IPPC are limited to those listed in Article IV, paragraph 2. Although many contracting parties may delegate their responsibilities to their NPPOs, the other responsibilities and requirements listed in the IPPC are those of the contracting parties (Article IV, paragraphs 3 and 4, Articles V to XI, XIII, and XV to XXIII). Therefore, NPPOs should strictly only be referred to with regard to the responsibilities noted in Article IV, paragraph 2.
- [165] Likewise, it should be noted that the Secretary is the Secretary of the Commission, as stated in Article XII, paragraph 1, in the IPPC. Logically, the secretariat staff assisting the Secretary would be the Secretariat of the Commission – see Article XII, paragraph 2. Usually, the Secretary and Secretariat are referred to as the IPPC Secretary and the IPPC Secretariat. Strictly, these references are not correct.
- [166] However, the TPG acknowledged that it would be confusing if after years of using “IPPC Secretariat” and “IPPC Secretary” this would now change. The Secretariat also pointed out that:
- The international plant protection community knows and uses the denomination “IPPC Secretariat”.

- “Secretariat to the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures” is long and wordy as it would need to be written out, whereas “IPPC Secretariat” is brief and clear, and normally understood without writing out “IPPC” as this is explained in documents in any case.
- In an effort to increase awareness of IPPC and brand the Secretariat, using only one aligned denomination for the Convention and the support function for the Convention is helpful.

[167] The TPG:

- (40) *agreed* to add a note on the use of bodies of CPM (rather than “IPPC”) when referred to as taking an action to the *General recommendations for consistency* (Appendix 7).

## 11.2 Concept of terminology

[168] A TPG member shared a rough outline of a paper on the “concept of terminology” noting that the TPG and the SC work with a number of unwritten rules or procedures in respect to the development of terminology, and that he suggested these rules be clarified and shared. These unwritten rules concern for instance considerations regarding “one term ⇔ one concept”, i.e. only one term should cover a concept, and only one concept should be covered by a term; that if a Glossary term exists to describe a concept, this term should be used; what the purpose of ISPM 5 definitions is; that definitions do not and shall not carry any requirements; and so forth.

[169] The TPG agreed with the suggestion of formalizing the concept of terminology development and decided to discuss this further in their next meeting.

[170] The TPG:

- (41) *agreed* to develop the paper on “concept of terminology” further (for possible future inclusion in the IPPC Standard setting procedure manual) to be discussed in the next TPG meeting.

## 11.3 Discussion of other terms

[171] **Invasive.** One TPG member suggested that the TPG should consider defining this term in an IPPC-related context. For biological control, the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) definition creates much confusion around the interpretation of the term, which impacts plant protection. Other TPG members felt that this term belongs to the CBD domain, that a comprehensive explanation of CBD terms in relation to the IPPC Glossary has been adopted as a supplement to ISPM 5, and that the term should not be defined in the Glossary because it would increase the confusion on its understanding. The IPPC categorizes pests as quarantine or regulated non-quarantine pests and these terms are clear and should be used.

[172] **Indigenous.** In the context of “invasive” one TPG member suggested that “indigenous” be defined, but the TPG agreed that the term is used in ISPMs with its common dictionary meaning.

## 11.4 Implementation facilitation of the Glossary

[173] Following the suggestion from the Secretary (see section 1.1 of this report), the Secretariat suggested that the TPG be involved in the preparation of some communication material for helping expert drafting groups use the Glossary. The TPG thought the idea was good and Ms Stephanie BLOEM (USA) volunteered to help the Secretariat draft a brochure.

## 12. Date and Venue of the Next Meeting

[174] The next TPG meeting was tentatively scheduled for 5-9 December 2016, Rome, Italy.

## 13. Close

[175] The Secretariat informed the TPG members that an electronic survey had been created for the evaluation of the meeting and the overall support from the Secretariat and urged all TPG members to complete the evaluation.

[176] The TPG Chairperson thanked the TPG members for their dedication and their valuable input helping to advance the work of the TPG, and the Secretariat for their support and facilitation of the meeting.

[177] The meeting was closed.

## APPENDIX 1 - Agenda

AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER
<b>1. Opening of the meeting</b>	-	
1.1 Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat	-	Secretariat
1.2 Selection of the Chairperson and Rapporteur	-	Secretariat
1.3 Review and adoption of the agenda		Chairperson
<b>2. Administrative Matters</b>	-	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Local information</li> </ul>	<a href="#">Web link</a>	Secretariat
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Documents list</li> </ul>	02_TPG_2015_De c	Secretariat
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Participants list</li> </ul>	03_TPG_2015_De c	Secretariat
<b>3. Reports</b>	-	
3.1 Previous meetings of the TPG (December 2014)	<a href="#">Web link</a>	Steward
3.2 Extracts from other meeting reports of relevance to the TPG (SC, CPM)	17_TPG_2015_De c	Secretariat
3.3 Current work plan The work plan was decided by the TPG 2014. The work plan will be reviewed during the meeting (agenda item 9.1)	<a href="#">Web link</a> (work area; log on needed)	Secretariat
<b>4. Review relating to draft ISPMs sent for member consultations in 2015 (1 Feb-30 June and 1 July-30 November)</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 2016).		
4.1 Draft appendix to ISPM 20 – <i>Arrangements for verification of compliance of consignments by the importing country in the exporting country</i> (2005-003) - Member comments on terms and consistency	2005-003 18_TPG_2015_De c	Chairperson
4.2 Draft amendments to Annex 1 and 2 of ISPM 15 for inclusion of the phytosanitary treatment <i>Sulphuryl fluoride fumigation of wood packaging material</i> (2006-010A) and the revision of the dielectric heating section in Annex 1 of ISPM 15 (2006-010B) - Member comments on terms and consistency	2006-010A_B 19_TPG_2015_De c	Chairperson
4.3 Draft annex to ISPM 28 – Sulphuryl fluoride fumigation of insects in debarked wood (2007-101A) - Member comments on terms and consistency	2007-101A 20_TPG_2015_De c	Chairperson
4.4 Draft annex to ISPM 28 – Sulphuryl fluoride fumigation of nematodes and insects in debarked wood (2007-101B) - Member comments on terms and consistency	2007-101B 21_TPG_2015_De c	Chairperson
4.5 Draft annex to ISPM 28 – Heat treatment of wood using dielectric heating (2007-114) - Member comments on terms and consistency	2007-114 22_TPG_2015_De c	Chairperson

AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER
4.6 Draft annex to ISPM 28 – Vapour heat treatment for <i>Bactrocera tryoni</i> on <i>Mangifera indica</i> (2010-107) - Member comments on terms and consistency	2010-107 23_TPG_2015_De c	Chairperson
4.7 Draft annex to ISPM 27 – DP for <i>Sorghum halepense</i> (2006-027) - Member comments on terms and consistency	2006-027 24_TPG_2015_De c	Chairperson
4.8 Draft annex to ISPM 27 – DP for <i>Aphelenchoides besseyi</i> , <i>A. fragariae</i> and <i>A. ritzemabosi</i> (2006-025) - Member comments on terms and consistency	2006-025 25_TPG_2015_De c	Chairperson
4.9 Draft annex to ISPM 27 – DP for <i>Xanthomonas fragariae</i> (2004-012) - Member comments on terms and consistency	2004-012 26_TPG_2015_De c	Chairperson
4.10 Draft annex to ISPM 27 – DP for Tomato spotted wilt virus, Impatiens necrotic spot virus and Watermelon silver mottle virus (2004-019) - Member comments on terms and consistency	2004-019 16_TPG_2015_De c	Chairperson
4.11 Draft annex to ISPM 27 – DP for Citrus tristeza virus (2004-021) - Member comments on terms and consistency	2004-021 14_TPG_2015_De c	Chairperson
4.12 Draft annex to ISPM 27 – DP for Genus <i>Liriomyza</i> (2006-017) - Member comments on terms and consistency	2006-017 15_TPG_2015_De c	Chairperson
<b>5. Consideration of new or revised terms/definitions</b>		
5.1 Subjects on the TPG work programme 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 2016.		
5.1.1 “confinement facility” (2015-001) and “quarantine” (2015-002)	04_TPG_2015_De c	Bouhot-Delduc
5.1.2 “containment” (2011-004), “control (of a pest)” (2011-005), “eradication” (2011-003), “exclusion” (2010-008), “suppression” (2011-002)	08_TPG_2015_De c	Hedley
5.1.3 “country of origin” (2006-016) (to decide on next steps)	05_TPG_2015_De c	Secretariat
5.1.4 “practically free” (consequential change/ ink amendment)	06_TPG_2015_De c	Secretariat
5.1.5 “pre-clearance” (2013-016) in the context of “clearance (of a consignment)”	07_TPG_2015_De c	Bloem
5.1.6 “test” (2015-003) in relation with “visual examination” (2013-010) and “inspection”	09_TPG_2015_De c	Melcho
5.1.7 Concept of “traceability” and its use in ISPMs	13_TPG_2015_De c	Shaza
<b>6. Review of ISPMs for consistency of terms and style</b>	-	
6.1 General recommendations on consistency (as modified following the TPG Feb 2014 and noted by the SC. To be reviewed and completed as needed)	10_TPG_2015_De c	Secretariat
6.2 Consistency of adopted ISPM (standard by standard) 6.2.1 ISPM 5 in Spanish for noting by CPM	11_TPG_2015_De c	Secretariat Melcho
6.3 Consistency across standards (Process as approved by SC Nov 2013) 6.3.1 “Trading partner” (2013-009)	12_TPG_2015_De c	Secretariat Orlinski

AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER
<p><b>7. Annotated glossary: 2013/14/15 amendments</b>            The annotated glossary, version 3, was finalized at TPG 2013 and published. The next version should be finalized in 2016. The TPG considers yearly which amendments need to be made.            7.1 Current revision of the annotated glossary.</p>	Annotated_Glossary	Melcho
<p><b>8. Explanation of Glossary terms</b>            Standing agenda item for TPG meetings. Members identify before the meeting some glossary terms/definitions requiring further explanations (and not already explained in other places, such as the annotated glossary) (with a short statement on what is the issue with the definition). These terms/definitions will be discussed during the TPG meeting and the need for additional explanations (e.g. in the annotated glossary) discussed.</p>		Secretariat
<p><b>9. TPG work plan</b></p>	-	
<p>9.1 TPG work plan            The TPG will update its work plan for the coming year, based on discussions at the meeting, to be presented to the SC May 2016 for noting.</p>	To be prepared during the meeting	Secretariat
<p><b>10. Membership of the TPG</b>            Under that agenda item, members are also expected to notify any expected change in membership, so that calls can be organized in good time</p>	See agenda item 2.3	
<p><b>11. Other issues</b>            11.1 The use of "IPPC" (when referred to as taking action)            11.2 Concept of terminology            11.3 Discussion of other terms</p>		
<p><b>12. Date and venue of the next meeting</b></p>	-	
<p><b>13. Close</b></p>	-	

