



*REPORT*

Rome, Italy  
12-15 December 2016

# Technical Panel for the Glossary December, 2016



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
1.4	Current specification: TP5 (TPG) (2016) (for information).....	4
2.	Administrative Matters .....	4
3.	Reports.....	5
3.1	Previous meetings of the TPG (December 2014).....	5
3.2	Extracts from other meeting reports of relevance to the TPG (SC, CPM).....	5
3.3	Current work plan .....	5
4.	Review relating to draft ISPMs sent for first consultation in 2016 (1 July-30 September).....	5
4.1	Draft 2016 Amendments to ISPM 5: <i>Glossary of Phytosanitary terms</i> (1994-001).....	5
4.2	Draft Revision of ISPM 6: <i>National surveillance systems</i> (2009-004).....	9
4.3	Draft ISPM on <i>Requirements for the use of temperature treatments as phytosanitary measures</i> (2014-005).....	10
5.	Consideration of new or revised terms/definitions (subjects on the TPG work programme).....	11
5.1	“mark” (2013-007) .....	12
5.2	“commodity class” or “commodity” (2015-013) .....	12
5.3	“confinement (of a regulated article)” (2016-002).....	15
5.4	“growing period” and “growing season” (2016-004).....	16
5.5	“survey” (2013-015).....	17
5.6	“ecosystems” (2016-003), “habitat” (2016-005) and “modern biotechnology” (2016-006) .....	18
6.	Review of ISPMs for consistency of terms and style .....	19
6.1	General recommendations on use of terms in ISPMs .....	19
6.2	Consistency of adopted ISPM (standard by standard) .....	19
6.3	Consistency across standards .....	19
6.3.1	Use of “contracting party”, “country” and similar terms consistently throughout standards.....	19
7.	Annotated Glossary: 2016 amendments .....	20
7.1	Current revision of the Annotated Glossary.....	20
8.	Explanation of Glossary terms.....	20
9.	TPG work plan.....	21
10.	Membership of the TPG (See agenda item 2.3).....	21
11.	Other issues.....	21
11.1	Formalizing the development of a “concept of terminology” .....	21
11.2	TPG-TPDP reporting on issues related to terms and consistency in draft diagnostic protocols.....	22
11.3	ISPM 5 Brochure.....	22
11.4	CBD.....	22
12.	Date and venue of the next meeting .....	22

---

13. Close .....	22
APPENDIX 1 - Agenda .....	23
APPENDIX 2 - Documents list.....	25
APPENDIX 3 - Participants list .....	27
APPENDIX 4: Proposed ink amendment to ISPM 5 (“detention”) .....	29
APPENDIX 5: General recommendations on use of terms in ISPMs.....	30
APPENDIX 6 – TPG Work Plan 2017-2018 .....	34

## 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 Secretariat noted that the ISPM for the *International movement of grain* (2008-007) was partially drafted but still needs some work and that it may not be finalized in time to be presented to the Standards Committee (SC) meeting in May 2017. The draft ISPM on the *Requirements for the use of fumigation as a phytosanitary measure* (2014-004) and the draft ISPM on the *International movement of cut flowers and foliage* (2008-005) will be presented to the SC in May 2017.
- [3] As to the discussion on ePhyto, he noted that the appendix to ISPM 12 (*Phytosanitary certification*) on e-certification is under the mandate of the SC, but that oversight on the terminology pertaining to the product descriptions to be used in ePhyto has yet to be decided upon (see section 5.2 of this report for the discussions).
- [4] He explained the work undertaken by the Secretariat to develop a phytosanitary treatments search tool, which will index both CPM adopted and non-adopted phytosanitary treatments. In this context, there will be search criteria based on an index of terms. He suggested that the Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG) considers if they should play a role on terminological issues in this area of work, by providing recommendations to the SC. The TPG did not discuss this proposal.

### 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] The TPG adopted the agenda (Appendix 1).

### 1.4 Current specification: TP5 (TPG) (2016) (for information)

- [7] The Secretariat presented the current specification for the TPG (TP 5)<sup>1</sup>, summarizing the tasks and also recalled that the SC, at their May 2016 meeting, modified the TPG specification to state that henceforth the review of draft ISPMs for consistency and use of terms following first consultation would exclude draft diagnostic protocols<sup>2</sup>.

## 2. Administrative Matters

- [8] The Secretariat clarified local arrangements and introduced the documents list (Appendix 2) and the participants list, inviting TPG members to verify their contact details (Appendix 3). Mr John HEDLEY (New Zealand) informed the TPG that he will be leaving his NPPO in 2017 and that the TPG 2017 meeting would be his last. In addition, the terms of Ms Hong NING (China) and Ms Shaza OMAR (Egypt) would be ending in 2017; they would confirm their employer’s support and their willingness to be considered for an additional term before the SC May 2017 meeting, so that if necessary a call for experts could be launched. The Secretariat stressed the importance of continuity of TPG membership.

---

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

<sup>2</sup> The Standards Committee meeting report: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/82530/>

### 3. Reports

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

[9] There were no comments on the report of the TPG 2015-12 meeting<sup>3</sup>.

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

[10] The Secretariat presented extracts of relevance to the TPG from meetings (CPM-11 (2016), SC May and SC November 2016) held since the last TPG meeting, noting that the TPG had received other updates via email<sup>4</sup>. The Secretariat also provided a verbal update on issues of TPG relevance from the Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols (related to their discussions on “method, test and assay”) and the Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments (related to their discussions on “process load”).

[11] One TPG member noted that some regional workshops had only discussed draft ISPMs from first consultation and suggested that all draft ISPMs out for consultation be added to the regional workshop agendas for 2017, now that both consultation periods occur at the same time.

[12] The TPG:

(1) *noted* the update.

#### 3.3 Current work plan

[13] The TPG updated their work plan during the meeting (see agenda item 9).

### 4. Review relating to draft ISPMs sent for first consultation in 2016 (1 July-30 September)

[14] The TPG reviewed consultation comments on terms and definitions together with the draft ISPMs for consistency in the use of terms. Recommendations will be transmitted to stewards and the SC-7 (May 2017).<sup>5</sup>

[15] The TPG noted that there were several consultation comments that identified terminology and consistency issues in the draft standards, and appreciated that contact points seemed to be more attentive of these issues than in the past.

[16] The Secretariat noted that the draft Amendments would no-longer be appended to the report, as this was not in line with the standard setting process.

#### 4.1 Draft 2016 Amendments to ISPM 5: *Glossary of Phytosanitary terms (1994-001)*

[17] The Steward introduced the draft ISPM and the consultation comments<sup>6</sup>.

##### [18] **“Exclusion (of a pest)” (2010-008)**

[19] **Qualifier “of a pest”**. One consultation comment suggested deleting the qualifier because the definition should recognize that only regulated pests are covered by the definition of phytosanitary measures. However, the TPG acknowledged that some ISPMs may use the term “exclusion” or its derivatives with their common meaning (e.g. ISPM 15 (*Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade*), ISPM 22 (*Requirements for the establishment of areas of low pest prevalence*) and ISPM 27 (*Diagnostic protocols for regulated pests*)), and that deleting the qualifier would make it difficult to use the term for these other purposes. The use of a qualifier is also consistent with other Glossary terms such as “control (of a pest)”, “entry (of a pest)” or “establishment (of a pest)”. The

---

<sup>3</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>4</sup> 18\_TPG\_2016\_Dec

<sup>5</sup> The tables of TPG recommendations are not attached to this report but will be posted on the TPG work area.

<sup>6</sup> 1994-001; 12\_TPG\_2016\_Dec

terms “containment”, “eradication” and “suppression” do not need the qualifier “of a pest” as these terms are only used in ISPMs in the context “of a pest”.

- [20] As to whether the qualifier should be “of a regulated pest”, the TPG noted that a pest free area may be obtained through exclusion which would be used as a measure to meet the phytosanitary import requirements (i.e. the broad understanding of “phytosanitary measure”). As the pest to be “excluded” would not necessarily be a regulated pest in the country of export, the TPG agreed that the correct qualifier was “of a pest”.
- [21] **“Entry or establishment”**. The TPG modified the proposed definition from “introduction” to “entry or establishment” pursuant to a consultation comment. By using the term “introduction” (i.e. “the entry of a pest resulting in its establishment”), the TPG felt that the concept of exclusion could be misinterpreted as if it would only apply to pests which can establish, in conflict with Article VII of the IPPC (Requirements in relation to imports) which specifies that: “A contracting party may apply measures specified in this Article to pests which may not be capable of establishment in its territories but, if they gained entry, cause economic damage” . By using “entry or establishment” in the proposed definition, it is clear that the applied phytosanitary measures may address either entry or establishment, or both.
- [22] **Consequently adjustment of “control (of a pest)”**. The TPG discussed whether “control (of a pest)” should be adjusted, following the possible future inclusion of “exclusion (of a pest)” in ISPM 5, to include also “exclusion” in its definition. The TPG did not feel that this was necessary as “suppression”, “containment” or “eradication” all refer to situations where the pest is already present and needs to be controlled, whereas “exclusion (of a pest)” is a measure applied to prevent the entry or establishment of a pest.
- [23] **“Contaminating pest, contamination” (2012-001)**
- [24] **For the definition of “contaminating pest”**
- [25] **“Present in” or “carried by”**. Following discussions related to a consultation comment on “contaminating pest”, the TPG agreed to retain “carried by” (previously proposed changed to “present in”) in relation to the regulated articles that move, to clarify that a contaminating pest does not cause “infestation”. Indeed, “infestation (of a commodity)” is defined as the “presence in a commodity of a living pest of the plant or plant product concerned” and thus using “present in” instead of “carried by” for commodities in the definition of “contaminating pest” could create confusion. “Present in” was used for storage place, as a storage place does not move and thus cannot carry a contaminating pest.
- [26] **Regulated articles carrying contaminating pests**. While definitions should not normally contain exhaustive lists of examples, “packaging” was added in response to a consultation comment to more adequately reflect the various regulated articles that may carry a contaminating pest.
- [27] In this context, the TPG discussed if it was possible to change “commodity” to “consignment” as the latter includes also packaging. The TPG did not agree to this because contamination may occur before a commodity becomes a consignment.
- [28] **For the definition of “contamination”**
- [29] **Regulated articles carrying contamination**. “Packaging” was added to more adequately reflect the various regulated articles that may carry contamination and to align the definition of “contamination” with the revised definition of “contaminating pest”.
- [30] **Use of “contamination” in ISPMs**. A consultation comment suggested that the use of “contamination” in ISPMs be reviewed. The TPG agreed that there may be some cases in adopted (e.g. ISPM 18 (*Guidelines for the use of irradiation as a phytosanitary measure*)) or draft ISPMs where the term is used with a different meaning from its definition in the Glossary, and concurred that a review across ISPMs should be undertaken.