**APPENDIX 2 - Documents list***Ordered by document number*

<b>DOCUMENT NO.</b>	<b>AGENDA ITEM</b>	<b>DOCUMENT TITLE</b>	<b>DATE POSTED / DISTRIBUTED</b>
01_TPG_2015_Dec	1.3	Draft annotated agenda	2015-11-26
02_TPG_2015_Dec	2.2	Document list	2015-11-26
03_TPG_2015_Dec	2.3	Participants list	2015-11-26
04_TPG_2015_Dec	5.1.1	Subjects on the TPG work programme: "confinement facility" (2015-001) and "quarantine" (2015-002)	2015-11-18
05_TPG_2015_Dec	5.1.3	Subjects on the TPG work programme: "country of origin" (2006-016)	2015-11-18
06_TPG_2015_Dec	5.1.4	Subjects on the TPG work programme: "practically free"	2015-11-18
07_TPG_2015_Dec	5.1.5	Subjects on the TPG work programme: "pre-clearance" (2013-016) in the context of "clearance (of a consignment)"	2015-11-18
08_TPG_2015_Dec	5.1.2	Subjects on the TPG work programme: "containment" (2011-004), "control (of a pest)" (2011-005), "eradication" (2011-003), "exclusion" (2010-008), "suppression" (2011-002)	2015-11-18
09_TPG_2015_Dec	5.1.6	Subjects on the TPG work programme: "test" (2015-003) in relation with "visual examination" (2013-010) and "inspection"	2015-11-19
10_TPG_2015_Dec	6.1	General recommendations on consistency	2015-11-18
11_TPG_2015_Dec	6.2.1	ISPM 5 in Spanish for translation review	2015-11-18
12_TPG_2015_Dec	6.3.1	"Trading partners" (2013-009)	2015-11-18
13_TPG_2015_Dec	5.1.7	Concept of "traceability" and its use in ISPMs	2005-11-26
14_TPG_2015_Dec	4.11	Compiled comments for TPG response - 2004-021: Draft Annex to ISPM 27 – Citrus tristeza virus	2015-11-19
15_TPG_2015_Dec	4.12	Compiled comments for TPG response - 2006-017: Draft Annex to ISPM 27– Genus Liriomyza	2015-11-19
16_TPG_2015_Dec	4.10	Compiled comments for TPG response - 2004-019: Draft Annex to ISPM 27 – Tomato spotted wilt virus, Impatiens necrotic spot virus and Watermelon silver mottle virus	2015-11-19
17_TPG_2015_Dec	3.2	Update from other meetings of relevance to the TPG	2015-11-25
18_TPG_2015_dec	4.1	Compiled comments for TPG response - 2005-003: Draft Appendix to ISPM 20 – Arrangements for verification of compliance of consignments by the importing country in the exporting country	2015-12-02

DOCUMENT NO.	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE	DATE POSTED / DISTRIBUTED
19_TPG_2015_dec	4.2	Compiled comments for TPG response - 2006-010A and B: Draft revisions to ISPM 15 – (Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade)	2015-12-02
20_TPG_2015_dec	4.3	Compiled comments for TPG response - 2007-101A: Draft Annex to ISPM 28 – Sulphuryl fluoride fumigation of insects in debarked wood	2015-12-02
21_TPG_2015_dec	4.4	Compiled comments for TPG response - 2007-101B: Draft Annex to ISPM 28 – Sulphuryl fluoride fumigation of nematodes and insects in debarked wood	2015-12-02
22_TPG_2015_dec	4.5	Compiled comments for TPG response - 2007-114: Draft Annex to ISPM 28 – Heat treatment of wood using dielectric heating	2015-12-02
23_TPG_2015_dec	4.6	Compiled comments for TPG response - Compiled comments for TPG response - 2010-107: Draft Annex to ISPM 28 – Vapour heat treatment for <i>Bactrocera tryoni</i> on <i>Mangifera indica</i>	2015-12-02
24_TPG_2015_dec	4.7	Compiled comments for TPG response - 2006-027: Draft Annex to ISPM 27 – Sorghum halepense	2015-12-02
25_TPG_2015_dec	4.8	Compiled comments for TPG response - 2006-025: Draft Annex TO ISPM 27 – <i>Aphelenchoides besseyi</i> , <i>A. fragariae</i> and <i>A. ritzemabosi</i>	2015-12-02
26_TPG_2015_dec	4.9	Compiled comments for TPG response - 2004-012: Draft Annex to ISPM 27 – <i>Xanthomonas fragariae</i>	2015-12-02
2004-012	4.9	Draft Annex to ISPM 27 – <i>Xanthomonas fragariae</i>	2015-11-18
2004-019	4.10	Draft Annex to ISPM 27 – Tomato spotted wilt virus, <i>Impatiens necrotic spot virus</i> and Watermelon silver mottle virus	2015-11-18
2004-021	4.11	Draft Annex to ISPM 27 – Citrus tristeza virus	2015-11-18
2005-003	4.1	Draft Appendix to ISPM 20 – Arrangements for verification of compliance of consignments by the importing country in the exporting country	2015-11-18
2006-010A and B	4.2	Draft revisions to ISPM 15 (Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade)	2015-11-18
2006-017	4.12	Draft Annex to ISPM 27– Genus <i>Liriomyza</i>	2015-11-18
2006-025	4.8	Draft Annex to ISPM 27 – <i>Aphelenchoides besseyi</i> , <i>A. fragariae</i> and <i>A. ritzemabosi</i> (2006-025)	2015-11-18
2006-027	4.7	Draft Annex to ISPM 27– Sorghum halepense	2015-11-18

DOCUMENT NO.	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE	DATE POSTED / DISTRIBUTED
2007-101A	4.3	Draft sulphuryl fluoride fumigation of insects in debarked wood	2015-11-18
2007-101B	4.4	Draft sulphuryl fluoride fumigation of nematodes and insects in debarked wood	2015-11-18
2007-107	4.6	Draft vapour heat treatment for bactrocera tryoni on mangifera indica	2015-11-18
2007-114	4.5	Draft Heat treatment of wood using dielectric heating	2015-11-18

*Web links (documents to be downloaded)*

DOCUMENT NO.	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE	DATE POSTED / DISTRIBUTED
<a href="https://www.ippc.int/publications/specification-tp-5-technical-panel-glossary-2013">https://www.ippc.int/publications/specification-tp-5-technical-panel-glossary-2013</a>	1.6	Current specification: TP5 (TPG) (2013) (for information)	N/A
<a href="https://www.ippc.int/publications/local-information-meeting-participants-rome-italy">https://www.ippc.int/publications/local-information-meeting-participants-rome-italy</a>	2.1	Local information	N/A
<a href="https://www.ippc.int/core-activities/standards-setting/expert-drafting-groups/technical-panels/technical-panel-glossary-phytosanitary-terms-ispm-5">https://www.ippc.int/core-activities/standards-setting/expert-drafting-groups/technical-panels/technical-panel-glossary-phytosanitary-terms-ispm-5</a>	3.1	Previous meetings of the TPG (December 2014)	N/A

**APPENDIX 3 - Participants list**

	Participants details			TPG member's term	
	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Participant role	Email address	begins	ends
✓	Ms Laurence BOUHOT-DELDUC Ministry of Agriculture, Agro-food and Forestry General directorate for food Sub-directorate for plant quality and protection 251 rue de Vaugirard 75732 Paris Cedex 15 <b>France</b> Tel: (+33) 149558437 Fax: (+33) 149555949	Steward / French	<a href="mailto:laurence.bouhot-delduc@agriculture.gouv.fr">laurence.bouhot-delduc@agriculture.gouv.fr</a>	May 2013	2018
✓	Ms Stephanie BLOEM U.S. Department of Agriculture, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Plant Protection Quarantine (USDA, APHIS, PPQ) 1730 Varsity Drive, Suite 300, Room 310, Raleigh, North Carolina 27606, <b>USA</b> Tel: (+1) 919 617 4040 Mobile: (+1) 919-480-4761 Fax: (+1) 9198557599	English	<a href="mailto:SBloem.NAPPO@gmail.com">SBloem.NAPPO@gmail.com</a>	Nov 2013	2018
✓	Mr John HEDLEY International Standard Organisations International Policy and Trade Ministry for Primary Industries Pastoral House, 25 The Terrace P.O. Box 2526 Wellington, <b>New Zealand</b> Tel: (+64) 4 894 0428 Mobile : (+64) 298940428 Fax: (+64) 4 894 0742	Steward / English	<a href="mailto:John.Hedley@mpi.govt.nz">John.Hedley@mpi.govt.nz</a>	2013	2018 (1 <sup>st</sup> term: 2008-2013)
✓	Ms Beatriz MELCHO 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> ;	Nov 2010	2020 (1 <sup>st</sup> term: 2010-2015)
✓	Ms Hong NING Plant Quarantine Station of Sichuan Agricultural Department No. 4 Wuhouci Street, Chengdu, Sichuan, <b>P.R.China</b> 610041 Tel: (+86) 28 85505251 Fax: (+86) 28 85505251	Chinese	<a href="mailto:ninghong2006@aliyun.com">ninghong2006@aliyun.com</a> ;	Sept 2012	2017

	Participants details			TPG member's term	
	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Participant role	Email address	begins	ends
✓	Mr Ebbe NORDBO Danish AgriFish Agency Nyropsgade 30 DK - 1780 Copenhagen V, <b>Denmark</b> Tel: (+45) 45 263 891	English	<a href="mailto:eno@naturerhverv.dk">eno@naturerhverv.dk</a> ;	May 2013	2019 (1 <sup>st</sup> term: 2009-2014)
✓	Ms Shaza Roushdy OMAR Phytosanitary Specialist Central Administration for Plant Quarantine Ministry of Agriculture 1 Nadi al Said Street Dokki, Giza, <b>Egypt</b> Mobile: (+20) 1014000813 Fax: (+20) 237608574	Arabic	<a href="mailto:shaza.roshdy@gmail.com">shaza.roshdy@gmail.com</a> ;	Oct 2012	2017
✓	Mr Andrei ORLINSKI European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization 21 bd. Richard Lenoir 75011 Paris, <b>France</b> Tel: (+33) 1 45 20 77 94 ; (+33) 1 84790743 Fax: (+33) 1 70 76 65 47	Russian	<a href="mailto:Orlinski@eppo.int">Orlinski@eppo.int</a> ;	Nov 2010	2020 (1 <sup>st</sup> term: 2010-2015)
✓	Ms Eva MOLLER Standard Setting IPPC Secretariat FAO, Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00153 Rome, <b>Italy</b> Tel: +390657052855	IPPC Secretariat	<a href="mailto:Eva.Moller@fao.org">Eva.Moller@fao.org</a> ;		
✓	Ms Céline GERMAIN Standard Setting IPPC Secretariat FAO, Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00153 Rome, <b>Italy</b> Tel: +390657055809	IPPC Secretariat	<a href="mailto:Celine.Germain@fao.org">Celine.Germain@fao.org</a> ;		
✓	Mr Paul Howard Standard Setting IPPC Secretariat FAO, Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00153 Rome, <b>Italy</b> Tel: +390657055809	IPPC Secretariat	<a href="mailto:Paul.Howard@fao.org">Paul.Howard@fao.org</a>		

## APPENDIX 4 - Draft 2016 Amendments to ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*) (1994-001)

### Publication history

<b>Date of this document</b>	2016-02-10
<b>Document category</b>	Draft 2016 Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms) (1994-001)
<b>Current document stage</b>	To Standards Committee (SC) May 2016 for approval for member consultation
<b>Major stages</b>	CEPM (1994) added topic: 1994-001, Amendments to ISPM 5: Glossary of phytosanitary terms 2006-05 SC approved specification TP5 2012-10 Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG) revised specification 2012-11 SC revised and approved revised specification, revoking Specification 1 2015-12 TPG drafted text
<b>Notes</b>	Note to Secretariat formatting this paper: formatting in definitions and explanations (strikethrough, bold, italics) needs to remain.

### EXPLANATORY NOTE FOR THE STANDARDS COMMITTEE MAY 2016 MEETING

At its meeting in December 2015, the Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG) made proposals for the addition, revision and deletion of terms and definitions in ISPM 5. As in past years, explanations are given for each proposal in the document that will be sent for member consultation. The proposals refer to individual terms in the *List of topics for IPPC standards*. This paper is presented to the SC May 2016 meeting for review and approval for member consultation.

Members are asked to consider the following proposals for addition, revision and deletion 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 comment. For full details on the discussions related to the specific terms, please refer to the meeting reports on the [IPP](#).

## 1. ADDITION

### 1.1 *Exclusion (of a pest) (2010-008)*

[178] In 2009, the Technical Panel for Fruit Flies (TPFF) developed a proposal for a definition of “exclusion” in the draft ISPM on *Phytosanitary Procedures for Fruit Fly (Tephritidae) Management* (2005-010)<sup>27</sup>. The term was added to the *List of Topics for IPPC standards* by the Standards Committee (SC) in April 2010 based on a TPG proposal. The TPFF definition was reviewed and modified by the TPG in October 2010, reviewed by the SC in May 2011 and sent for member consultation in June 2011. *In view of the comments received, in November 2011 the TPG suggested that “exclusion” should be reconsidered in association with “containment”, “suppression”, “eradication” and “control”.* The TPG proposed revisions in the 2013 Amendments to use “official measures” instead of “phytosanitary measures” in these definitions, because “phytosanitary measures” relates only to regulated pests (i.e. quarantine pests or regulated non-quarantine pests), and there is no need to restrict the definition of these terms to regulated pests. The SC in May 2013 agreed to send them for member consultation.