[31] **“Endangered area” (2014-009)**

[32] The TPG acknowledged that the definition of “endangered area” should not be revised as the term is defined in Article II of IPPC and the original definition is not incorrect. The TPG therefore recommended that the term be withdrawn from the draft 2016 Amendments to the Glossary. The TPG also agreed that the misunderstandings (identified by contracting parties in the [General IPPC Survey 2012–2013](#) undertaken by the Implementation Review and Support System) that the revision to the definition could address were not sufficiently important to merit an “agreed interpretation” of the term.

[33] Instead, note 1 in the Explanatory document on ISPM 5 (the “Annotated Glossary”) would be adjusted to clarify that the term “endangered area” should not be misinterpreted to mean an environmentally protected area in the ecological conservation sense.

[34] **“Quarantine” (2015-002)**

[35] The proposed definition was adjusted following consultation comments to be less restrictive and not distinguish between the purposes for quarantine of regulated articles and the purposes for quarantine of pests or beneficial organisms. This because it is current practice in many countries that observation and research may be carried out in quarantine stations on regulated articles, pests or beneficial organisms. The definition of “quarantine” should therefore cover the official confinement of beneficial organisms for observation or research in order to ensure that these organisms will have minimal negative effects after release. It should also cover regulated articles such as prohibited plants that, by way of derogation, are used for varietal selection or breeding while under quarantine.

[36] **“Test” (2015-003), “visual examination” (2013-010)**

[37] **Test.** The TPG agreed to align the definition of “test” to that of “inspection” by including “determine compliance with phytosanitary regulations” as an objective of test. This addition allows the definition of “test” to cover the common use of testing to check for compliance (e.g. whether a required treatment has been carried out), beyond only determining if pests are present or identifying pests. The TPG considered if this addition should rather be to “determine compliance with specific requirements” or “determine compliance with phytosanitary import requirements” but noted that these are a subset of phytosanitary regulations and that there are situations where testing is done for a particular purpose.

[38] A consultation comment suggested deleting “plants and plant products” from the definition of “test” as these are included in the definition of “regulated articles”. The TPG acknowledged that this was correct, but agreed that it was useful to retain as the focus of the definition should be on plants and plant products.

[39] A consultation comment suggested deleting “to determine if pests are present” as the most important message to convey is that a test allows to identify pests. The TPG did not agree with this deletion as determination of whether a pest is present is an essential objective of testing.

[40] **“Visual examination”.** The TPG discussed deleting “plants, plant products, or other regulated articles” from the definition of “visual examination”. Some TPG members felt that this deletion would make the term irrelevant in an IPPC context, and wondered if the term should then rather be deleted from the Glossary. Other TPG members felt that it was important not to restrict the visual examination process and preferred to be able to use the term also for objects that are not necessarily regulated articles (e.g. containers). In contrast, “inspection”, being official, restricts the visual examination to plants, plant products and other regulated articles. The TPG noted that “examination” in its common English usage may have different meanings, which in some cases include tests, and that the IPPC related definition may be needed for this reason. The TPG agreed to adjust the definition to make it as comprehensive (or less restrictive) as possible by not referring to any of the objects for examination.

[41] The TPG agreed to change “microscope” to “light microscope” as the simple use of a light microscope can be considered part of the inspection process, although it was recognized that it may also be used with tests. “Light microscope” was used instead of “microscope” to avoid creating interpretation difficulties between “visual examination” and “test” which may require the use of a microscope.

- [42] The TPG agreed to delete “physical” from the definition of “visual examination” as it was felt to be redundant, could cause confusion, and did not help to define the term.
- [43] **“Inspection” in relation to “visual examination”**. During their discussions, the TPG recognized that the definition of “inspection” may be considered outdated due to advances in modern technology that result in visual examination not being the only method used. The TPG considered that should “inspection” reflect current practices, it should include mention of for instance olfactory and acoustic examination. Consequently, the TPG discussed if “visual examination” might also be considered outdated, but agreed that the definition (as modified in this meeting) was still correct although it may be considered irrelevant should “inspection” refer to also other types of examination.
- [44] The TPG considered to propose the withdrawal of “visual examination” from the draft 2016 Amendments, as the SC may find that the term should be reconsidered in combination with “inspection” in the future, but agreed to put it forward for SC consideration as the current revision still improves the definition.
- [45] Through the discussions on the alignment of “test” and “inspection” as reported in this section, the TPG noted that ISPM 23 (*Guidelines for inspection*) would benefit from revision to include also “testing” (i.e. to help implementation by clarifying the relationship between the measures). The TPG briefly considered if “inspection” should really be defined as “detection”, and “testing” as “identification” but did not pursue this further. The Secretariat encouraged the TPG members to liaise with their NPPOs, should they wish to submit the revision of ISPM 23 as a topic at a future call for topics.
- [46] **“Kiln-drying” (2013-006)**
- [47] There were no consultation comments received for this term, proposed for deletion, and the TPG therefore did not make any changes to the explanatory points. The Secretariat noted that this term would not be open for commenting during the second consultation.
- [48] **“Pre-clearance” (2013-016)**
- [49] Some consultation comments suggested that TPG reconsider the deletion of the term, and instead propose a revision. The TPG discussed this and concluded that it was not possible to propose a revision. The concept intended by the term remains unclear, as demonstrated by the variety of proposals for the revision received during first consultation. For instance, some countries suggested that “pre-clearance” may be used as a phytosanitary measure, which is very a controversial issue. Other countries understood the term as the arrangements described in the draft annex “Arrangements for verification of compliance of consignments by the importing country in the exporting country” (2005-003) to ISPM 20 (*Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system*), and other countries in yet other ways. The draft annex to ISPM 20 is proposed for adoption at CPM-12 (2017).
- [50] The TPG reconfirmed that it was currently impossible to propose a definition that would correctly reflect a standardized understanding of the term worldwide. In addition, “pre-clearance” is used only three times in ISPM 20, and without any clarification of the meaning or use of the concept. It is not used in other ISPMs. The new draft annex to ISPM 20 does not use the term intentionally either. The TPG recalled that:
- [51] - It has so far taken the IPPC community more than a decade to submit a draft to the CPM on the content of this annex, which deals with a concept that, for some, may be considered (partly) as pre-clearance and for others not at all.
- [52] – The SC was unable to agree on a name for the concept dealt with in the draft annex to ISPM 20 (so no particular term is used in the annex) but preferred to explain the concept throughout.
- [53] - The concept dealt with in the annex is very clear and does not warrant a term with a definition.
- [54] The TPG noted that should a term be deemed necessary following the probable adoption of the Annex, such term may be proposed by the SC, contracting parties or RPPOs for addition to the *List of topics*



for IPPC standards. Such a proposal, however, should be submitted together with a draft definition to provide guidance to the TPG when they would develop the definition. The submission of the term for inclusion into the Glossary would also need to respect the criteria for the inclusion of new terms in ISPM 5 (e.g. that terms to be defined in ISPM 5 must be used in existing or draft ISPMs).

- [55] The TPG stressed that countries may continue to use the term if they deem it is useful, but that the usage of a term does not necessitate it being defined in the Glossary.
- [56] Thus, the deletion of the term from the Glossary appears to be the best solution as its current definition is incorrect and there is currently no common understanding of which concept may need to be assigned a “shortcut” in the form of a term and definition.
- [57] The TPG recalled that ink amendments to ISPM 20 might be considered at a later stage to reflect the concept outlined in the draft annex to ISPM 20 if deemed appropriate.
- [58] The TPG:
- (2) *noted* that responses to comments and the modified draft 2016 *Amendments to the Glossary* (1994-001) would be transmitted to the SC-7.
  - (3) in relation to “contamination and contaminating pest”, *invited* the SC to *approve* the addition of “contamination” to the *List of topics for IPPC standards* for a consistency review across standards.
  - (4) *agreed* that the proposed revision of “endangered area” is withdrawn from the draft *Amendments to the Glossary*
  - (5) noting that the proposed revision of “visual examination” is correct, *invited* the SC-7 to consider if “visual examination” needs to be withdrawn from the draft 2016 *Amendments to the Glossary* to be reconsidered in combination with “inspection” as visual examination may not be the only official examination method to be undertaken for inspection.
  - (6) *invited* the SC to consider if “inspection” should be revised to adequately reflect current inspection practices that may also include examination methods other than visual and if so add this term to the *List of topics for IPPC standards*.
  - (7) *noted* that the Secretariat will transmit the proposals regarding language versions of terms and definitions to the translators.

#### 4.2 Draft Revision of ISPM 6: *National surveillance systems* (2009-004)

- [59] The Chairperson introduced the draft ISPM and the consultation comments on consistency in use of terms and definitions<sup>7</sup>.
- [60] The TPG provided recommendations on terms and consistency which would be submitted to the steward of the ISPM.
- [61] In addition, the TPG discussed the following issues.
- [62] **Title.** The TPG supported the use of short titles in ISPMs (i.e. “surveillance” for this standard).
- [63] **“Exotic”.** In response to a consultation comment suggesting to change “exotic” to “unexpected”, TPG acknowledged that ISPM 17 (*Pest reporting*) uses “unexpected” but considered that “new to an area” was sufficient in this standard. The TPG also felt that “unexpected” is unclear in spite of its use in ISPM 17 and recalled that the term “exotic” should be avoided because it presents translation problems (see also the Annotated Glossary, Appendix 1 that explains that a term such as “non-indigenous” expresses well the concept of organisms that are not naturally present in the area of concern).
- [64] **“Method” or “methodology”.** The TPG noted that “method” is at the same hierarchical level as “tools” whereas “methodology” is a system of methods.