<sup>27</sup> This draft was adopted by the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) in 2015 as Annex 3 to ISPM 26.

- [179] The TPG reviewed member comments in 2014 and presented a recommendation to the SC May 2014 to withdraw the terms from the Amendments because it resulted from the member comments that contracting parties had different understandings of “phytosanitary measure”. The TPG had outlined two understandings: narrow which would include only measures established by the importing country (“official measures” would be used in the exporting country), and broad, which would include measures established by either the importing or the exporting country to manage pests regulated by the importing country. “Phytosanitary measures” should in any case be used only in relation with regulated pests only. The SC in May 2015 discussed the understanding of the term “phytosanitary measure” and did not agree which interpretation should be used.
- [180] In their December 2015 meeting, the TPG discussed further the understanding of “phytosanitary measure” and the related terms. They reviewed the use of “phytosanitary measure” in the IPPC and in adopted ISPMs and noted that in some cases the term was used in the narrow understanding, in other cases it was used in the broad understanding, and that there were cases for which it could be argued which understanding was meant. Referring to the World Trade Organization (WTO) Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (Sanitary and Phytosanitary (SPS) Agreement), some TPG members added that whilst “phytosanitary measures” in the preamble and Annex A (1) is used in the narrow understanding, in article 4 (Equivalence) it also refers to measures taken by the exporting country, consistently with the broad understanding. Besides, applying the narrow understanding to the SPS agreement may also mean that official measures other than phytosanitary measures may not need to be scientifically justified. The TPG discussed the possible impact of a decision to implement the narrow understanding and found that a number of Glossary definitions would need to be modified because they were actually used in ISPMs in the broad sense. The TPG did not agree on this issue and thus decided to not propose changes to the definitions of the terms “containment”, “control (of a pest)”, “eradication” and “suppression”.
- [181] The following explanatory points may be considered when reviewing the proposal for the term “exclusion (of a pest)”:
- It is useful to add this term and its definition to the existing collection of “control”-related terms, which includes “containment”, “control (of a pest)”, “eradication” and “suppression”.
  - It is recommended to use “phytosanitary measures” rather than “official measures”. Although “official” might have been appropriate for such measures applied against pests within a country, the definitions of “containment”, “control (of a pest)”, “eradication” and “suppression” use “phytosanitary measures”, and it is not desirable to introduce inconsistency between all these definitions.
  - The term is qualified by “of a pest” so the word “exclusion” can still be used in its common meaning in other contexts, as is currently the case in various ISPMs (such as “excludes wood packaging material” in ISPM 15, “exclude a certain area” in ISPM 22, exclusion of chemicals or equipment in ISPM 27). The use of a qualifier is also consistent with other glossary terms, such as “control”, “entry” and “establishment”.
  - The term “introduction” (i.e. “entry and establishment”) is used and not “entry”. A package of exclusion measures might include measures to prevent “establishment” in cases of transience or incursion.
  - Although the definition of “introduction” already refers (indirectly) to an area by using the term “entry”, the words “into an area” were added for clarification, as the concept of exclusion is linked to a defined area, whether a country or an area within a country or between several countries.
  - It was considered whether the wording “the application of measures in and around an area” should be used to be consistent with the definition of “containment” and to cover the case of a buffer zone. It is recognized that the definition of “exclusion” was originally developed to apply to pest free areas (PFAs) and areas of low pest prevalence (ALPPs) for fruit flies (in which case it is restricted to the application of measures “in and around an area”); however, exclusion also needs to be used in contexts other than fruit fly PFAs and ALPPs. “In and around an area” is not

relevant in the common scenario in which the area under exclusion is a whole country, or when exclusion measures that benefit one country are applied in another country.

### Proposed addition

<b>exclusion (of a pest)</b>	Application of <b>phytosanitary measures</b> to prevent the <b>introduction</b> of a <b>pest</b> into an <b>area</b> .
------------------------------	--

## 2. REVISIONS

### 2.1 *quarantine* (2015-002)

[182] The Glossary term “quarantine” was added to the *List of Topics for IPPC Standards* by the SC in May 2015 based on a TPG proposal. The TPG reviewed the term in their December 2015 meeting and discussed whether the purposes “observation and research” should be kept in the definition.

[183] The following explanatory points may be considered when reviewing the definition:

- It is current practice that observation and research may be carried out in quarantine stations on pests and beneficial organisms. In order to not exclude such practice, the term “quarantine” should therefore cover the official confinement of biological control agents and other beneficial organisms, which is intended to ensure that they will have minimal negative effects after release and would require observation and research. Thus, official confinement may be carried out for observation and research on pests or beneficial organisms which are not included under “regulated articles”, and it is proposed to add text in the definition to clarify this.
- It is proposed to remove “further” in the definition because there may be cases where initial inspection, testing or treatment has not been carried out before the regulated article is placed in quarantine.

#### [184] *Current definition*

<b>quarantine</b>	<b>Official confinement of regulated articles</b> for observation and research or for further <b>inspection, testing</b> or <b>treatment</b> [FAO, 1990; revised FAO, 1995; CEPM, 1999]
-------------------	---

[185]

#### [186] *Proposed revision*

<b>quarantine</b>	<b>Official confinement of regulated articles</b> for <del>observation and research or for further</del> <b>inspection, testing</b> or <b>treatment</b> , or of <b>pests</b> or <b>beneficial organisms</b> for observation or research [FAO, 1990; revised FAO, 1995; CEPM, 1999]
-------------------	--

### 2.2. *test* (2015-003), *visual examination* (2013-010)

[187] The term “visual examination” was added to the *List of topics for IPPC standards* by the SC in May 2013, based on a TPG proposal. A revised definition was proposed by the TPG in February 2014 and approved for member consultation by the SC in May 2014. At their December 2014 meeting, the TPG discussed whether “visual examination”, “testing” and “inspection” should be reviewed in combination, as suggested by a member comment. The TPG found that the issue might arise from the definition of “test” and invited the SC to add the term to the *List of topics for IPPC standards*. In May 2015, the SC added the term “test” to the *List of topics for IPPC standards*, and the SC-7 withdrew “visual examination” from the 2014 draft Amendments to ISPM 5 (1994-001) so that definitions of “visual examination”, “testing”, and “inspection” could be considered by the TPG together to ensure they are consistent and useful. In November 2015, the SC added the term “inspection” (2015-012) to

the *List of topics for IPPC standards*. The TPG reviewed the terms “test”, “visual examination” and “inspection” in their December 2015 meeting.

[188] The following explanatory points may be considered when reviewing the definitions:

- The current definition of “inspection” is clear and useful and reflects appropriately the concept described in ISPM 23. The term therefore should not be revised.
- The definition of “test” clearly separates such methods from “visual examination”. However, the definition does not exclude that “visual examination” may be done before or after testing. In the proposed revision of “test”, the mention “of plants, plant products, or other regulated articles” is added to clearly indicate that “inspection” and “testing” are two different methods on the same hierarchical level.
- The definition of “visual examination” should describe the process of visual examination, but not its purpose (“to detect pests or contaminants without testing or processing”). The purpose is covered in the definition of “inspection”. Both definitions are needed with “visual examination” simply describing the process, whilst “inspection” describes its application in the phytosanitary context (i.e. it is official and to determine if pests are present or to determine compliance with phytosanitary regulations). The original wording in the definition of visual examination was also confusing (as contamination covers both pests and regulated articles). Although “processing” is often necessary and more elaborate prior to “testing”, some simple processing (e.g. dyeing) may also be carried out prior to visual examination, so need not to be mentioned. “Without testing” was also deleted because it does not add clarification, and the contrast to “testing” is already well covered under the definition of “test”.
- ISPM 23 states that certain tools may be used in conjunction with the inspection process. The simple use of a microscope can be considered part of the inspection process, and should be maintained in the definition of “visual examination” for clarification.
- Collecting and sending samples to a laboratory for the verification of the pest’s identity may be combined with the inspection process, independent if the verification is made visually or by testing.
- The current definition of “inspection” and the proposed revisions for “test” and “visual examination” adequately reflect the uses in adopted ISPMs. The definitions are general; any particular requirements that would differ from those described in the definitions should be clarified in the ISPM text.

[189] *Current definitions*

<b>test</b>	<b>Official</b> examination, other than visual, to determine if <b>pests</b> are present or to identify <b>pests</b> [FAO, 1990]
<b>visual examination</b>	The physical examination of <b>plants, plant products</b> , or other <b>regulated articles</b> using the unaided eye, lens, stereoscope or microscope to detect <b>pests</b> or <b>contaminants</b> without <b>testing</b> or processing [ISPM 23]

[190]

[191] *Proposed revisions*

<b>test</b>	<b>Official</b> examination <u>of <b>plants, plant products</b>, or other <b>regulated articles</b></u> , other than visual, to determine if <b>pests</b> are present or to identify <b>pests</b> [FAO, 1990]
<b>visual examination</b>	The physical examination of <b>plants, plant products</b> , or other <b>regulated articles</b> using the unaided eye, lens, stereoscope or microscope <del>to detect <b>pests</b> or <b>contaminants</b> without <b>testing</b> or processing</del> [ISPM 23]

### 3. DELETIONS

#### 3.1. *pre-clearance* (2013-016)

[192] When reviewing the draft ISPM *Phytosanitary pre-import clearance* (2005-003) in their May 2013 meeting, the SC added the revision of the term “pre-clearance” to the *List of topics for IPPC standards* with a pending status because the term was causing confusion. At the May 2015 meeting, the SC approved the draft appendix to ISPM 20 on *Arrangements for verification of compliance of consignments by the importing country in the exporting country* (2005-003) for member consultation, in which the term “pre-clearance” is not used. The SC agreed to remove the pending status of the term and asked the TPG to consider it in the context of the term “clearance (of a consignment)”. The TPG reviewed it in their December 2015 meeting and proposed the deletion of the term “pre-clearance” (2013-016).

[193] The following explanatory points may be considered:

- The current definition of “pre-clearance” is not in accordance with the Convention as it indicates that phytosanitary certification can be performed by or under the regular supervision of the national plant protection organization of the country of destination.
- “Pre-clearance” is currently used in many different countries with very different meanings. It does not seem possible to revise the definition to adequately reflect all the various meanings of the term allowing for international harmonization and agreement. The term “pre-clearance” is only used three times in ISPM 20 and is not used in the draft appendix to ISPM 20 on *Arrangements for verification of compliance of consignments by the importing country in the exporting country* (2005-003), which was submitted to member consultation in 2015. Thus, the deletion of term from the Glossary appears to be the best solution as its current definition is incorrect.
- Ink amendments to ISPM 20 might be considered at a later stage to reflect the concept outlined in the draft appendix to ISPM 20, once fully clarified and if deemed appropriate.
- The deletion of the term “pre-clearance” would not affect the meaning of “clearance (of a consignment)” which is considered to be clear.

[194] *Proposed deletion*

<b>pre-clearance</b>	<b>Phytosanitary certification</b> and/or <b>clearance</b> in the <b>country of origin</b> , performed by or under the regular supervision of the <b>national plant protection organization</b> of the country of destination [FAO, 1990; revised FAO, 1995]
----------------------	--

## APPENDIX 5 - Proposed ink amendments to ISPM 3 to replace “quarantine facility” with the glossary term “quarantine station”

### Background

The Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG) proposed a revised definition to “quarantine station” in the amendments to ISPM 5, which were adopted by CPM-10 (2015). In the proposed amendments reviewed by the TPG in their February 2014 meeting, the TPG noted that ISPM 3 used the term “quarantine facility” and that, once the revised definition for “quarantine station” would be adopted, ISPM 3 could have ink amendments to correct this. The below table outlines the proposed ink amendments to ISPM 3 to ensure consistency in the use of Glossary terms.

### Recommendation

The SC is *invited* to review and approve the ink amendments to ISPM 3 to replace “quarantine facility” with the Glossary term “quarantine station”.

#### Ink amendments to replace “quarantine facility” with the Glossary term “quarantine station” (ISPM 3)

Row no.	Reference	Original text	Proposed change
1.	Scope, 1 <sup>st</sup> para, last sentence	Provisions are also included for import for research in quarantine facilities of non-indigenous biological control agents and other beneficial organisms.	Provisions are also included for import for research in quarantine <del>facilities</del> <u>stations</u> of non-indigenous biological control agents and other beneficial organisms.
2.	Outline of requirements, 3 <sup>rd</sup> para, 4 <sup>th</sup> indent	- ensure that biological control agents and other beneficial organisms are taken either directly to designated quarantine facilities or mass-rearing facilities or, if appropriate, passed directly for release into the environment	- ensure that biological control agents and other beneficial organisms are taken either directly to designated quarantine <del>facilities</del> <u>stations</u> or mass-rearing facilities or, if appropriate, passed directly for release into the environment
3.	1.2 General responsibilities, 2 <sup>nd</sup> para, 4 <sup>th</sup> indent	- ensure that biological control agents and other beneficial organisms are taken either directly to designated quarantine facilities or, if appropriate, passed to mass rearing facilities or directly for release into the environment	- ensure that biological control agents and other beneficial organisms are taken either directly to designated quarantine <del>facilities</del> <u>stations</u> or, if appropriate, passed to mass rearing facilities or directly for release into the environment
4.	3.1 Responsibilities of the importing contracting party, 3.1.2, 2 <sup>nd</sup> sentence	The contracting party should establish appropriate phytosanitary measures for import, shipment, quarantine facilities (including approval of research facilities, and phytosanitary measures for confinement and disposal) or release of biological control agents appropriate to the assessed risk.	The contracting party should establish appropriate phytosanitary measures for import, shipment, quarantine <del>facilities</del> <u>stations</u> (including approval of research facilities, and phytosanitary measures for confinement and disposal) or release of biological control agents appropriate to the assessed risk.

Row no.	Reference	Original text	Proposed change
5.	3.1 Responsibilities of the importing contracting party, 3.1.5. 1 <sup>st</sup> sentence and 2 <sup>nd</sup> sentence	If appropriate, ensure entry of consignments, and processing where required, through quarantine facilities. Where a country does not have secure quarantine facilities, import through a quarantine station in a third country, recognized by the importing contracting party, may be considered.	If appropriate, ensure entry of consignments, and processing where required, through quarantine <u>stations</u> <del>facilities</del> . Where a country does not have secure quarantine <u>stations</u> <del>facilities</del> , import through a quarantine station in a third country, recognized by the importing contracting party, may be considered.
6.	4.4 Documentary requirements related to research in quarantine, 2 <sup>nd</sup> para, 1 <sup>st</sup> sentence, 3 <sup>rd</sup> and 4 <sup>th</sup> indents	The researcher, in conjunction with the quarantine facility to be used, should also provide the following information: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- (...)</li> <li>- (...)</li> <li>- detailed description of the quarantine facility (including security and the competency and qualifications of the staff)</li> <li>- an emergency plan that will be implemented in the case of an escape from the quarantine facility.</li> </ul>	The researcher, in conjunction with the quarantine <u>station</u> <del>facility</del> to be used, should also provide the following information: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- (...)</li> <li>- (...)</li> <li>- detailed description of the quarantine <u>station</u> <del>facility</del> (including security and the competency and qualifications of the staff)</li> <li>- an emergency plan that will be implemented in the case of an escape from the quarantine <u>station</u> <del>facility</del>.</li> </ul>
7.	6.1 Inspection	Where required (see section 3.1.5) after checking the documentation, inspection should take place at an officially nominated quarantine facility.	Where required (see section 3.1.5) after checking the documentation, inspection should take place at an officially nominated quarantine <u>station</u> <del>facility</del> .

## APPENDIX 6 - Proposed ink amendment to “practically free”

(Agreed by TPG 2015-12 for discussion by SC)

The TPG in their December 2015 meeting discussed the Glossary term “practically free” and agreed adding the qualifier “of a consignment, field or place of production” to the term, and consequently remove this text from the definition, which would also align with the term “*free from (of a consignment, field or place of production)*”.

*Original term/definition:*

**practically free** Of a **consignment, field, or place of production**, without **pests** (or a specific **pest**) in numbers or quantities in excess of those that can be expected to result from, and be consistent with good cultural and handling practices employed in the production and marketing of the **commodity** [FAO, 1990; revised FAO, 1995]

*Proposed revision:*

**practically free (of a consignment, field, or place of production)** ~~Of a **consignment, field, or place of production**, without **pests** (or a specific **pest**) in numbers or quantities in excess of those that can be expected to result from, and be consistent with, good cultural and handling practices employed in the production and marketing of the **commodity** [FAO, 1990; revised FAO, 1995]~~

### Recommendation

The SC is *invited* to review and approve the ink amendment to “practically free” in ISPM 5 (*Glossary of Phytosanitary terms*).

## APPENDIX 7 - Recommendations on use of specific terms

(As revised by TPG 2015-12 meeting)

### *Acceptable level of risk, appropriate level of protection*

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

### *Accredit, authorize and certify*

These terms are used by many bodies and organizations in ways that may make them appear to have the same or similar meanings. In ISPMs and other IPPC documents, it is recommended the terms be used with the following restriction. When the concepts correspond, these three terms should be used in preference:

“accredit” – to give authority to a person or a body to do something when certain requirements have been met.

“authorize” – to give authority to a person or a body to do something.

“certify” – to state that a product or article meets certain requirements.

### *Contamination and contaminating pest*

These are Glossary terms and they should be used in preference to “contaminant”.

### *Country, contracting party, NPPO*

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

### *Efficacy, effectiveness*

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

### *Inspection*

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

### *Intended use*

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

### *IPPC*

It is suggested that the abbreviation “IPPC” only be used when referring specifically to the Convention itself. When referring to decisions or actions of the Commission or actions by the Secretariat these bodies should be specified.

### *(Non-)compliance, (non-)conformity*

According to IPPC Article VII (2f), “Importing contracting parties shall...inform...of instances of non-compliance with phytosanitary certification...”. Furthermore, “Compliance procedure (for a

consignment)” has been defined in the Glossary. Thus, in those cases, compliance and non-compliance are clearly linked to consignments and thus to import. For other cases of correct or incorrect implementation of measures (e.g. regarding requirements prescribed for an entire place of production) it might be more appropriate to use other terms such as “(non-)conformity”.

#### *Official*

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

#### *Pest list*

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

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

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

#### *Pest free*

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

#### *Pest risk management*

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

#### *Phytosanitary certificate, certificate*

Where “certificate” or “certification” refers to “phytosanitary certificate” or “phytosanitary certification”, these terms should be used, to distinguish from other instances where certificate and certification may relate to other situations (e.g. Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) certificates, certification scheme). In ISPM 12 (*Phytosanitary certificates*), the plural term “phytosanitary certificates” refers to export and re-export certificates.

#### *Phytosanitary import requirements*

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

#### *Phytosanitary measures, phytosanitary actions*

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

#### *Phytosanitary status*

The use of “phytosanitary status” should be avoided as it presents a problem for the understanding of ISPMs, and creates conflicts of meaning between existing ISPMs. The defined Glossary terms “pest status (in an area)” or “pest risk” may be used in some contexts. .

#### *Point of entry*

This is the Glossary term. First, “point of entry” should be used in preference to other wordings such as “port of entry”. Second, “point of entry” should not be used in relation to entrance points into a pest free area (PFA) or area of low pest prevalence (ALPP).

#### *Presence, occurrence*

The terms “presence” and “occurrence” have both been used in ISPMs in relation to pest status. However, in future ISPMs, it is recommended that the term “presence” be used rather than the term “occurrence”<sup>28</sup>.

#### *Prevalence*

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

#### *Restriction*

While this previous Glossary term has been used in ISPMs, it has mainly been used in the meaning of another Glossary term, “phytosanitary import requirements”. For that meaning, only “phytosanitary import requirements” should be used in the future<sup>29</sup>.

#### *Security, phytosanitary security*

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

#### *Shipment*

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

#### *Trading partner*

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

### **Other recommendations**

#### *and/or*

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

#### *References to the text of the IPPC*

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

#### *“/” and “(s)”*

<sup>28</sup> CPM-10 (2015) adopted the deletion of the definition of “occurrence” and confirmed that the term “presence” does not need a specific IPPC definition.

<sup>29</sup> CPM-10 (2015) adopted the deletion of the Glossary term “restriction” and the term can be used with its general English meaning in the future.

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

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

## APPENDIX 8 - Consistency changes across ISPMs: *trading partner* (2013-009)

(Prepared by TPG 2015-12)

### Background

[195] In reviewing ISPM 17 (*Pest reporting*) for consistency, in its October 2012 meeting, the TPG noted that the term *trading partners* was used in an unclear manner in this standard. Where ISPMs normally intend trading partners to be countries, the mention here could refer to a commercial trading company. In order to clarify the meaning of the term, the TPG asked that it should be added as a subject on the TPG work programme.

[196] The SC May 2013 agreed and added the term to the *List of topics for IPPC standards*.

[197] The TPG in its February 2014 meeting discussed the term.

[198] Where it had previously been envisaged that this term in ISPMs covered both importing and exporting countries, the analysis presented to the meeting demonstrated that:

in most cases the intended meaning of *trading partners* is *importing countries*. However, the TPG believed that the term *trading partners* potentially creates serious misunderstandings. In particular, it could be read to cover exporting countries and private companies, which was not intended in most cases.

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

[199] The SC May 2014 discussed the consistency proposals (under agenda item 8.2) but since “there were some concerns regarding the proposal for replacing all the uses of *trading partners* with *importing countries*”, the TPG was asked to review the proposed ink amendments.

[200] The TPG December 2014 discussed the proposed ink amendments and made changes to address the SC concerns.

[201] The SC May 2015 reviewed the proposed ink amendments but “some SC members had some concerns with some of the proposals, either due to the wording or the change in meaning”, and invited SC members to submit written comments. Hereafter the TPG should revise the proposals and submit them for an SC e-decision.

[202] The TPG received comments from one SC member and the TPG lead proposed responses and changes to the proposals. The TPG discussed this version in a TPG e-forum (*TPG e-decision\_02*) but did not reach agreement and the proposals were presented to the TPG December 2015 meeting, where consensus was reached.

### Recommendation

[203] The SC is *invited* to review and approve the ink amendments in Table 1 for the replacement of “trading partner” (2013-009) across ISPMs.

**TABLE 1: Proposed changes across ISPMs in relation to the use of “trading partners”**

[204] The TPG found that in the great majority of cases in ISPMs, trading partner (or trade partner) can be replaced by “NPPOs of importing countries”, or a very slightly different rewording can be done, without any apparent change of meaning. In a few cases, trading partner is understood to have another meaning and different rewording is proposed.

ISPM	Section	Para	Current text	Proposed text	Rationale
4	2.3.4	-	Documentation may include supporting evidence describing official controls such as survey results, phytosanitary regulations and information on the NPPO as noted in section 1.3. As this type of PFA is likely to involve an agreement between trade partners, its implementation would need to be reviewed and evaluated by the NPPO of the importing country.	Documentation may include supporting evidence describing official controls such as survey results, phytosanitary regulations and information on the NPPO as noted in section 1.3. As this type of PFA is likely to involve an agreement between <u>the exporting and the importing country</u> <del>between trade partners</del> , its implementation would need to be reviewed and evaluated by the NPPO of the importing country.	Because in the section 2.3 - case the PFA is created for export purposes, the 'likely agreement' is <b>between the exporting and the importing country</b> . Agreements within the exporting country between producers or producers and the NPPO are not relevant to mention in an ISPM, and such agreements are not providing the rationale for the NPPO to 'review and evaluate'.
8	4	3, 3 <sup>rd</sup> indent	To observe good reporting practices, NPPOs should:  .... inform the NPPO of trading partners as soon as possible, and their regional plant protection organization (RPPO) where appropriate, of relevant changes in	To observe good reporting practices, NPPOs should:  .... inform the <u>NPPOs of countries that are traded with trading partners</u> as soon as possible, and their regional plant protection organization (RPPO) where appropriate, of relevant changes in pest status and	The proposed change is consistent with reporting obligations of an NPPO under the IPPC and contributes to facilitation of international trade of plants and plant products. An NPPO has no 'trading partners' and has no obligation to report to trading organizations. The change clarifies that the obligation is towards those countries that the country in question trades with.