---

<sup>7</sup> 2009-004; 13\_TPG\_2016\_Dec

- [65] **“Propagule pressure”**. The TPG agreed that this term should not be used as it was too specific. The TPG recommended using the term “pest incidence” as “incidence (of a pest)” is the Glossary term expressing the level of infestation, which the TPG felt was the meaning to be conveyed. In addition, “propagule pressure” is a subset of “pest incidence”.
- [66] **“Consolidation”**. The TPG felt that this term was correctly used in the context of this standard but might warrant further explanation in the draft ISPM. The TPG also discussed if a definition of the term in the phytosanitary context could be useful but preferred that the term was explained in the specific context.
- [67] **“Population”**. TPG supported a consultation comment pointing out that in the section on statistical design, “population” may be confused with “pest population”. However, the term “population” is commonly used in statistics. The TPG suggested that using the terms “population unit” and “statistical population” may help address this possible confusion. The TPG also felt that “collection” without further explanation would be confusing.
- [68] The TPG also provided some recommendations for the translation of terms into French and Spanish.
- [69] The TPG reviewed the term “survey” (2013-015) in conjunction with the discussions on the terms used in the draft ISPM to ensure a consistent approach to the review (see section 5.5 of this report). In this relation, the TPG suggested some text changes to the draft ISPM so as not to repeat the definition of the term “survey” in the text.
- [70] The TPG:
- (8) *noted* that recommendations on comments and consistency would be transmitted to the steward and SC-7 for their consideration.

#### **4.3 Draft ISPM on *Requirements for the use of temperature treatments as phytosanitary measures* (2014-005)**

- [71] The Assistant steward introduced the draft ISPM and the consultation comments on consistency in use of terms and definitions<sup>8</sup>.
- [72] The TPG provided recommendations on terms and consistency which would be submitted to the steward of the ISPM.
- [73] In addition, the TPG discussed the following issues.
- [74] **Target temperature vs required temperature**. The TPG noted that “target temperature” would indicate the temperature that is aimed at to be able to achieve the specific efficacy, but that the “target” may be missed. “Required temperature” would indicate that temperature which is required by the importing country. Thus, the TPG agreed that “required temperature” was a more appropriate term to use in standards. In this context, the TPG also noted that “prescribed” and “required” for temperature, dose and similar seem synonymous, but one term only (“required”) should be used. The TPG agreed to add a note on this to the General recommendations on use of terms in ISPMs (see section 6.1 of this report).
- [75] **Load vs process load**. TPG noted the TPPT e-forum discussions on “process load” where the TPPT confirmed that the term is useful in a wider IPPC context, and thus may be used in more ISPMs in the future. The TPG felt that if “process load” was not to be used in other ISPMs in the future, it would be recommended to delete it from ISPM 5 and include the term and definition only in ISPM 18. For the draft ISPM on *Requirements for temperature treatments* (2014-005), the TPG also considered that “load” (in the sense of “bulk”) was a useful term, specifically in relation to “load configuration” and similar terms. The TPG suggested, however, that “load configuration” be explained in the standard. In this context, the TPG discussed if it would be useful to define “load” in ISPM 5 but felt that “process load” and “load” had the same meaning in the context of treatments.

---

<sup>8</sup> 2014-005; 14\_TPG\_2016\_Dec

- [76] **Commodity, consignment and load.** The TPG noted that these three terms were used throughout the standard and suggested that they be reviewed for consistency. The TPG stressed that “consignment” should only be used in the meaning of a “commodity being moved internationally with a phytosanitary certificate” and that the terms therefore cannot be used interchangeably.
- [77] **Definitions of different treatments.** In response to the proposal by a consultation comment that all the different treatments mentioned in the draft ISPM be defined in ISPM 5, the TPG stressed that this was not recommended as a treatment cannot be described in a brief definition but requires a full standard.
- [78] **“Efficacy” and “level of efficacy”.** The TPG noted that “level of efficacy” was used several times in the draft standard, although “efficacy” is defined as “a defined, measurable, and reproducible effect by a prescribed treatment” and thus “level” was not needed. The TPG acknowledged that ISPM 18 and ISPM 28 (*Phytosanitary treatments for regulated pests*) both use “level of efficacy” and “efficacy” interchangeably and that including “level of” did not create confusion to the extent that ink amendments would be needed to those standards. However, the TPG decided to add a note on this to the General recommendations on the use of terms in ISPMs (see section 6.1 of this report).
- [79] **Appendix 1.** One TPG member noted that there was an inconsistency between the scope of the standard (guidance on the application of temperature treatments) and the content of the appendix (guidance for temperature treatment efficacy studies), and considered if perhaps the appendix would fit better under ISPM 28. Other TPG members preferred including the appendix in the draft ISPM because of the following reasons:
- [80] - Efficacy of temperature treatments is a major concern with many countries lacking trust in the efficacy studies. The appendix will help countries to carry out studies for temperature treatments in a consistent manner, and this should enhance confidence in the treatments between countries. The link between the scope of the standard and the issue of trust is mentioned in the draft standard. One TPG member expressed concern that countries might feel that historically used treatments would need to be supported by research carried out according to the appendix to be able to be used internationally. This could potentially impede trade. However, the TPG stressed that the guidance in the appendix would be highly useful to help researchers design their experiments better to generate meaningful data and that the appendix was not prescriptive.
- [81] - There are practical examples of countries needing guidance on designing temperature treatment efficacy studies.
- [82] - The appendix has broader relevance than IPPC adopted PTs and it would therefore not be appropriate to include it under ISPM 28. However, the Secretariat noted that should there be a wish to do so, a topic for the revision of ISPM 28 should be submitted in response to a call for topics.
- [83] The TPG noted that the discussion was at the margins of their mandate, and recommended the SC consider the issue.
- [84] The TPG:
- (9) *noted* that recommendations on consultation comments and consistency would be transmitted to the steward and SC-7 for consideration.
  - (10) *invited* the SC to consider whether the proposed Appendix 1 would fit better as an appendix to ISPM 28.

## 5. Consideration of new or revised terms/definitions (subjects on the TPG work programme)

- [85] The TPG suggested that any future draft Amendments should contain only the arguments for the proposals, but not the historic information, when they are sent for consultation (the historic information should be retained for the SC only).

## 5.1 “mark” (2013-007)

- [86] The TPG lead introduced the paper<sup>9</sup>. The Glossary term “mark” was added to the *List of topics for IPPC standards* by the SC in May 2013, based upon a TPG proposal for revising the definition to become explicit and precise, and avoid using the phrase “phytosanitary status” within the definition (cf. doc. 30\_TPG\_2014\_Feb).
- [87] Comments from many contact points during the 2014 consultation recommended that the term and definition be deleted altogether, suggesting that the definition would not be needed, as the meaning of “mark” could instead be specified case-by-case with any future use of the term in new ISPMs, as is done already in ISPM 15. It was recalled that “mark” as a term and definition was originally included in ISPM 15 and then moved to ISPM 5, based on comments from a number of countries during the 2001 consultation. No justification was provided for this inclusion. The Interim Standards Committee, November 2001, agreed with the inclusion recognizing that “the term ‘mark’ may be applicable to phytosanitary issues beyond the scope of this standard”.
- [88] The TPG considered that “mark” is used inconsistently in several ISPMs; i.e. with a different meaning than that of the current or proposed revised definition. Retaining the definition (whether in the original or revised form) would necessitate the revision of those uses (probably as ink amendments), substituting the term “mark” with different wording. Finding appropriate alternative terms for ink amendments could prove very difficult.
- [89] The TPG therefore agreed to propose the deletion of “mark” from the Glossary, as its definition was not necessary. The term so far is only used in its Glossary meaning in ISPM 15, which actually through its Outline and Section 3.1 provides a comprehensive description of the ISPM 15 mark, reflecting all features included in the definition (whether in the current or revised form).
- [90] The TPG:
- (11) *proposed* the deletion of “mark” (2013-007) in the draft 2017 Amendments to the Glossary (1994-001) to be presented to SC May 2017.

## 5.2 “commodity class” or “commodity” (2015-013)

- [91] The TPG lead introduced the paper<sup>10</sup> and provided an overview of the work done in relation to this term. He recalled that this paper had been discussed by the TPG virtually in April 2016 and shared with the ePhyto Steering Group.
- [92] He noted that the Glossary defines both “commodity” and “commodity class” as well as a number of terms as a “commodity class”. However, it is not always clear which commodities belong to a specific commodity class, or if one commodity class term should actually rather be considered part of another commodity class. This has created some confusion specifically in relation to the development of standards for specific commodity classes. The current definition of “commodity class” as well as the categorization of specific commodities into commodity classes has also made it challenging for the IPPC community to agree on specific requirements when developing standards (e.g. for “wood”). This because there is a discrepancy between the groupings of commodities based on an *a priori* perceived similar pest risk and the actual specific requirements that may be set for the individual commodities within the commodity class.
- [93] The TPG felt that the general discussion on grouping commodities and how to define their hierarchy was not essential for the purposes of developing ISPMs. The TPG stressed that the scope of an ISPM should define what the ISPM concerns, but also acknowledged that when there are existing Glossary terms that are defined differently from the scope of an ISPM, this creates confusion (e.g. the draft ISPM on *International movement of cut flowers and foliage* (2008-005) has a different scope from what is intended by “cut flowers and branches (as a commodity class)” in ISPM 5). The TPG agreed it

---

<sup>9</sup> 04\_TPG\_2016\_Dec

<sup>10</sup> 06\_TPG\_2016\_Dec

was appropriate to consider revising or deleting the term “commodity class” and the specific commodity class terms from the Glossary and suggested that this be added to their work programme.

- [94] As to the broader context of harmonized phytosanitary terminology, the TPG appreciated the opportunity to discuss this with Mr Nico HORN, representative of the ePhyto Steering Group (ESG), to promote a degree of alignment between ISPM 5 and ePhyto and provide input in the standardization of product descriptions to be used in ePhyto.
- [95] **Standardized product descriptions.** Mr Nico HORN gave a presentation on standardized product descriptions needed for the ePhyto system<sup>11</sup>. He stressed that the harmonization of product descriptions was essential for ePhyto but would also be useful for the paper phytosanitary certificates.
- [96] He noted that while the use of international custom codes (HS codes) would seem a beneficial way to harmonize product categorization, they are too few and the individual codes cover too many different plant products to be useful for phytosanitary certification. Furthermore, he explained that adding new HS codes is a lengthy process so it would be unrealistic to request that all plant products be given individual HS codes. Therefore, and because making HS codes mandatory would add an obligation not required by ISPM 12, the use of HS codes would be optional in ePhyto as it is currently optional for paper phytosanitary certificates.
- [97] He explained that the main challenges faced in setting up the product descriptions concern how to categorize products (i.e. commodities in the ISPM-5 sense) in a standardized manner and without overlaps. To have a functioning electronic system, entries need to be systematized and standardized, and not allow countries to input entries incorrectly which could result in erroneous handling at import. For instance, the same product may appear in different categories according to its intended use. This is the case for “potatoes”, which may be described as tubers (seed potatoes for planting) or as vegetables (ware potatoes for consumption), with different levels of risk and consequent phytosanitary import requirements. Likewise, some seeds (in the botanical sense) may be for consumption and others for planting, again with significant differences in the pest risk.
- [98] Added challenges to this were (i) the discrepancies between the proposed product descriptions and the ISPM 5 definitions. The Glossary defines specific products (commodity classes, actually) by making their intended use explicit. For instance, “bulbs and tubers” or “seeds” are only intended for planting, and not for processing or consumption, whereas in the ePhyto context these products per se may also be for processing or consumption. (ii) The relation between the ePhyto system and ISPM 32 (*Categorization of commodities according to their pest risk*) because this standard requires that certain commodities are exempted from phytosanitary certification due to their level of processing or their intended use. Should the ePhyto system allow for certificates to be issued also for no-risk commodities (as still required by some countries) or only for risk products?
- [99] First, the TPG agreed that it was not appropriate to link the product descriptions to the Glossary terms “commodity” or “commodity class”, therefore using the word “product” was appropriate. The TPG also agreed that ISPM 5 terms should be used in the ePhyto context only when useful and should not be mandatory. The TPG agreed with the importance of having sufficient parameters for categorization to ensure that phytosanitary certification would be unambiguous. The TPG felt that it was necessary to have three layers for plants and plant products: intended use, plant parts and condition.
- [100] Second, the TPG suggested that the intended use be the first input level as this was deemed the most essential parameter to take into account. By having intended use at the first level, categorization of the products would be more straightforward. The system should hereafter prompt a list of products (i.e. at the second level) that would automatically fall under the respective first level entry (e.g. first level: consumption; second level: potatoes). This would allow the system to filter the products without countries having to consider whether to name a potato “a tuber”, “seed potato”, “ware potato”, etc., as the system would automatically make this distinction.

---

<sup>11</sup> 19\_TPG\_2016\_Dec; <https://www.ippc.int/en/work-area-pages/technical-panel-for-the-glossary-tpg/>

- [101] In this context, the TPG considered that there were three intended-use categories: planting, consumption and other uses (e.g. crafts, decorative products, cut flowers), and processing (see ISPM 32, section 1.2).
- [102] Third, the TPG supported describing the products according to the “plant part” and the “condition” as the second and third levels, respectively.
- [103] Fourth, acknowledging that some countries would still require phytosanitary certificates for products categorized in ISPM 32 as low risk, the TPG suggested that the system be set up so that it would query input where a phytosanitary certificate would not normally be requested (e.g. by prompting “Do you realize that, according to ISPM 32, no phytosanitary certificate should be required for this product?”).
- [104] Fifth, the TPG recommended that the ePhyto system should:
- facilitate choosing the right description (e.g. by auto filling and not allowing the selection of “seeds” after having chosen the intended use “consumption”, or by querying the selection)
  - provide descriptions of the categories of products (e.g. via a pop up or a float over)
  - provide scroll down description lists as comprehensive as needed, but as short as possible to reduce the number of possible errors by users (the longer the list, the more subtle the differences between descriptions and higher probability of selecting the wrong description).
- [105] **Oversight body.** The Secretariat invited the TPG to consider which body should have governance of determining and revising the list of products (now called “IPPC commodity classes”<sup>12</sup>) in the future. The TPG considered that while the harmonized product descriptions would facilitate both paper and electronic phytosanitary certificates, the immediate objective is to enable the development of ePhyto for which strict and thorough harmonization on the one hand, and a flexible development process on the other hand, are essential. Therefore, the list of products should not be included as or considered part of ISPM 12 (i.e. requiring a lengthy standard setting and adoption procedure). Nevertheless, there would be value in having a formal oversight body to endorse the changes and additions to the list of products considering the standardization needed (and consequently international harmonization). The TPG recommended the SC become responsible for the oversight of the product descriptions, as this work was still linked to ISPM 12 and phytosanitary certification.
- [106] Mr Nico HORN agreed that the process of maintaining the list of product descriptions would need an oversight body and supported that SC would be the suitable one. He noted that the ESG should propose a procedure for developing and maintaining the list.
- [107] The TPG suggested that, for transparency purposes, the list of products could be presented to the CPM for noting. A TPG member added that it might be useful to have a “hands on” demonstration of how to input data into the system during a CPM side session and take that opportunity to invite for further comments to the description list.
- [108] **“Commodity class”.** Following the discussions, the TPG felt that the definition for “commodity class” was not useful and considered that it might be suitable to delete it from the Glossary. The TPG agreed to analyze how the term had been used in standards, however, before proposing its deletion. As to the actual terms defining different commodity classes, the TPG suggested that these be reviewed carefully to determine if their definitions add value or rather create challenges, and thus agreed that these terms should all be added to their work programme.
- [109] The TPG:
- (12) *invited* the SC to add to the *List of topics for IPPC standards* all the commodity class terms.
  - (13) *invited* the SC to note that the TPG would consider further the possible deletion of the term “commodity class” in combination with the review of the different commodity classes included in the Glossary.

---

<sup>12</sup> See <http://ephyto.ippc.int/commodity>

- (14) *proposed* the SC consider taking on the oversight role in the process of developing and maintaining the list of product descriptions to be included in the ePhyto system (considering that the list would harmonize and standardize terminology), following a process that the ESG would set up.

### 5.3 “confinement (of a regulated article)” (2016-002)

[110] The TPG lead introduced the paper<sup>13</sup>.

[111] Originally, “confinement (of a regulated article)” was included in the Glossary in 2012 following a TPG proposal to develop a definition in relation to ISPM 3 (*Guidelines for the export, shipment, import and release of biological control agents and other beneficial organisms*) and ISPM 34 (*Design and operation of post-entry quarantine stations for plants*). This Glossary term was added to the *List of topics for IPPC standards* by the SC in May 2016 based on a TPG proposal of December 2015, where the TPG discussed the terms “confinement facility” (2015-001) and “quarantine” (2015-002) and felt that “confinement” should be revised, or possibly deleted from the Glossary, because the definition of “quarantine” (whether in the current or revised form) conflicts with that of “confinement”.

[112] The TPG considered that:

- There are currently three defined terms (“quarantine”, “confinement” and “detention”) covering almost the same concept; the difference between the three definitions is very subtle, the definitions are somewhat circular in that they refer to each other, and the terms are often used interchangeably in ISPMs. This situation creates unfortunate and unnecessary confusion.
- The original aim of defining “confinement (of a regulated article)” was to avoid that the Glossary term “containment” would be used beyond its defined scope (pertaining to an “area”). However, defining “confinement (of a regulated article)” is not needed to avoid the misuse of the well-defined “containment”.
- The description of “confinement (of a regulated article)” as being the “application of phytosanitary measures...” misses the notion of holding in some sort of enclosure. Example: while “treatment” is a “phytosanitary measure”, the mere applying of a treatment would not count as “confinement”. Therefore, normal English dictionary definitions of “confinement” are more adequate than the current definition.
- “Confinement” in the broad, common sense is used in the definition of “quarantine”, and here clearly functions to provide the notion of holding in enclosure, and suggesting that “quarantine” is a subset of “confinement”. On the other hand, the purpose of “confinement (of a regulated article)” is defined as “to prevent the escape of pests”. This is only one out of several purposes for “quarantine”, so “confinement (of a regulated article)” is defined more restrictively than for “quarantine”, suggesting that “confinement (of a regulated article)” becomes a subset of “quarantine”. Thus, the relation between the two terms is confused.
- “Confinement” in the broad, common sense is also used in the definition of “detention”. For the IPPC community to deal with the terms: the undefined “confinement” used to define two very closely related terms (“quarantine” and “detention”) and then the defined term “confinement (of a regulated article)” is confusing.
- Retaining the definitions of “quarantine” and “detention” is sufficient for all ISPM purposes, in particular if the less restrictive revised definition of “quarantine” shall be agreed, leaving the definition for “confinement (of a regulated article)” unnecessary and confusing.
- Although, as stated in its definition, “detention” is a subset of “quarantine”, it is not particularly clear whether such distinction has been used deliberately in ISPMs so far. On the other hand, the uses seem unproblematic.
- The use in ISPMs of “confinement” in the broad, common sense is appropriate and well understood in all current ISPM contexts. “Confinement” as used would not merit any ink

<sup>13</sup> 05\_TPG\_2016\_Dec

amendments in ISPMs if the term is left without a definition in the Glossary. In future, the Glossary terms “quarantine” or “detention” should be used where appropriate, and “confinement” could be used in its common English meaning.

- “Confinement” is difficult to translate into other FAO languages, e.g. Arabic uses the same term as the translation of “detention”.

[113] During discussions, the TPG further noted that the definition of “detention” was inconsistent with other Glossary definitions as it had the cross reference “see quarantine”. Glossary terms are bolded in the definitions of other Glossary terms to ensure cross-reference, whereas “see...” is not used. Therefore, the TPG agreed that an ink amendment should be proposed to delete the wording “(see quarantine)” from the definition of “detention”, as a consistency issue.

[114] The TPG:

- (15) *proposed* the deletion of “confinement (of a regulated article)” (2016-002) in the draft 2017 *Amendments to the Glossary* (1994-001) to be presented to SC May 2017.
- (16) *invited* the SC to review the ink amendment to “detention” for consistency (Appendix 4).