ISPM	Section	Para	Current text	Proposed text	Rationale
			pest status and especially reports of newly established pests	especially reports of newly established pest	
9	<b>Outline of Requirements</b>	4	When an eradication programme is completed, the absence of the pest must be verified. The verification procedure should use criteria established at the beginning of the programme and should be supported by adequate documentation of programme activities and results. The verification stage is integral to the programme, and should involve independent analysis if trading partners require this reassurance. Successful programmes result in a declaration of eradication by the NPPO. When unsuccessful, all aspects of the programme should be reviewed, including the biology of the pest to determine if new information is available, and the cost-benefit of the programme.	When an eradication programme is completed, the absence of the pest must be verified. The verification procedure should use criteria established at the beginning of the programme and should be supported by adequate documentation of programme activities and results. The verification stage is integral to the programme, and should involve independent analysis if <del>trading partners</del> <u>NPPOs of importing countries</u> require this reassurance. Successful programmes result in a declaration of eradication by the NPPO. When unsuccessful, all aspects of the programme should be reviewed, including the biology of the pest to determine if new information is available, and the cost-benefit of the programme.	Under the IPPC, NPPOs of importing countries (and not 'trading partners') have the right to verify/analyse pest status in the exporting countries which includes the results of eradication programs.
9	<b>2.3.2</b>	4	In cases where survey data are to provide the basis for establishing a	In cases where survey data are to provide the basis for establishing a pest free area	This is up to NPPOs of importing countries (and not 'trading partners') to decide about quantity and quality of data necessary to meet phytosanitary

ISPM	Section	Para	Current text	Proposed text	Rationale
			pest free area for export purposes, it may be desirable to consult trading partners in advance to determine the quantity and quality of data necessary to meet their phytosanitary import requirements.	for export purposes, it may be desirable to consult <del>trading partners</del> <u>NPPOs of importing countries</u> in advance to determine the quantity and quality of data necessary to meet their phytosanitary import requirements.	import requirements.
9	3	2	Direction and coordination should be provided by an official management authority, ensuring that criteria are established to determine when eradication has been achieved and that appropriate documentation and process controls exist to provide sufficient confidence in the results. It may be necessary to consult with trading partners over some aspects of the eradication process.	Direction and coordination should be provided by an official management authority, ensuring that criteria are established to determine when eradication has been achieved and that appropriate documentation and process controls exist to provide sufficient confidence in the results. It may be necessary to consult with <u>NPPOs of importing countries</u> <del>trading partners</del> over some aspects of the eradication process.	NPPOs of importing countries (and not 'trading partners') establish phytosanitary import requirements. Therefore it is important that they accept aspects of the eradication process to consider eradication results reliable.
9	3.4	-	NPPOs should ensure that records are kept of information supporting all stages of the eradication process. It is essential that NPPOs maintain such documentation in case trading partners request information to support claims of pest freedom.	NPPOs should ensure that records are kept of information supporting all stages of the eradication process. It is essential that NPPOs maintain such documentation in case <del>trading partners</del> <u>NPPOs of importing countries</u> request information to support claims of pest freedom.	Under the IPPC, NPPOs of importing countries have the obligation to report on request of the exporting countries (and not 'trading partners') of the "occurrence outbreak or spread of pests". This includes records of information on eradication programs.

ISPM	Section	Para	Current text	Proposed text	Rationale
11	2.3.1.2	1 <sup>st</sup> parag., 1 <sup>st</sup> indent	effects on domestic and export markets, including in particular effects on export market access (The potential consequences for market access which may result if the pest becomes established, should be estimated. This involves considering the extent of any phytosanitary regulations imposed (or likely to be imposed) by trading partners.)	effects on domestic and export markets, including in particular effects on export market access (The potential consequences for market access which may result if the pest becomes established, should be estimated. This involves considering the extent of any phytosanitary regulations imposed (or likely to be imposed) by <u>importing countries</u> <del>trading partners</del> .)	Any phytosanitary regulations could be imposed only by importing countries and not by 'trading partners'.
14	8	1	The development of a systems approach may be undertaken by the importing country, or by the exporting country, or ideally through the cooperation of both countries. The process of developing systems approaches may include consultation with industry, the scientific community, and trading partner(s). However, the NPPO of the importing country decides the suitability of the systems approach in meeting its requirements, subject to consideration of technical justification, minimal impact, transparency, non-	The development of a systems approach may be undertaken by the importing country, or by the exporting country, or ideally through the cooperation of both countries. The process of developing systems approaches may include consultation with industry, the scientific community, and <u>NPPOs of importing and exporting countries</u> <del>trading partner(s)</del> . However, the NPPO of the importing country decides the suitability of the systems approach in meeting its requirements, subject to consideration of technical justification, minimal impact, transparency, non-discrimination, equivalence and operational feasibility.	The systems approaches are primarily developed by NPPOs of importing countries (and not 'trading partners') in cooperation (if needed) with the scientific community and industry.

ISPM	Section	Para	Current text	Proposed text	Rationale
			discrimination, equivalence and operational feasibility.		
14	9.1	2	Where the systems approach has been found unacceptable, the rationale for this decision should be described in detail and made available to trading partners to facilitate the identification of possible improvements.	Where the systems approach has been found unacceptable, the rationale for this decision should be described in detail and made available to <u>NPPOs of the exporting country</u> trading partners to facilitate the identification of possible improvements.	Under the ISPM 14, “The development of a systems approach may be undertaken by the importing country, or by the exporting country, or ideally through the cooperation of both countries.” This means that when the importing country finds the systems approach unacceptable (not feasible, not sufficiently effective, unnecessarily restrictive or not possible to evaluate) the rationale for this decision should be made available to the NPPO of the exporting country.
15	3.3	-	NPPOs may accept measures other than those listed in Annex 1 by bilateral arrangement with their trading partners. In such cases, the mark shown in Annex 2 must not be used unless all requirements of this standard have been met.	NPPOs may accept measures other than those listed in Annex 1 by bilateral arrangement <del>with their trading partners</del> . In such cases, the mark shown in Annex 2 must not be used unless all requirements of this standard have been met.	The ‘bilateral arrangement’ (which could include exemptions from ISPM 15 requirements) is an agreement between the exporting and importing countries which means between their NPPOs (and not ‘trading partners’).
17	Outline of requirements	1	The International Plant Protection Convention requires contracting parties to report on the occurrence, outbreak and spread of pests with the purpose of communicating immediate or potential danger. National plant	The International Plant Protection Convention requires contracting parties to report on the occurrence, outbreak and spread of pests with the purpose of communicating immediate or potential danger. National plant protection organizations (NPPOs) have	Reporting occurrence, outbreak or spread of pests is an obligation of NPPOs and should be ensured for countries concerned. Using “countries that are traded with” limits this obligation to those countries that are really concerned. If “importing countries” was used it would not be clear <i>which</i> importing countries would be intended, whereas it is now clear that it is only those countries that are traded with.

ISPM	Section	Para	Current text	Proposed text	Rationale
			protection organizations (NPPOs) have the responsibility to collect pest information by surveillance and to verify the pest records thus collected. Occurrence, outbreak or spread of pests that are known (on the basis of observation, previous experience, or pest risk analysis (PRA)) to be of immediate or potential danger should be reported to other countries, in particular to neighbouring countries and trading partners.	the responsibility to collect pest information by surveillance and to verify the pest records thus collected. Occurrence, outbreak or spread of pests that are known (on the basis of observation, previous experience, or pest risk analysis (PRA)) to be of immediate or potential danger should be reported to other countries, in particular to <u>NPPOs of neighbouring countries and trading partners of countries that are traded with.</u>	
17	2		The main purpose of pest reporting is to communicate immediate or potential danger. Immediate or potential danger normally arises from the occurrence, outbreak or spread of a pest that is a quarantine pest in the country in which it is detected, or a quarantine pest for neighbouring countries and trading partners.	The main purpose of pest reporting is to communicate immediate or potential danger. Immediate or potential danger normally arises from the occurrence, outbreak or spread of a pest that is a quarantine pest in the country in which it is detected, or a quarantine pest for neighbouring countries and <u>trading partners countries that are traded with.</u>	Countries are concerned about occurrence, outbreak or spread of pests if they are quarantine pests for them. Using “countries that are traded with” limits this obligation to those countries that are really concerned. If “importing countries” was used it would not be clear <i>which</i> importing countries would be intended, whereas it is now clear that it is only those countries that are traded with.
17	4.1	4	Contracting parties have an obligation to report occurrence,	Contracting parties have an obligation to report occurrence, outbreak or	Occurrence, outbreak or spread of pests concern more countries than traders.

ISPM	Section	Para	Current text	Proposed text	Rationale
			outbreak or spread of pests that are not of danger to them but are known to be regulated by or of immediate danger to other countries. This will concern trading partners (for relevant pathways) and neighbouring countries to which the pest could spread without trade.	spread of pests that are not of danger to them but are known to be regulated by or of immediate danger to other countries. This will concern <del>importing countries</del> <del>trading partners</del> (for relevant pathways) and neighbouring countries to which the pest could spread without trade.	
17	5.1	-	Occurrence should normally be reported where the presence of a pest is newly determined, which is known to be a regulated pest by neighbouring countries or trading partners (for relevant pathways).	Occurrence should normally be reported where the presence of a pest is newly determined, which is known to be a regulated pest <del>by</del> <del>in</del> neighbouring <del>countries</del> or <del>importing countries</del> <del>trading partners</del> (for relevant pathways).	Countries are concerned about occurrence of pests if these pests are regulated by them (not by traders).
17	5.2	2	The term outbreak also applies to an unexpected situation associated with an established pest which results in a significant increase in phytosanitary risk to the reporting country, neighbouring countries or trading partners, particularly if it is known that the pest is a regulated pest. Such unexpected situations could include a rapid increase in the pest	The term outbreak also applies to an unexpected situation associated with an established pest which results in a significant increase in phytosanitary risk to the reporting, neighbouring <del>countries</del> or <del>importing countries</del> <del>trading partners</del> , particularly if it is known that the pest is a regulated pest. Such unexpected situations could include a rapid increase in the pest population, changes in host range the development of a new, more	Outbreak and establishment of regulated pests concern more countries (reporting, neighbouring and importing) than traders.

ISPM	Section	Para	Current text	Proposed text	Rationale
			population, changes in host range the development of a new, more vigorous strain or biotype, or the detection of a new pathway.	vigorous strain or biotype, or the detection of a new pathway.	
17	5.3		Spread concerns an established pest that expands its geographical distribution, resulting in a significant increase in pest risk to the reporting country, neighbouring countries or trading partners, particularly if it is known that the pest is regulated.	Spread concerns an established pest that expands its geographical distribution, resulting in a significant increase in pest risk to the reporting <del>country</del> , neighbouring <del>countries</del> or <del>importing countries</del> <del>trading partners</del> , particularly if it is known that the pest is regulated.	Spread of regulated pests concern more countries (reporting, neighbouring and importing) than traders.
24	Annex 1	1	The interactive procedure described below is recommended for assessing phytosanitary measures in order to make a determination as to their equivalence. However, the procedure that trading partners utilize to determine equivalence may vary depending on the circumstances.	The interactive procedure described below is recommended for assessing phytosanitary measures in order to make a determination as to their equivalence. However, the procedure that <del>contracting parties</del> <del>trading partners</del> utilize to determine equivalence may vary depending on the circumstances.	This is the responsibility of contracting parties to determine equivalence. "Countries" is not used for consistency with the text of ISPM 24, which uses "contracting parties".
24	Annex 1	2	Recommended steps are: (1) The exporting contracting party communicates its interest in an equivalence	Recommended steps are: (1) The exporting contracting party communicates its interest in an equivalence determination to <del>the</del> <del>importing country</del>	This is the responsibility of importing contracting parties to determine equivalence.

ISPM	Section	Para	Current text	Proposed text	Rationale
			<p>determination to its trading partner, indicating the specified commodity, the regulated pest of concern and the existing and proposed alternative measures, including relevant data. At the same time it may request from the importing contracting party the technical justification for the existing measures. In discussions on the determination of equivalence, an agreement including an outline of the steps involved, an agenda and a possible timetable may be established.</p>	<p><del>contracting party</del><del>its trading partner</del>, indicating the specified commodity, the regulated pest of concern and the existing and proposed alternative measures, including relevant data. At the same time it may request from the importing contracting party the technical justification for the existing measures. In discussions on the determination of equivalence, an agreement including an outline of the steps involved, an agenda and a possible timetable may be established.</p>	
29	1	3	<p>ISPM 4:1995 points out that, since certain PFAs are likely to involve an agreement between trading partners, their implementation would need to be reviewed and evaluated by the national plant protection organization (NPPO) of the importing country (section 2.3.4).</p>	<p>ISPM 4:1995 points out that, since certain PFAs are likely to involve an agreement <del>between trading partners</del>, their implementation would need to be reviewed and evaluated by the national plant protection organization (NPPO) of the importing country (section 2.3.4). <i>[note: this is a direct quote of ISPM 4, with the same change as proposed above]</i></p>	<p>Because the PFA is created for export purposes, the 'likely agreement' is <b>between the exporting and the importing country</b>. Agreements within the exporting country between producers or producers and the NPPO are not relevant to mention in an ISPM, and such agreements are not providing the rationale for the NPPO to 'review and evaluate'.</p>
30	2.1.1	2 <sup>nd</sup>	Individual NPPOs may	Individual NPPOs may draw	NPPOs of importing countries are responsible for plant health and not

ISPM	Section	Para	Current text	Proposed text	Rationale
		paragraph, 1 <sup>st</sup> indent	draw on a variety of different factors when determining exactly what an appropriate level of pest prevalence should be for a given FF-ALPP. Some commonly considered factors include the following:  levels stipulated by trading partners in order for trade to proceed	on a variety of different factors when determining exactly what an appropriate level of pest prevalence should be for a given FF-ALPP. Some commonly considered factors include the following:  - levels stipulated by <del>trading partners</del> <u>NPPOs of importing countries</u> in order for trade to proceed	traders.

## APPENDIX 9 – TPG Work Plan 2015-2016

*(Prepared by the Secretariat, last updated 2016-02-05)*

[Table 1: Regular tasks](#)

[Table 2: One-off tasks](#)

[Table 3: Terms on the TPG work programme as subjects](#)

[Table 4: Chronological summary of deadlines](#)

**The next TPG meeting is scheduled for 5-9 December 2016. Deadline for submitting meeting documents is 3 October 2016.**

**TABLE 1 - REGULAR TASKS**

Regular tasks		Detailed task	Responsible	Deadline	Comments
<b>1. Meeting reports: preparation and update to SC</b>	<b>December 2015</b>	Draft report to Steward and rapporteur	Secretariat	2015-12-23	
		Steward and rapporteur send back draft report	Steward & rapporteur	2016-01-15	
		Secretariat finalizes report and sends to TPG	Secretariat	2016-01-22	
		TPG review report and sends comments	All	2016-02-05	
		Final report	Secretariat	2015-02-19	(10 weeks after meeting)
	<b>Update for SC May 2016</b>	Prepare update (incl. decisions) from December 2015 meeting for SC May 2016	Secretariat with steward	2016-03-14	Secretariat to draft; steward to respond by 21/3 tent.
<b>2. Draft ISPMs in member consultation (for Amendments, see 3)</b>	2014 MC (except Amendments, see 3)	Check accuracy of translation of definitions in draft ISPMs. Members receive draft definitions for their language	French, Spanish	2014-10-08	These will be submitted to translation-services when drafts go for translation before CPM
		Proposals of translations for Chinese, Arabic and Russian in draft ISPMs	Russian, Chinese, Arabic	2014-10-08	These will be submitted to translation-services when drafts go for translation before CPM
		Terms and consistency comments extracted	Secretariat	2014-12-04	
		Review for possible inconsistencies and consideration of comments	All	TPG meeting	
		Reactions to comments/consistency review integrated in tables: all drafts, and send to stewards via Secretariat	Secretariat with steward		Comments from TPG on these will not be solicited, documents will be finalized by Secretariat and Steward (15/2 deadline for stewards to send Sec. responses

Regular tasks	Detailed task	Responsible	Deadline	Comments	
				to comments and revised draft)	
	Reactions on translation of terms sent to Secretariat for consideration at next translation phase	Secretariat	2015-12	When submitting drafts for translation before CPM	
	Reactions to requests for new terms and definitions in member comments	Secretariat with <b>steward</b>	Tbd	After TPG meeting	
<b>2015 MC (except Amendments, see 3)</b>	Check accuracy of translation of definitions in draft ISPMs. Members receive draft definitions for their language	French, Spanish	2015-10-07	These will be submitted to translation-services when drafts go for translation before CPM	
	Proposals of translations for Chinese, Arabic and Russian in draft ISPMs	Russian, Chinese, Arabic	2015-10-07	These will be submitted to translation-services when drafts go for translation before CPM	
	Terms and consistency comments extracted	Secretariat	2015-12-04		
	Review for possible inconsistencies and consideration of comments	All	TPG meeting		
	Reactions to comments/consistency review integrated in tables: all drafts, and send to stewards via Secretariat	Secretariat with <b>steward</b>	2016-01-05	Comments from TPG on these will not be solicited, documents will be finalized by Secretariat and Steward (15/2 deadline for stewards to send Sec. responses to comments and revised draft)	
	Reactions on translation of terms sent to Secretariat for consideration at next translation phase	Secretariat	2016-12	When submitting drafts for translation before CPM	
	Reactions to requests for new terms and definitions in member comments	Secretariat with <b>steward</b>	Tbd	After TPG meeting	
<b>3. Terms and definitions (incl. Amendments to the Glossary)</b>	<b>2014 Amendments</b>	Volunteers sends draft meeting papers to Secretariat	ALL, as allocated in Table 3	2013-12-31	TPG 2014
		Draft amendments 2014 compiled based on discussions at Feb 2014, and finalized with steward, and sent to TPG for comment	Secretariat and steward	2014-03-28	
		TPG sends back comments	ALL	2014-04-08	
		Amendments processed for SC	Secretariat	2014-04-10	

Regular tasks	Detailed task	Responsible	Deadline	Comments
	Draft amendments in member consultation		2014-07 to 12	
	Draft amendments and member comments considered by TPG		TPG meeting	
	Finalize amendments and responses with steward	Secretariat and <b>steward</b>	2014-12-31	Secretariat will send drafts to steward by 17-12-2014
	Amendments and responses for TPG comments	ALL	2015-02-15	Draft Amendments and responses to compiled comments to be posted by 1 March for SC-7 / SCCP
	Consultation by email on SCCP comments	ALL	Tbd, in 2015-10	(SCCP is from 07 to 09)
	Check of translations of draft Amendments going for adoption (i.e. after SC November and when it has been revised/translated into all languages)	Members for languages	Tbd, in 2016-01	The translations will be ready for review around the beginning of January and must be posted by 1 March for CPM.
<b>2016 Amendments (2015 Amendments will be sent to MC in 2016)</b>	Volunteers sends draft meeting papers to Secretariat	ALL (as allocated in Table 3)	2015-10-07	TPG meeting
	Draft Amendments 2016 compiled based on discussions at TPG send to Steward for finalization	Secretariat	2015-12-17	
	Steward sends comments	Steward	2016-01-15	
	Draft Amendments for TPG comments	ALL	2016-02-05	Posting deadline for SC May 2016 is 1 March
	Draft Amendments in member consultation		2016-07 to 12	
	Draft Amendments and member comments considered by TPG		TPG meeting 2016	
	Finalize Amendments and responses with steward	Secretariat and <b>steward</b>	2016-12-22	Draft Amendments and responses to compiled comments to be posted by 1 March for SC-7 / SCCP
	Draft amendments in SCCP		2016-07 to 09	

Regular tasks	Detailed task		Responsible	Deadline	Comments
	Consultation by email on SCCP comments		ALL	ASAP after 30 September	If Steward feels consultation is needed. The draft Amendments and responses to SCCP 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)		Members for languages	Tbd, in 2018-01	
<b>Translation of terms</b>	Secretariat to solicit TPG members' help to translate new terms in languages for the List of topics (LOT)		Secretariat	Tbd	Normally, in the TPG meeting as terms would be agreed for inclusion on LOT in SC May meeting.
<b>4. Annotated glossary – (to be published every 3 years)</b>	2015 (for publishing)	To prepare intermediate update based on TPG comments, outcome of SC Nov 2014, TPG 2015, CPM 2015, SC May 2015	Beatriz Melcho	2015-08-28	
		To review intermediate update	All	2015-10-07	Draft including comments to be reviewed at TPG 2015 meeting
		To modify and finalize based on outcome of SC Nov 2015 and on the outcome of TPG 2015 meeting	Beatriz Melcho	2016-01-29	(Tentative deadline)
	2016 (intermediate)	To comment	All	2016-02-12	(Tentative deadline)
		To finalize for publication	Beatriz Melcho / Secretariat	2016-02-29	Secretariat to publish on 2016-03-09 tent.
		To prepare intermediate update based on outcomes of CPM 2016, SC May 2016	Beatriz Melcho	Tbd	
	To review intermediate update	All	Tbd		
<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 to send to Secretariat	2016-10-03	
<b>6. Review of membership</b>	Annual review of membership to make recommendations to SC on new members needed			TPG meeting	

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

One-off tasks	Detailed task	Responsible	Deadline	Comments
<b>7. Review of ISPMs for consistency and style (other than in draft ISPMs)</b>	Ink amendments to ISPM 5 Spanish	Beatriz Melcho	2015-10-07	TPG 2015 meeting (then LRG review; Secretariat will post after CPM-11)
	Consistency across standards (“trading partner”)	Secretariat and steward		TPG 2015-12 meeting / In TPG 2015-12 report
	Ink amendments to replace “controlled area” and “protected area” with “regulated area” (for these to be presented to SC May 2016, not in the TPG 2015-12 report)	Beatriz Melcho	2016-03-05 (extended)	TPG e-forum closing on 15 February 2016
	Ink amendments to the term “practically free” in ISPM 5	Secretariat	2016-02-15	TPG 2015-12 report
	Ink amendments to ISPM 3 – replace “quarantine facility” with “quarantine station”	Secretariat	2016-02-15	TPG 2015-12 report
	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>	Input into Glossary brochure (communication material for implementation of ISPM 5)	Secretariat and Stephanie Bloem		Tbd
	General recommendations on consistency: yearly updates as needed	All before meeting Secretariat and steward to SC	2016-10-03	Appended to TPG report
	Concept of terminology	Ebbe Nordbo	2016-10-03	

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

<b>Blue shading:</b>	<b>Active subjects on the List of topics</b>
<b>Red shading:</b>	<b>Consequential changes to terms</b>
<b>Green shading:</b>	<b>Pending subjects on the List of topics</b>
<b>Green text:</b>	<b>Terms to be submitted to member consultation</b>
<b>Orange text:</b>	<b>Terms to be submitted to SC-7 / substantial concerns commenting period or to CPM</b>