#### 5.4 “growing period” and “growing season” (2016-004)

[115] The TPG lead introduced the paper<sup>14</sup> recalling that the TPG proposed that the SC May 2016 add this term to the *List of topics for IPPC standards*. The objective was to review the definition of “growing period” because of the linking of “area, place of production or production site” to “growing season” but not to “growing period”, which seemed odd because “a growing period” was supposed to be more specific than “a growing season”.

[116] It was recalled that the mention of “plants” and the wording “in an area” were deleted from the definition of “growing period (of a plant species)” by the SC in November 2002, when a reference to “growing season” was introduced in the definition of “growing period” and the wording “place of production or production site” was added to the definition of “growing season”. The TPG noted that “growing season” is relevant for a range of plants whereas “growing period” is related to a specific plants species.

[117] The TPG considered the following points for “growing season”:

[118] – While “growing season” is used in ISPMs, the term does not have any specific IPPC meaning and may be used in its common dictionary meaning. In comparison, “growing period” is essential for inspection purposes and is also important when applying other phytosanitary procedures.

[119] – Several tropical countries do not have “growing seasons” and the term is therefore not relevant for them.

[120] – Plants grown under artificial conditions may actively grow beyond the outdoor “growing season”.

[121] Originally, the term “growing period” was defined in the Glossary to replace the term “growing season” which was intended to be deleted.

[122] – Deleting the term “growing season” would not cause difficulties of understanding the uses of the term in ISPMs and would not require ink amendments.

[123] The TPG agreed that growing season does not have a particular meaning in the phytosanitary context and might cause confusion. The TPG therefore recommended deleting it from the Glossary.

[124] The TPG considered the following points for “growing period”:

---

<sup>14</sup> 07\_TPG\_2016\_Dec



- [125] – The term “growing period” is essential for inspection purposes to ensure that inspection is carried out when the plant actively grows, and may be important also for treatments, surveys and other phytosanitary procedures.
- [126] – “Time” and “period” ultimately mean the same thing, thus “time” can be considered redundant and should be deleted.
- [127] – “Actively grows” correctly reflects that some plants have active growth periods alternating with periods of dormancy.
- [128] – The cross reference to “growing season” is unnecessary and confusing as not all countries have growing seasons and as plants grown under artificial conditions may actively grow beyond the growing season of an area.
- [129] – The addition of “when a plant species” ensures that the definition restricts the growing period to one specific plant species, which facilitates the implementation of inspection and phytosanitary procedures. Consequently, the qualifier “(of a plant species)” can be deleted.
- [130] - “in an area, place of production or production site” should be added to the definition to ensure that the growing period is particular to an area or a specific place of production or production site (especially under artificial conditions).
- [131] The TPG:
- (17) *proposed* the deletion of “growing season” and the revision of “growing period” (2016-004) in the draft 2017 *Amendments to the Glossary* (1994-001) to be presented to SC May 2017.

## 5.5 “survey” (2013-015)

- [132] The TPG lead introduced the paper<sup>15</sup> and recalled the TPG that the term “survey” was added to the *List of Topics for IPPC Standards* by the SC in May 2013, because the SC agreed that this definition needed further consideration as to whether it should read “whether a pest is present or absent”. While the term is currently pending on the TPG work programme, due to the ongoing revision of ISPM 6 (*Guidelines for surveillance*) (2009-004), the TPG discussed the term in combination with their review of terms and consistency for the draft revision to ISPM 6 (2009-004).
- [133] The TPG discussed the following points (see also discussions under section 4.2 of this report):
- [134] - Adding the qualifier “(of pests)”. The TPG agreed that by adding this qualifier, “survey” could be used in a general sense, for instance for surveys in the IPPC domain done for IRSS.
- [135] - “Whether a pest is present or absent”. Some TPG members noted that “whether a pest is present”, in English, would also mean to assess whether the pest was absent. Nevertheless, TPG agreed that both terms should be included in the definition to enhance clarity.
- [136] - Referring to specific surveys. The TPG considered if the cross-reference to the specific surveys in the definition was useful. The TPG preferred to ensure that the definition would cover the different types of surveys that can be carried out by representing their purposes in the definition.
- [137] - Including “boundaries”. Some TPG members felt that “distribution” (in the sense of spatial and temporal distribution) was a more appropriate term than the “boundaries (of a pest population)”. Other TPG members felt that “characteristics of a pest population” would be understood to include “distribution”, which would then not be needed in the definition. However, the TPG preferred that the definition be more explicit so that the different types of surveys were covered. The TPG felt that “boundaries (of a pest population)” added clarity and also noted that the revised definition was consistent with the wording proposed in the draft revision to ISPM 6 (2009-004).

---

<sup>15</sup> 11\_TPG\_2016\_Dec

- [138] The TPG noted that there were some translation issues in the draft revision to ISPM 6 (2009-004). Most importantly were the translation error that “survey” is translated into Spanish as “encuesta” (which means a survey for information, e.g. IRSS) and not “prospección” which is the correct term. This should be corrected in all “survey”-related terms.
- [139] The TPG discussed “monitoring” in the context of “survey” and the draft revision to ISPM 6. The TPG felt that there was some confusion around the use of the Glossary term “monitoring” in ISPMs and suggested that perhaps “monitoring” was not needed in the Glossary, but could be used in its normal dictionary sense. In addition, it was not fully clear what “phytosanitary situations” means, which was being used in its definition. The TPG discussed the term and agreed that the definition is very broad and may not be perfectly clear. However, after some discussion, the TPG agreed that it was an important term and definition due to it being “ongoing” and “official”, hereby clarifying that it is the NPPO being responsible for the monitoring (i.e. not the farmer or industry). The TPG discussed if there would be cases where monitoring would not be used in its official sense, and agreed that monitoring would always be “official” when used in ISPMs. The TPG also noted that should the term be deleted from the Glossary, “official” would have to be inserted in all the standards where monitoring is used in the “official” sense which would require numerous ink amendments.
- [140] The TPG agreed to not take any further action on this term, but noted that some languages, such as Chinese does not distinguish between “surveillance” and “monitoring”.

[141] The TPG:

- (18) *invited* the SC to add the revision of “survey” to the draft 2017 *Amendments to the Glossary*.

## **5.6 “ecosystems” (2016-003), “habitat” (2016-005) and “modern biotechnology” (2016-006)**

- [142] The TPG lead introduced the paper<sup>16</sup>. He recalled that the terms “ecosystem”, “habitat” and “modern biotechnology” were added to the *List of topics for IPPC standards* by the SC in May 2016 based on a TPG proposal to review the definitions and use in ISPMs of “ecosystem”, “habitat” and “modern biotechnology”, and possibly propose their deletion.
- [143] The TPG considered the following points:
- [144] - “Ecosystem” and “habitat” are common terms with a wide range of meanings. They are generally used in environmental/ecological matters and are often related to the Convention on Biodiversity (CBD) issues. In the IPPC context, the terms “ecosystem” and “habitat” were originally defined as individual terms for the purpose of ISPM 3. They were later used in the revised ISPM 11 (*Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests*) that took into account environmental risks. They are frequently used together when describing plant protection of the IPPC e.g. “...to the protection of plants, including cultivated and uncultivated/unmanaged plants and wild flora (including aquatic plants), habitats and ecosystems in the importing countries.”
- [145] - “Modern biotechnology” definition found in the Glossary is based on a CBD definition. The term was used extensively in the report of the Open-ended Expert Working Group for the development of a detailed standard specification on the plant pest risks associated with living modified organisms (LMOs)/products of modern biotechnology from the Third Interim Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (ICPM) of 2001. Thus, the term is used in ISPMs and CPM recommendations in the specific context of the LMOs and CBD.
- [146] The TPG agreed that the terms were useful to retain in the Glossary because their Glossary definitions allow limiting and better understanding their meanings in the IPPC context.

---

<sup>16</sup> 09\_TPG\_2016\_Dec

[147] The TPG:

- (19) *agreed* that “ecosystems” (2016-003), “habitat” (2016-005) and “modern biotechnology” (2016-006) are used in meanings specific to IPPC and are useful terms to retain in the Glossary.
- (20) *invited* the SC to delete the terms “ecosystems” (2016-003), “habitat” (2016-005) and “modern biotechnology” (2016-006) from the *List of topics for IPPC standards*.

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

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

[148] The Secretariat introduced the paper<sup>17</sup> recalling that the *General recommendations on use of terms in ISPMs* are published in the IPPC Style guide.

[149] The TPG modified the *General recommendations on use of terms in ISPMs* by adding notes on “prescribed, required and target” and modifying the note on “efficacy” (see section 4.3 of this report). In addition, the TPG made editorial changes to most of the notes and agreed to prepare a note on “invasive, invasiveness, invasion” for the for inclusion into the report.

[150] The TPG agreed to prepare notes for discussion at their 2017 meeting on:

- “acceptable level of risk”, “appropriate level of protection” (revision)
- “accredit”, “authorize” and “certify” (revision)
- “contamination” (revision)
- “country”, “contracting party”, “NPPO” (revision)
- “dispersal, spread, dissemination”
- “exotic, non-indigenous, non-naturally present” and “hazard”.

[151] The TPG:

- (21) *invited* the SC to note the modified *General recommendations on use of terms in ISPMs* (Appendix 5).

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

[152] The Secretariat updated the TPG on the standards for which ink amendments had been proposed and agreed to by SC since last TPG meeting<sup>18</sup>. The TPG expressed appreciation of the overview and asked the Secretariat to provide hyperlinks to the papers containing the ink amendments.

### 6.3 Consistency across standards

#### 6.3.1 Use of “contracting party”, “country” and similar terms consistently throughout standards

[153] The TPG lead introduced the paper<sup>19</sup> and recalled the TPG that when discussing the term “trading partner”, TPG noted in December 2015 that “contracting party”, “country” and “member” were used inconsistently in ISPMs and between the Convention text and ISPMs.

[154] The TPG discussed the results of the analysis and felt that the terms were generally used with their correct meanings and that none of the cases of slightly incorrect uses in ISPMs would necessitate ink amendments. The TPG acknowledged that “countries” were often used in ISPMs to mean “contracting parties”, but that this was not considered a problem or in conflict with the IPPC. The TPG also recalled that the *General recommendations on use of terms in ISPMs* specified when to use the various terms.