	<b>Term</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Lead</b>	<b>Comments &amp; next steps</b>
1.	additional declaration (2010-006)	To CPM-11	John Hedley	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- SC 2010-11 Deletion of “soil or other” was proposed, as the definition for additional declaration includes the wording “in relation to regulated pests”. On the other hand it was noted that the AD is the only place on the phytosanitary certificate where statements for specific situations, such as soil freedom, can be made. The SC requested the TPG to consider revision of the definition of <i>additional declaration</i>.</li> <li>- TPG 2013 discussed. No agreement found on how the definition should be revised, submitted to SC May 2013 for decision on how to proceed.</li> <li>- SC 2013-05 gave guidance, Secretariat to compile..</li> <li>- TPG 2014-02 discussed. Incorporate to Amendments to the Glossary (2014) for SC 2014-05.</li> <li>- SC 2014-05 approved for member consultation.</li> <li>- Member consultation 1 July – 30 Nov. 2014.</li> <li>- TPG 2014-12 reviewed member comments. No additional changes to the revision</li> <li>- SC-7 2015 agreed with the proposed revision.</li> <li>- SCCP 2015.</li> <li>- SC Nov. 2015 approved to be submitted for adoption at CPM-11 (2016).</li> </ul>
2.	bark (as a commodity) (2013-005)	To SC May 2016	Andrei Orlinski	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- TPG 2013 proposed revision following review of the draft ISPM on the Int. movement of wood.</li> <li>- SC 2013-05 added subject to List of topics.</li> <li>- TPG 2014-02 discussed: define bark as a commodity and create a new commodity class for wood.</li> <li>- SC 2014-05 discussed and modified term / definition and approved it for Member consultation 1 July – 30 Nov.</li> <li>- TPG 2014-12 discussed; no additional changes to the addition made.</li> <li>- SC-7 2015-05 withdrew term because they did not feel it was needed to define bark as a commodity, and because they were afraid of possible repercussions on the future Glossary work; they did not think we should</li> </ul>

Term	Status	Lead	Comments & next steps
			have two definitions for all terms that may also be commodities.
3. commodity class (2015-013)	To TPG 2016	Andrei Orłinski	- SC 2015-11 added the term to LOT following discussions on the 2014 Amendments, specifically for the terms grain and seeds, and asked the TPG to review this term in light of the recent discussions on the concept of a commodity standard (see section 5 of TPG 2015 report) and commodity classes within the context of ePhyto and consider deletion.
4. confinement	To SC May 2016	Ebbe Nordbo	- TPG 2015-12 recommended inclusion on LOT for revision
5. confinement facility (2015-001)	To SC May 2016	Laurence Bouhot-Delduc	- TPG 2014-12 proposed addition based on proposal to revise “quarantine” by deleting “observation and research” from the definition because these purposes would not normally be understood to be quarantine. Normally, quarantine is confinement with the purpose of understanding if the consignment is safe. “Confinement facility” (which would include observation and research) should be defined so that there would be two distinct terms for the different purposes. - SC 2015-05 added to List of topics based on TPG 2014-12 proposal (addition for new term). - TPG 2015-12 recommended deletion from LOT as there is no need to add this new term.
6. containment (2011-004)	To SC May 2016	John Hedley	To be considered together with <i>suppression</i> (2011-002), <i>eradication</i> (2011-003), <i>exclusion</i> (2010-008), <i>control</i> (2011-005). - TPG 2010-10 Proposed for addition to the work programme in order to consider the use of <i>phytosanitary measures</i> in these definitions. - For revision in Amendments (2013). - SC 2013-05 approved for member consultation. - TPG 2014-02 reviewed member comments. - SC 2014-05 withdrew from Amendments (2013). After SC discussion on phytosanitary measure, the TPG will be able to review the term and definition. - SC 2015-05 could not agree on one understanding of phytosanitary measure but made the term “unpending”. - TPG 2015-12 recommended deletion from LOT as no revision is deemed necessary.

Term	Status	Lead	Comments & next steps
7. contaminating pest, contamination (2012-001)	To MC 2016	Laurence Bouhot-Delduc	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- SC 2012-04 added contaminating pest; definition to be reviewed to make sure that it covers the concepts normally expressed by a hitch-hiker pest. (see report of 2011 TPG meeting).</li> <li>- deletion proposed in Amendments 2013.</li> <li>- SC 2013-05 agreed with proposal.</li> <li>- TPG 2014-02 reviewed member comments.</li> <li>- TPG 2014-02 proposed to remove <i>contaminating pests</i> from the Amendments to the Glossary, and to reconsider the term in conjunction with <i>contamination</i> at the next meeting.</li> <li>- SC 2014-05 agreed to withdraw from Amendments (2013) for the TPG to reconsider with <i>contamination</i>.</li> <li>- TPG 2014-12 discussed and proposed revisions to both terms in 2015 Amendments; to SC 2015-05 for approval for member consultation.</li> <li>- SC 2015-05 approved for MC 2016 (MC delayed one year as too few terms).</li> </ul>
8. control (of a pest) (2011-005)	To SC May 2016	John Hedley	<p>To be considered together with <i>suppression</i> (2011-002), <i>eradication</i> (2011-003), <i>containment</i> (2011-004), <i>exclusion</i> (2010-008).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-TPG 2010-10 proposed for addition to the work programme in order to consider mentioning exclusion in the definition.</li> <li>- For revision in Amendments (2013).</li> <li>- SC 2013-05 agreed.</li> <li>- TPG 2014-02 reviewed member comments.</li> <li>- SC 2014-05 withdrew from Amendments (2013). After SC discussion on phytosanitary measure, the TPG will be able to review the term and definition.</li> <li>- SC 2015-05 could not agree on one understanding of phytosanitary measure but made the term “unpending”.</li> <li>- TPG 2015-12 recommended deletion from LOT as no revision is deemed necessary.</li> </ul>
9. country of origin (2006-016)	To SC May 2016	Secretariat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In standard setting programme presented to CPM-4.</li> <li>- SC 2006-05 decided that this would be taken up under the review of ISPMs 7 and 12 and the review of other adopted ISPMs.</li> <li>- Past TPG meetings; SC 2010-11 made pending the outcome of revision to ISPM 7 and 12.</li> <li>- Review done for ISPM 7 and 12. Needs to be addressed in 11 and 20?</li> <li>- TPG 2015-12 recommended deletion from LOT as further work is not needed.</li> </ul>
10. cut flowers and branches (as a commodity class) (2012-007)	Pending EWG Cut flowers	Pending until EWG on International movement of cut flowers and branches (2008-005)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- SC 2012-04 added to the List of topics. Discussed by the SC in relation to the specification for the topic of <i>International movement of cut flowers and branches</i>. The SC asked the TPG to review the current definition of cut flowers and branches.</li> <li>- TPG 2013 proposal submitted to SC May 2013 in Amendments (2013).</li> <li>- SC 2013-05 postponed the consideration of the revised definition of cut flowers and branches (2008-005), and requested the Secretariat to transmit the proposed revised definition (and associated explanations) to the EWG on International movement of cut flowers and branches (2008-005) for further consideration. One issue is</li> </ul>

Term	Status	Lead	Comments & next steps
			<p>whether the ISPM should be restricted to fresh material.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- SC 2015-05 discussed the draft ISPM on cut flowers and agreed that the term be kept pending until the draft ISPM has advanced further.</li> <li>- TPG 2015-12 was given an update on the draft ISPM which had its scope modified to "cut flowers and foliage" in SC 2015-11 meeting.</li> </ul>
11. ecosystems	To SC May 2016		- TPG 2015-12 recommended inclusion to LOT to discuss if to delete term from Glossary.
12. endangered area (2014-009)	To MC 2016	Stephanie Bloem	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- SC 2014-05 added.</li> <li>- 2014-12 TPG discussed and made proposal for revision; added to 2015 Amendments to be presented to SC 2015-05 (with input from SC member Forest).</li> <li>- SC 2015-05 approved for MC 2016 (MC delayed one year as too few terms).</li> </ul>
13. eradication (2011-003)	To SC May 2016	John Hedley	<p>To be considered together with <i>suppression</i> (2011-002), <i>containment</i> (2011-004), <i>exclusion</i> (2010-008), <i>control</i> (2011-005).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- TPG 2010-10 Proposed for addition to the work programme in order to consider the use of <i>phytosanitary measures</i> in these definitions.</li> <li>- For revision in Amendments (2013).</li> <li>- SC 2013-05 agreed.</li> <li>- TPG 2014 reviewed member comments.</li> <li>- SC 2014-05 withdrew from Amendments (2013). After SC discussion on phytosanitary measure, the TPG will be able to review the term and definition.</li> <li>- SC 2015-05 could not agree on one understanding of phytosanitary measure but made the term "unpending".</li> <li>- TPG 2015-12 recommended deletion from LOT as no revision is deemed necessary.</li> </ul>
14. exclusion (2010-008)	To SC May 2016	John Hedley	<p>Addition be considered together with <i>suppression</i> (2011-002), <i>eradication</i> (2011-003), <i>containment</i> (2011-004), <i>control</i> (2011-005).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- TPF 2009, but not considered by TPG 2009. TPF 2010 resubmitted a definition to TPG. TPG 2010 modified definition.</li> <li>- SC 2011-05 decided to send for MC.</li> <li>- TPG 2011 advised, based on comments received, that the draft definition should be reconsidered together with <i>suppression</i>, <i>eradication</i>, <i>containment</i>, <i>control</i>.</li> <li>- For revision in Amendments (2013) as addition.</li> <li>- SC May 2013 agreed.</li> <li>- TPG 2014 reviewed member comments.</li> <li>- SC May 2014 withdrew from Amendments (2013). After SC discussion on phytosanitary measure, the TPG will be able to review the definition proposal.</li> <li>- SC 2015-05 could not agree on one understanding of phytosanitary measure but made the term "unpending".</li> <li>- TPG 2015-12 recommended addition in the draft 2016 Amendments.</li> </ul>

Term	Status	Lead	Comments & next steps
15. grain (as a commodity class) (2013-018)	To CPM-11	Secretariat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- SC 2013-11 added in relation to the consideration of the draft specification on International movement on grain.</li> <li>- TPG 2014-02 discussed Incorporated into Amendments (2014) for SC 2014-05, together with consequential change for “seeds”.</li> <li>- SC 2014-05 approved for member consultation.</li> <li>- Member consultation 1 July – 30 Nov 2014.</li> <li>- TPG 2014-12 reviewed member comments, no changes to the proposed revision.</li> <li>- CPM-10 (2015) approved ink amendment to transfer the descriptive element to the term, i.e. add “(as a commodity class” in the term.</li> <li>- SC-7 2015 agreed with proposed revision.</li> <li>- SC 2015-11 approved to be submitted for adoption by CPM-11 (2016).</li> </ul>
16. growing period / growing season	To SC May 2016	Laurence Bouhot-Delduc	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- TPG 2015-12 proposed to add to the LOT (proposal to be submitted to the SC May 2016).</li> </ul>
17. habitat	To SC May 2016		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- TPG 2015-12 recommended inclusion to LOT to discuss if to delete term from Glossary.</li> </ul>
18. identity (2011-001)	To TPG 2016 meeting?	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 <i>identity</i>, <i>integrity (of a consignment)</i>, <i>phytosanitary security (of a consignment)</i> 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 <i>TPG_2015-06_e-decision_03: Draft specification for the revision of ISPM 12</i> 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, TPG to prepare revision of ISPM 12. (Consider if apply “phytosanitary status” revisions as well)</li> </ul>
19. integrity (of a consignment) consequential)	To TPG 2016 meeting? (consequential)	Ebbe Nordbo <b>(see identity)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- See <i>identity</i>.</li> <li>- SC 2014-05 withdrew from Amendments (2014).</li> <li>- TPG to reconsider.</li> <li>- TPG 2014-12 reviewed; deferred final decision to e-forum discussion but agreed that terms and ISPM 12 will</li> </ul>