---

<sup>17</sup> 17\_TPG\_2016\_Dec

<sup>18</sup> 15\_TPG\_2016\_Dec

<sup>19</sup> 08\_TPG\_2016\_Dec

## 7. Annotated Glossary: 2016 amendments

### 7.1 Current revision of the Annotated Glossary

[155] The TPG lead introduced the Explanatory document on ISPM 5, the Annotated Glossary, as revised from the last version (version 4), published in March 2016 after TPG finalized it in December 2015. Some comments were made while discussing this agenda item, and further suggestions were made during discussion of various agenda items.

[156] The lead summarized the changes that would be made to the Annotated Glossary:

- Note 1 would be amended in relation to “endangered area” (see section 4.1 of this report).
- Note 7 would be amended to include a note to clarify that pests, and in the general case beneficial organisms and biological control agents, are not included in the definition of regulated articles.
- Note 8 would be amended to align wording between “surveillance” and the draft revised ISPM 6 (see section 4.2 of this report).
- Terms adopted by CPM-11 would be included.
- Terms that have been taken off the TPG work programme would be included in Appendix 2 (List of terms considered or under consideration by the TPG), as would the terms currently on the TPG work programme.

[157] The TPG agreed that the lead should share the updated Annotated Glossary with the TPG only after the SC May 2017 meeting.

The TPG:

(22) *agreed* that the intermediate version of the Annotated Glossary would be modified after the meeting by Beatriz MELCHO<sup>20</sup>.

## 8. Explanation of Glossary terms

[158] The following terms were discussed.

[159] **Pest free area (PFA).** One TPG member noted that there are examples of a country that exports from PFAs although pathogens may be present. She explained that the area is considered a PFA because the conditions are not conducive to the pathogen being expressed. The definition of PFA does not allow for a pest to be present even if it is not harmful to the plant in the specific area and this creates some difficulties for the country that considers the area a PFA.

[160] The TPG discussed the issue but stressed that the definition of PFA is essential to be able to take necessary measures. The TPG highlighted that while the conditions may not favour the expression of the pest in that specific area, the pest is still considered injurious to the specific plants and may be harmful should it be introduced through the international movement to another area where the conditions would favour the pest to develop. It was further recalled that almost all pests are harmful under certain conditions and in certain places, and in those places (being endangered areas) would, if technically justified, be declared as quarantine pests. The TPG felt that the definition of PFA was clear and essential for contracting parties to be able to regulate pests as quarantine pests. The TPG suggested, for the example in question, that it would be more correct to use the Glossary term “area of low pest prevalence” or “symptom-free area” (not a Glossary term).

[161] **Monitoring.** See 5.5 for the discussions on this term.

[162] **Inspection.** See 4.1 for the discussions on this term.

[163] **Treatment.** One TPG member pointed out that “treatment” in the Glossary sense is always “official” and suggested that it may be useful to revise the definition to allow for farmers treating their crops to

---

<sup>20</sup>for circulation within the TPG after SC May 2017

call this a “treatment”, because it has proven difficult to find an alternative term to be used in national legislation for the non-official case. The TPG felt that “treatment” is both a common term and also that it was useful to have it defined in the Glossary. The TPG agreed it would be useful to analyze the term and definition further.

[164] The TPG:

(23) *invited* the SC to add the term “treatment” to the *List of topics for IPPC standards*.

## 9. TPG work plan

[165] The TPG updated its work plan for 2017 (Appendix 06). This work plan will be presented to SC May 2017.

[166] The Secretariat reminded TPG members that the work plan is posted on the TPG restricted work area and is updated throughout the year. Members should refer to the online version for the latest updates, and the Secretariat also circulates the work plan by email when needed.

[167] The TPG:

(24) *invited* the SC to note the TPG work plan 2017 (Appendix 06).

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

[168] The terms of two members (for Arabic and Chinese) would end in 2017 and one other member noted that he might stop within a few years (English). The TPG felt that it was important to have overlap and invited the Secretariat to issue a call as appropriate.

## 11. Other issues

### 11.1 Formalizing the development of a “concept of terminology”

[169] The TPG Lead introduced the paper to formalize the “concept of terminology” with an aim to facilitate drafting of IPPC-related documents by the SC and expert drafting groups (EDG), and at ensuring transparency. The paper outlined a number of principles that had been developed based on unwritten practices of the SC and the TPG, on the Annotated Glossary, the ISO standard 704:2009 and a seminar provided to the TPG by the FAO Terminology services in 2014. The TPG discussed the principles proposed in the draft document and provided suggestions for changes. The following main points on the principles presented were discussed:

[170] **Principle 1a and 1b.** While synonyms may have the same normal English dictionary definition, the TPG agreed that Glossary terms should always be used instead of any synonyms, when possible, to avoid confusion. The TPG discussed if it would be possible to provide guidance on the use of non-defined terms also in languages other than English. It was recalled as a very fundamental translation principle that rather than translating word-by-word, the translation should use the appropriate words in the respective language to convey the intended meaning. For example, “quarantine station” in Spanish uses a different term than “station” to convey the definition of the term because “station” in Spanish has a very specific meaning, different from the English language definition.

[171] **Principle 4.** Several TPG members suggested that ISPM 5 should also define terms that are not mentioned in the IPPC or ISPMs, when these terms are useful in a phytosanitary context. However, the Secretariat recalled that should such terms be included in the Glossary, the ICPM-2 (1999) decision would need to be changed. One TPG member also noted that there could be legal repercussions to doing this, and the issue should be considered carefully. In addition, there would be resource constraints for the Secretariat connected to this.

[172] **Principle 5.** One TPG member felt that it might be useful to try to define terms where concepts are not clear to try to harmonize understanding this way. The TPG did not agree, but felt that principle 5 was correct, namely that only when a concept is clear should the TPG be asked to develop a definition for it.

[173] **Principle 7.** One TPG member suggested that if a term was useful in a phytosanitary context it should not be restricted to one standard only. The TPG, however, agreed with principle 7 that when a term is relevant to a specific standard only, also if it might be useful in a broader phytosanitary context, it should be defined in the specific standard.

[174] **Principle 8.** The TPG suggested that this principle be merged with principle 2.

[175] The TPG:

(25) *agreed* to send comments to the TPG lead by 2017-02-09. The lead will then revise the paper on the principles for presentation to the SC May 2017.

## 11.2 TPG-TPDP reporting on issues related to terms and consistency in draft diagnostic protocols

[176] The Steward informed the TPG that she had not been contacted by the TPDP Steward and therefore had nothing to report.

## 11.3 ISPM 5 Brochure

[177] The Secretariat distributed the draft brochure on phytosanitary terminology, to be addressed to NPPOs. The TPG provided comments. The Secretariat would aim at publishing the draft brochure in January 2017.

## 11.4 CBD

[178] The Secretariat informed the TPG that the CBD wishes to draft a document comparing the terms used in the Cartagena protocol with terms in the ISPM 5 explaining the linkages and differences. The CBD Secretariat had inquired if the TPG was willing to review the draft to help ensure that the proper linkages and explanations were made and that this document did not infringe the meaning of IPPC terms. TPG agreed to this task, provided the SC agrees, and recommended the CBD Secretariat also consider preparing a similar document vis-a-vie the OIE and CODEX Glossaries.

## 12. Date and venue of the next meeting

[179] The next TPG meeting is tentatively scheduled for 4-7 December 2017. The venue will be announced later as there were conflicting meetings held at FAO, HQ and it was not certain if a room could be found.

## 13. Close

[180] The Secretariat thanked the TPG members for their tremendous contributions to the work of the TPG.

[181] As this was likely to be her last meeting, Ms Ning HONG (China) thanked the TPG members for the good companionship and interesting discussions over the past five years. The TPG wished her the best for the future and thanked her for her contributions.

[182] The Chairperson thanked the Secretariat for their support, wished all the TPG members safe travels and closed the meeting.

**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	-	-
1.3 Review and adoption of the agenda		Chairperson
1.4 Current specification: TP5 (TPG) (2016) [Posted June 2016 in three languages]	<a href="#">Web link</a>	Secretariat
<b>2. Administrative Matters</b>	-	
2.1 Local information	<a href="#">Web link</a>	Secretariat
2.2 Documents list	02_TPG_2016_Dec	Secretariat
2.3 Participants list	03_TPG_2016_Dec	Secretariat
<b>3. Reports</b>	-	
3.1 Previous meetings of the TPG (December 2015)	<a href="#">Web link</a>	Steward
3.2 Extracts from other meeting reports of relevance to the TPG (SC, CPM) - CPM-11 (2016), SC May 2016, SC Nov. 2016	18_TPG_2016_Dec	Secretariat
3.3 Current work plan The work plan was decided by the TPG 2015. 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 first consultation in 2016 (1 July-30 September)</b> The TPG will review member comments on terms and definitions, and will review the drafts for consistency in the use of terms. Recommendations will be transmitted to stewards and the SC-7 (May 2017).		
4.1 Draft 2016 Amendments to ISPM 5: <i>Glossary of Phytosanitary terms</i> (1994-001) 1. Consultation comments on terms and consistency 2. Translations of terms and definitions in French and Spanish 3. Proposed draft translations of terms and definitions for Arabic, Chinese, Russian (only terms and definitions, not any additional text)	1994-001  12_TPG_2016_Dec 1994-001_Amendments_Es; 1994-001_Amendments_Fr	Chairperson
4.2 Draft <i>Revision of ISPM 6</i> (2009-004) - Consultation comments on terms and consistency, including translation issues	2009-004 13_TPG_2016_Dec; 16_TPG_2016_Dec	Chairperson
4.3 Draft ISPM on <i>Requirements for the use of temperature treatments as a phytosanitary measure</i> (2014-005) - Consultation comments on terms and consistency, including translation issues	2014-005 14_TPG_2016_Dec	Chairperson
<b>5. Consideration of new or revised terms/definitions (subjects on the TPG work programme)</b>		
Proposals for new or revised terms/definitions will be compiled into new draft Amendments to the Glossary, to be submitted to the SC in May 2017.		
5.1 "mark" (2013-007)	04_TPG_2016_Dec	Nordbo
5.2 "commodity", "commodity class" (2015-013) and actual terms belonging to these two categories	06_TPG_2016_Dec; 19_TPG_2016_Dec	Orlinski / Representative from ePhyto Steering Group

AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER
5.3 "confinement" (2016-002)	05_TPG_2016_Dec	Nordbo
5.4 "growing period" and "growing season" (2016-004)	07_TPG_2016_Dec	Bouhot-Delduc
5.5 "survey"(2013-015)	11_TPG_2016_Dec	Bouhot-Delduc
5.6 "ecosystems" (2016-003), "habitat" (2016-005) and "modern biotechnology" (2016-006)	09_TPG_2016_Dec	Hedley
<b>6. Review of ISPMs for consistency of terms and style</b>	-	
6.1 General recommendations on consistency (as modified following the TPG 2015 and noted by the SC. To be reviewed and completed as needed)	17_TPG_2016_Dec	Secretariat
6.2 Consistency of adopted ISPM (standard by standard) - List of standards that have gone through the consistency review	15_TPG_2016_Dec	Secretariat
6.3 Use of "contracting party", "country" and similar terms consistently throughout standards	08_TPG_2016_Dec	Orlinski
<b>7. Annotated glossary: 2016 amendments</b> The annotated glossary, version 4, was finalized at TPG 2015 and published in March 2016. The next version should be finalized in 2019. The TPG considers yearly which amendments need to be made and produces an intermediate version.	<a href="#">Web link</a>	Melcho
<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. These terms/definitions will be discussed during the TPG meeting and the need for additional explanations (e.g. in the annotated glossary) discussed.		Secretariat
<b>9. TPG work plan</b>	-	
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 2017 for noting.	To be prepared during the meeting	Secretariat
<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	See agenda item 2.3	
<b>11. Other issues</b>		
11.1 Formalizing the development of a "concept of terminology"	10_TPG_2016_Dec	Nordbo
11.2 TPG-TPDP reporting on issues related to terms and consistency in draft diagnostic protocols		Steward
11.3 ISPM 5 Brochure		Secretariat/ Bloem
<b>12. Date and venue of the next meeting</b>	-	
<b>13. Close</b>	-	



**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>
<b>Draft ISPMs</b>			
1994-01_Amendments_En	4.1	Draft Amendments to the ISPM 5 ( <i>Glossary of phytosanitary terms</i> )	2016-11-07
1994-01_Amendments_Es	4.1	Translation of terms and definitions (Spanish)	2016-11-07
1994-001_Amendments_Fr	4.1	Translation of terms and definitions (French)	2016-11-07
2009-004	4.2	Draft revision of ISPM 6: <i>National surveillance system</i>	2016-11-07
2014-005	4.3	Draft ISPM on <i>Requirements for the use of temperature treatments as phytosanitary measures</i>	2016-11-07
<b>Documents</b>			
01_TPG_2016_Dec	1.3	Draft annotated agenda	2016-11-28
02_TPG_2016_Dec	2.2	Document list	2016-11-07
03_TPG_2016_Dec	2.3	Participants list	2016-11-07
04_TPG_2016_Dec	5.3	Subject: mark (2013-007)	2016-11-07
05_TPG_2016_Dec	5.1	Subject: confinement (2016-002)	2016-11-07
06_TPG_2016_Dec	5.2	Subjects: commodity class or commodity (2015-013)	2016-11-10
07_TPG_2016_Dec	5.4	Subject: "growing period" versa "growing season" (2016-004)	2016-11-07
08_TPG_2016_Dec_Rev1	6.3	Use of "contracting party", "country" and similar terms consistently throughout standards	2016-11-24
09_TPG_2016_Dec	5.6	Subjects for deletion: "ecosystem" (2016-003), "habitat (2016-005) and "modern biotechnology" (2016-006)	2016-11-07
10_TPG_2016_Dec	11.1	Consistency of terminology and purpose of the IPPC Glossary	2016-11-07
11_TPG_2016_Dec	5.5	Subject: survey (2013-015)	2016-11-07
12_TPG_2016_Dec	4.1	Compiled member comments – Draft Amendments to the Glossary (1994-001) 2016	2016-11-07
13_TPG_2016_Dec	4.2	Compiled member comments – Draft revision of ISPM 6: <i>National surveillance systems</i> (2009-004)	2016-11-07
14_TPG_2016_Dec	4.3	Compiled member comments – Draft ISPM on <i>Requirements for the use of temperature treatments as a phytosanitary measure</i> (2014-005)	2016-11-07
15_TPG_2016_Dec	6.2	List of proposed or approved link amendments for ISPMs	2016-11-07

DOCUMENT NO.	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE	DATE POSTED / DISTRIBUTED
16_TPG_2016_Dec	4.2	"Surveillance" terms in Spanish and French	2016-11-07
17_TPG_2016_Dec	6.1	General recommendations on use of terms in ISPMs	2016-11-24
18_TPG_2016_Dec	3.2	Update from the various meetings of relevance to the TPG	2016-11-24
19_TPG_2016_Dec	5.2	Commodity description in ePhyto	2016-11-28

*Web links (documents to be downloaded)*

DOCUMENT NO.	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE	DATE POSTED / DISTRIBUTED
<a href="#">Specification TP 5</a>		Current specification: TP5 (TPG) (2016) (for information)	N/A
<a href="#">Web link</a>		Local information	N/A
<a href="#">Web link</a>		Previous meetings of the TPG (December 2015)	N/A
<a href="#">Web link</a> (work area; log on needed)		Current work plan	N/A

**APPENDIX 3 - Participants list**

	Participants details			TPG member's term	
	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Participant role	Email address	begins	ends
✓	<p><b>Ms Laurence BOUHOT-DELDUC</b>  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</p>	Steward / French	<a href="mailto:laurence.bouhot-delduc@agriculture.gouv.fr">laurence.bouhot-delduc@agriculture.gouv.fr</a>	May 2013	2018
✓	<p><b>Ms Stephanie BLOEM</b>  Executive Director  North American Plant Protection Organization (NAPPO)  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</p>	English	<a href="mailto:SBloem.NAPPO@gmail.com">SBloem.NAPPO@gmail.com</a>	Nov 2013	2018
✓	<p><b>Mr John HEDLEY</b>  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</p>	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)
✓	<p><b>Ms Beatriz MELCHO</b>  Ministry of Livestock, Agriculture and Fisheries,  General Direction of Agricultural Services,  Plant Protection Division  Avda. Millan 4703  CP 12900  Montevideo,  <b>URUGUAY</b>  Tel: (+598) 2 309 8410 ext 267</p>	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)
✓	<p><b>Ms Hong NING</b>  Plant Quarantine Station of Sichuan  Agricultural Department  No. 4 Wuhouci Street, Chengdu, Sichuan,  610041  <b>PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA</b>  Tel: (+86) 28 85505251  Fax: (+86) 28 85505251</p>	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
✓	<b>Mr Ebbe NORDBO</b> Danish AgriFish Agency Nyropsgade 30 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)
	<b>Ms Shaza Roushdy OMAR</b> 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.roshty@gmail.com">shaza.roshty@gmail.com</a> ;	Oct 2012	2017
✓	<b>Mr Andrei ORLINSKI</b> 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@epo.int">Orlinski@epo.int</a> ;	Nov 2010	2020 (1 <sup>st</sup> term: 2010-2015)
✓	<b>Ms Eva MOLLER</b> Standard Setting IPPC Secretariat Rome, <b>ITALY</b> Tel: +390657052855	IPPC Secretariat	<a href="mailto:Eva.Moller@fao.org">Eva.Moller@fao.org</a> ;		
✓	<b>Mr Paul HOWARD</b> Standard Setting IPPC Secretariat, FAO Rome <b>ITALY</b> Tel: +390657055809	IPPC Secretariat	<a href="mailto:Paul.Howard@fao.org">Paul.Howard@fao.org</a> ;		
✓	<b>Mr Piotr WLODARCZYK</b> Standard Setting IPPC Secretariat, FAO Rome <b>ITALY</b> Tel: +390657055809	IPPC Secretariat	<a href="mailto:Piotr.Wlodarczyk@fao.org">Piotr.Wlodarczyk@fao.org</a> ;		

## APPENDIX 4: Proposed ink amendment to ISPM 5 (“detention”)

- [183] The Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG) reviewed the definition of “detention” in their 2016 meeting when discussing “confinement (of a regulated article)” (2016-002).
- [184] The TPG noted that the definition of “detention” was inconsistent with other Glossary definitions and the general style as it had the cross reference “see quarantine”. Glossary terms are using bolded words when using other Glossary terms in their definition to ensure easy cross reference, whereas cross reference to any other term (by “see...”) is not used. The intention and legal effect of “see...” is obscure, and therefore inappropriate, and more confusing than helpful in harmonized terminology.
- [185] The below ink amendment to delete the cross reference “see quarantine” is therefore proposed to ensure consistency among Glossary terms.

**Table 1.** Proposed ink amendment to ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*) for consistency

<b>detention</b>	Keeping a <b>consignment</b> in <b>official</b> custody or confinement, as a <b>phytosanitary measure</b> ( <del>see <b>quarantine</b></del> ) [FAO, 1990; revised FAO, 1995; CEPV, 1999; ICPM, 2005]
------------------	---

## APPENDIX 5: General recommendations on use of terms in ISPMs

Drafting groups should follow these recommendations<sup>21</sup> to ensure consistency across ISPMs:

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

### Recommendations on use of specific terms

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

These terms are not defined in the Glossary, but are taken from the SPS Agreement. They should only be used in that context, and 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 instead of “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, avoid using the expression “the importing NPPO”, and use instead “the NPPO of the importing country”. “Country” should be reference.

#### *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. The definition of “efficacy” includes the notion of being “measurable”. Therefore, “efficacy” should preferably be used alone, without “level of”. In some cases, the term “effectiveness” and its derived form “effective” may be used; for instance, an “effective measure”, “effectiveness of measures”. The generally accepted understanding is that efficacy refers to measurable results under controlled conditions, whereas effectiveness is the degree to which something is successful in producing the desired results.

#### *Inspection*

This is the Glossary term. The definition of “inspection” includes “visual examination”, so the term “inspection” should not be used in conjunction with the word “visual” (as in “visual inspection”).