Term	Status	Lead	Comments & next steps	
			<p>be processed combined only (for SC May 2015).</p> <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 <i>TPG_2015-06_e-decision_03: Draft specification for the revision of ISPM 12</i> 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, TPG to prepare revision of ISPM 12.</li> </ul>	
20.	Inspection (2015-012)	To SC May 2016	Beatriz Melcho	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- SC-7 2015 asked that "inspection" be added to the LOT for it to be reviewed together with "visual examination" and "testing".</li> <li>- SC 2015-11 added to the LOT.</li> <li>- TPG 2015-12 recommended deletion from LOT as no revision is deemed necessary.</li> </ul>
21.	kiln-drying (2013-006)	To MC 2016	Andrei Orliński Secretariat	<p>TPG 2012-10, SC 2013-05 added.</p> <p>TPG 2014 discussed and added to incorporate to Amendments (2014).</p> <p>SC 2014-05 withdrew the proposal from the Amendments (2014) and asked TPG to rediscuss.</p> <p>TPG 2014-12 discussed and agreed to propose for deletion from Glossary (in Amendments 2015).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- SC 2015-05 agreed with proposal and approved for MC 2016 (delayed one year as too few terms).</li> </ul>
22.	mark (2013-007)	To TPG 2016-12	Ebbe Nordbo	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- TPG 2013 addition to the List of topics. To remove "phytosanitary status" in the definition. Proposal already exists. To be extracted from relevant document.</li> <li>- SC 2013-05 agreed.</li> <li>- TPG 2014-02 discussed and incorporated to Amendments to the Glossary (2014).</li> <li>- SC 2014-05 approved for MC.</li> <li>- Member consultation 1 July – 30 Nov. 2014.</li> <li>- TPG 2014-12 reviewed member comments; no changes to the proposed revision.</li> <li>- SC-7 2015 agreed with the proposal and approved for SCCP.</li> <li>- SC withdrew term from Amendments (2014) and asked TPG to consider deletion.</li> </ul>
23.	modern biotechnology	To SC May 2016		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- TPG 2015-12 recommended inclusion to LOT to discuss if to delete term from Glossary.</li> </ul>
24.	phytosanitary security (of a consignment) (2013-008)	To TPG 2016 meeting?	Ebbe Nordbo	<p><b>See identity.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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).</li> <li>- 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>

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 <i>TPG_2015-06_e-decision_03: Draft specification for the revision of ISPM 12</i> 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, TPG to prepare revision of ISPM 12.</li> </ul>	
25.	practically free	To SC May 2016	Secretariat (Consequential change or ink amendment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- TPG 2014-12 discussed the term (see 8 of the TPG report) and suggested adding a qualifier “of a consignment, field or place of production” to the term and consequently remove this text from the definition. The TPG considered this an ink amendment (not to be added to the List of topics).</li> <li>- TPG 2015-12 recommended this ink amendment for approval by SC.</li> </ul>
26.	pre-clearance (2013-016)	To SC May 2016	Stephanie Bloem	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Concepts are being considered by the SC. Work on the definition will start only when the concepts are clarified. However, the SC decided to add pre-clearance as pending. An ISPM is being developed.</li> <li>- SC 2015-05 made the term “unpending”. The Secretariat also transmitted the following SC 2015-05 recommendation to FAO Translation: “in future IPPC related documents, “pre-clearance” should not be translated into Spanish as “pre-certificación” and ask them to consult with the Spanish speaking TPG member to identify an appropriate translation for the term.”</li> <li>- TPG 2015-12 recommended deletion from Glossary as term cannot be revised (concept unclear) and as it is currently not correct.</li> </ul>
27.	quarantine (2015-002)	To SC May 2016	Laurence Bouhot-Delduc	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- SC 2015-05 added to the List of topics based on TPG 2014-12 proposal.</li> <li>- TPG 2015-12 recommended revision in the draft 2016 Amendments.</li> </ul>
28.	quarantine area (2012-006)	Pending revision of ISPM 8	Pending until revision of ISPM 8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- TPF 2011.</li> <li>- SC 2012-04 added.</li> <li>- To be considered based on a draft revised definition proposed by the TPF.</li> <li>- TPG 2012-2013 considered definition, but proposed it should be postponed until ISPM 8 is revised. (details in TPG 2012 and 2013 reports)</li> <li>- SC 2013-05 changed the status to pending until after the revision of ISPM 8 (Determination of pest status in an area).</li> </ul>
29.	quarantine facility	To SC May 2016	Consequential change or ink amendment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- TPG 2015-12 invited the SC to approve ink amendments to ISPM 3 to replace “quarantine facility” with “quarantine station”.</li> </ul>
30.	seeds (as a commodity class)	To CPM-11	Consequential change or ink amendment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- When reviewing draft specification in international movement of grain (2008-007), the SC tasked TPG to review the definition for <i>grain</i>, particular to include the explanatory words “(in the botanical sense)” in the definition. Consequential changes to seeds were proposed at this time.</li> </ul>

Term	Status	Lead	Comments & next steps	
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- TPG 2014-12 reviewed member comments and agreed to a member comment suggesting to delete “processing or consumption” because treatment could be misunderstood as a type of processing.</li> <li>- CPM-10 (2015) approved ink amendment to transfer the descriptive element to the term, i.e. add “(as a commodity class” in the term.</li> <li>- SC 2015-11 approved to be submitted for adoption at CPM-11 (2016).</li> </ul>	
31.	suppression (2011-002)	To SC May 2016	John Hedley	<p>To be considered together with <i>eradication</i> (2011-003), <i>containment</i> (2011-004), <i>exclusion</i> (2010-008), <i>control</i> (2011-005).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- TPG 2010-10 Proposed for addition to the work programme in order to consider the use of <i>phytosanitary measures</i> in these definitions.</li> <li>- For revision in amendments 2013.</li> <li>- SC May 2013 agreed.</li> <li>- TPG 2014-02 reviewed member comments.</li> <li>- SC May 2014 withdrew from Amendments (2013). After SC discussion on phytosanitary measure, the TPG will be able to review the term and definition.</li> <li>- SC 2015-05 could not agree on one understanding of phytosanitary measure but made the term “unpending”.</li> <li>- TPG 2015-12 recommended deletion from LOT as no revision is deemed necessary.</li> </ul>
32.	survey (2013-015)	Pending EWG on ISPM 6 (possibly to TPG 2016-12)	Laurence Bouhot-Delduc	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- See SC May 2013.</li> <li>- TPG 2014 discussed. Proposed to SC 2014-05 to classify as “pending” until progress made with revision of ISPM 6.</li> <li>- SC 2014-05 reviewed TPG recommendation and made term pending till draft revised ISPM 6 is available.</li> <li>- TPG 2015-12 was informed that the EWG was held in 2015 and the draft ISPM will be reviewed by SC May 2016.</li> </ul>
33.	test (2015-003)	To SC May 2016	Beatriz Melcho	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- SC 2015-05 added to the List of topics based on proposal by TPG 2014-12.</li> <li>- SC-7 2015 withdrew “visual examination”, recommended the SC add the term “inspection” to the LOT for the TPG to consider “visual examination”, “test” and “inspection” together. The SC-7 also suggested that the TPG consider what could be the consequential changes to ISPMs following their review.</li> <li>- TPG 2015-12 recommended revision in the draft 2016 Amendments.</li> </ul>
34.	Concept of “traceability”	To SC May 2016	Shaza Omar	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- SC 2015-05 asked TPG to review the concept of “traceability” (and related terms) and how it is used in ISPMs (i.e. not provide definition!).</li> <li>- TPG 2015-12 discussed the concept and made recommendations to be shared with the the SC (concept is clear in ISPMs).</li> </ul>
35.	trading partner (2013-009)	To SC May 2016	Secretariat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- TPG 2012.</li> <li>- SC 2013-05 added to the List of topics.</li> <li>- TPG 2014-02 discussed: Not define; Proposals for consistency across standards to SC; General recommendation on consistency.</li> </ul>

Term	Status	Lead	Comments & next steps
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- SC 2014-05 reviewed and asked TPG to reconsider.</li> <li>- TPG 2014-12 discussed and revised the proposals for consistency across standards to be presented to SC.</li> <li>- SC 2015-05 did not agree with all proposals and requested SC members to send comments on the proposals for ink amendments on the term “trading partner” in ISPMs to the TPG Steward (with copy to the Secretariat) by 15 June 2015 (into Secretariat by 24 August; for SC e-decision on 14 September).</li> <li>- TPG_2015-06_e-decision_02: Trading partner (2013-009). No consensus.</li> <li>- TPG 2015-12 recommended ink amendments across standards for SC approval.</li> </ul>
36. visual examination (2013-010)	To SC May 2016	Beatriz Melcho (Prev. Shaza Omar)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- TPG 2012-10.</li> <li>- SC May 2013 added to the List of topics.</li> <li>- TPG 2014 discussed, incorporated to Amendments (2014) for May 2014 SC; General recommendation on consistency (on visual inspection); Note to SC that occurrences of visual inspection in stds will need to be corrected at revision.</li> <li>- SC 2014-05 approved for MC.</li> <li>- Member consultation 1 July – 30 Nov. 2014.</li> <li>- TPG 2014-12 reviewed member comments and agreed to delete “without testing” from the proposed revision because of member comments suggesting that visual examination, testing and inspection create confusion.</li> <li>- 2015-05 SC-7 withdrew term from the draft 2014 Amendments; back to TPG with recommendation that the term be reviewed together with “test” and “inspection”.</li> <li>- TPG 2015-12 recommended revision in the draft 2016 Amendments.</li> </ul>
37. wood (as a commodity class) (2013-011)	To CPM-11	Andrei Orlinski	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- TPG 2013-02.</li> <li>- SC 2013-05 added to the List of topics.</li> <li>- TPG 2014 discussed, incorporated into Amendments (2014).</li> <li>- SC 2014-05 approved for MC with revised term/definition.</li> <li>- Member consultation 1 July – 30 Nov. 2014.</li> <li>- TPG 2014-12 reviewed member comments and agreed to change “wood waste” to “wood residue” as suggested by member comments.</li> <li>- CPM-10 (2015) approved ink amendment to transfer the descriptive element to the term, i.e. add “(as a commodity class” in the term.</li> <li>- SC-7 2015 agreed with the proposed revision and approved for SCCP.</li> <li>- SC 2015-11 approved to be submitted for adoption at CPM-11 (2016).</li> </ul>
<b>Related to consistency</b>			
38. Review of the use of and/or in adopted ISPMs (2010-030)	Ongoing	Stays on the work programme to be	<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>

Term	Status	Lead	Comments & next steps
		implemented during the consistency review	
39. Review of the Spanish language version of ISPM 5			- SC 2015-05 agreed with TPG 2014-12 proposal - TPG 2015 was informed of the work; LRG to review and then Secretariat will publish after CPM-11.
40. Use of "contracting party" and "country" in ISPM 5	To TPG 2016	Andrei Orłinski	When TPG 2015-12 reviewed "trading partner", it noted that "contracting party", "country" etc. was used inconsistently.

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

**Only deadlines until the next meeting are listed below**

Deadline	Activity in tables	Resp.	Task
2016-01-??	3. Terms and defs	ALL	Check of translations of draft 2014 Amendments going for adoption
2016-02-05	3. Terms and defs	ALL	Draft 2016 Amendments for TPG comments following TPG meeting
2016-02-12	4. Ann. Gloss.	ALL	Comment on final version of Annotated Glossary
2016-02-15	7. Review of ISPMs	Secretariat	Ink amendments to replace “quarantine facility” to “quarantine station” in ISPM 3
2016-02-15	7. Review of ISPMs	Secretariat	Ink amendments to “practically free” in ISPM 5
2016-03-05	7. Review of ISPMs	Beatriz Melcho	Ink amendments to replace “controlled area” and “protected area” with “regulated area” for SC May 2016
2016-10-03	8. Other tasks	ALL	Check general recommendations on consistency for yearly update as needed
2016-10-03	8. Other tasks	Ebbe Nordbo	Concept of terminology paper
2016-10-03	3. Terms and defs	Andrei Orlinski	Review whether “contracting party”, “country” and similar terms have been used consistently throughout ISPM 5

Deadline	Activity in tables	Resp.	Task
2016-10-03	3. Terms and defs	Andrei Orlinski	Paper on “commodity class”
2016-10-03	3. Terms and defs	Ebbe Nordbo	Revision to ISPM 12?
2016-10-03	3. Terms and defs	Ebbe Nordbo	Paper on “mark”
2016-10-03	3. Terms and defs	Ebbe Nordbo	Paper on “confinement”?
2016-10-03	3. Terms and defs	Laurence Bouhot-Delduc	Paper on “growing period / growing season”?
2016-10-03	3. Terms and defs	Laurence Bouhot-Delduc	Paper on “survey”?
2016-10-03	3. Terms and defs	John Hedley	Paper on “ecosystems, habitat and modern biotechnology”?
TBD	8. Other tasks	Stephanie Bloem	Input into Glossary brochure
2016-12 5 to 9			TPG Meeting