<sup>21</sup> Previous process approved by the TPG 2010-10 (Annex 13), noted by the SC 2011-05; revised by TPG 2013-02, approved by SC 2013-11 (Appendix 16); recommendations revised by TPG 2014-02, noted by SC 2014-05; revised by TPG 2015-12, noted by SC 2016-05; revised by TPG 2016-12 to be noted by SC 2017-05.

### *Intended use*

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

### *IPPC*

It is recommended that the abbreviation “IPPC” only be used when referring specifically to the Convention itself. When referring to decisions or actions of the Commission or 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 cases referring to correct or incorrect implementation of measures (e.g. regarding requirements prescribed for an entire place of production) it might be more appropriate to use 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 interpreted 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 always be qualified.

In relation to the pests regulated by a country, proper wording would be, for example, “list of regulated pests” or “regulated pest 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.

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

### *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 rearranged 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.

### *Phytosanitary certificate, certificate*

Where “certificate” or “certification” refers to “phytosanitary certificate” or “phytosanitary certification”, the latter 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 this 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 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. In other cases, the concept should be explained in plain words.

*Point of entry*

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

*Prescribed, required, target*

The terms “prescribed”, “required” and “target” have been used in ISPMs to indicate the desired measurement of a temperature, dose or similar. However, “target” indicates that which is aimed for, but which may not be reached. Thus, the word “target” should not be used in ISPMs in this context. “Required” indicates a measurement that is set in the phytosanitary import requirements of a country, and is therefore a suitable adjective to use. “Prescribed” is synonymous with “required”, but “required” is the preferred term in this context.

*Presence, occurrence*

The terms “presence” and “occurrence” have been used in ISPMs in relation to pest status. However, , it is recommended that the term “presence” be used rather than the term “occurrence”<sup>22</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 word “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 previously defined Glossary term has been used in ISPMs, it was used to mean “phytosanitary import requirements”. The term “phytosanitary import requirements” is defined in the Glossary and, as such, is the preferred term<sup>23</sup>.

*Security, phytosanitary security*

Only “phytosanitary security” is defined in the Glossary. The 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 be used, and “shipment” should be avoided.

---

<sup>22</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>23</sup> CPM-10 (2015) adopted the deletion of the Glossary term “restriction” and thus the term can now be used with its general English meaning.



### *Trading partner*

“Trading partner” (or “trade partner”) has been used in ISPMs in different contexts. This term 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.

### *Invasive, invasiveness, invasion*

“Invasive” is a defined term of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) when it refers to certain organisms. It is recommended that this term is not used in ISPMs because more precise terms have been defined for the IPPC (i.e. “pest” and “quarantine pest”, building upon the well-defined processes of “entry”, “establishment” and “spread”. While IPPC and CBD terminology may seem similar, differences are rather important (cf. Appendix 1 to ISPM 5) and confusion could arise from using CBD terminology in ISPMs. The derivatives “invasiveness” and “invasion”, although not defined by CBD, should also be avoided in ISPMs, as the meaning of these words is unclear and appropriate and well-defined IPPC terms exist for use in ISPMs.

### **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 either option or both options can apply at the same time. 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 quoted as written.

#### *“/” and “(s)”*

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 6 – TPG Work Plan 2017-2018***(Prepared by the Secretariat, last updated 2017-02-07)*[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 tentatively for 4-7 December 2017. Deadline for submitting meeting documents is 2 October 2017.****TABLE 1 - REGULAR TASKS**

Regular tasks		Detailed task	Responsible	Deadline	Comments
1. Meeting reports: preparation and update to SC	December 2016	Draft report to Steward, Chairperson and rapporteur	Secretariat	2016-01-06	
		Steward, Chairperson and rapporteur send back draft report	Steward, Chair & rapporteur	2017-01-13	
		Secretariat finalizes report and sends to TPG	Secretariat	2017-01-17	
		TPG review report and send comments	All	2017-01-27	
		Final report	Secretariat	2017-02-03	(To allow review in Secretariat)
	Update for SC May 2017	Prepare update (incl. decisions) from December 2016 meeting for SC May 2017	Secretariat with stewards	2017-03-17	Secretariat to draft; steward to respond by 24/3 tent.
2. Draft ISPMS in 1 <sup>st</sup> consultation (except Amendments, see 3)	Going to SC-7 / 2 <sup>nd</sup> consultation	Terms and consistency comments extracted	Secretariat	2016-10-03	1 <sup>st</sup> consultation closes 30/09
		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 stewards	2016-12-22	Comments from TPG on these will not be solicited, documents will be finalized by Secretariat and Steward (15/02 deadline for stewards to send Sec. responses to comments and revised draft)
		Check accuracy of translation of definitions in draft ISPMS	French, Spanish	2017-01-20	These will be submitted to

Regular tasks	Detailed task	Responsible	Deadline	Comments
	(Revision to ISPM 6) and propose translations for Chinese, Arabic and Russian	Russian, Chinese, Arabic		translation-services when drafts go for translation before CPM
<b>3. Terms and definitions (incl. Amendments to the Glossary)</b>	<b>2016 Amendments</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 1 <sup>st</sup> Consultation		2016-07 to 09	
	Draft Amendments and 1 <sup>st</sup> Cons comments reviewed	ALL	TPG meeting	
	Adjustments to draft Amendments and responses	Secretariat and stewards	2016-12-22	Back to Secretariat by 2017-01-04
	Finalize draft Amendments and responses	ALL	2017-01-20	Draft Amendments and responses to compiled comments to be posted by 1 March for SC-7 / 2 <sup>nd</sup> Cons. Steward to participate for 1 day in SC-7
	Consultation by email on 2 <sup>nd</sup> Cons. (2017-07 to 09) comments	ALL	ASAP after 1 Oct.	If Steward feels consultation is needed. The draft Amendments and responses to 2 <sup>nd</sup> Cons. comments are submitted to SC November
	Check of translations of draft Amendments going for adoption	Members for languages	TBD, in 2018-01	After SC November and when revised/translated into all languages, but before posting for CPM
	<b>2017 Amendments</b> Volunteers sends draft meeting papers to Secretariat	ALL, as allocated in Table 3	2016-10-03	TPG 2016
	Draft 2017 Amendments compiled based on discussions at TPG 2016-12	Secretariat and steward	2016-12-22	Back to Secretariat by 2017-01-04

Regular tasks		Detailed task	Responsible	Deadline	Comments
		TPG members' help to translate new terms proposed for the draft amendments in languages for the List of topics (LOT)	Secretariat N/A	TPG meeting	No terms for TPG 2016-12 as all terms already in the Glossary
		Draft 2017 Amendments finalized	ALL	2017-01-20	
		Amendments processed for SC	Secretariat	2017-02-17	Posting deadline for SC May 2017 is 1 March
		Draft amendments to 1 <sup>st</sup> Consultation		2018-07 to 09	Draft 2017 Amendments will be combined with potential 2018 Amendments and sent for consultation only in 2018
		Draft amendments and 1 <sup>st</sup> Cons. comments reviewed		TPG 2018-12	
		Finalize amendments and responses	Secretariat and <b>steward</b>	2018-12-22	Back to Secretariat by 2019-01-04
		Amendments and responses for TPG comments	ALL	2019-01-20	Draft Amendments and responses to compiled comments to be posted by 1 March for SC-7 / 2 <sup>nd</sup> Cons.
		Draft amendments in 2 <sup>nd</sup> Consultation		2019-07 to 09	
		Consultation by email on 2 <sup>nd</sup> Cons. comments	ALL	TBD, in 2019-10	If Steward feels consultation is needed. The draft Amendments and responses to 2 <sup>nd</sup> Cons. comments are submitted to SC November
		Check of translations of draft Amendments going for adoption (i.e. after SC November and when it has been revised/translated into all languages)	Members for languages	TBD, in 2020-01	The translations will be ready for review around the beginning of January and must be posted by 1 March for CPM.
4. Annotated Glossary – (to be published every 3 years)	2017 (intermediate)	To prepare intermediate update based on TPG comments, outcomes of TPG 2016, CPM 2017, SC May 2017	Beatriz Melcho	After SC 2017-05	
		To review intermediate update	All	After SC 2017-05	
	2018 (intermediate)	To prepare intermediate update based on TPG comments, outcomes of TPG 2017, including updates from SC Nov. 2017, CPM 2018 SC May 2018	Beatriz Melcho	TBD	All to review / provide comments during TPG 2017 meeting

Regular tasks	Detailed task	Responsible	Deadline	Comments
	To review intermediate update	All	After SC 2018-05	
	2019 (for publishing)			To be approved by SC via e-decision asap in 2019.
	To review intermediate update			
5. Explanation of Glossary terms	Members to identify before the meeting some Glossary terms/definitions requiring further explanations (and not already explained in other places, such as the Annotated Glossary)	All	2017-10-02	
6. Review of membership	Annual review of membership to make recommendations to SC on new members needed		TPG meeting	

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

One-off tasks	Detailed task	Responsible	Deadline	Comments
7. Review of ISPMs for consistency and style (other than in draft ISPMs)	Ongoing consistency review	All during TPG meeting		TPG meeting
	Present all ink amendments / proposals for revision made so far	Secretariat	Ongoing	TPG meeting
	Consistency review of "contamination"	TBD	2017-10-02	
8. Other tasks	Review of Glossary brochure (communication material for implementation of ISPM 5)	ALL	TPG 2016-12	
	General recommendations on consistency: yearly updates as needed	Secretariat with stewards	2016-12-22	Back to the Secretariat by 2017-01-13
	General recommendations on consistency	ALL	2017-01-27	Appended to TPG report
	Concept of terminology, draft paper	Ebbe Nordbo	2017-01-09	(Actual date)
	Concept of terminology, finalized paper	ALL	2017-02-09	To be included in SC May 2017 update
	Review of CBD Glossary	ALL	TPG 2017 meeting	TENTATIVE (dependent on SC 2017-05 decision and draft Glossary to be provided)

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

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

Term	Status	Lead	Comments & next steps
1. bulbs and tubers (as a commodity class)	To SC 2017-05 (for addition to LOT)		- TPG 2016-12 invited SC to add all commodity class terms to the LOT to consider whether any should be deleted or revised. This recommendation was prompted by the discussions on "commodity class" in the context of ePhyto.
2. commodity class (2015-013)	To SC 2017-05	Andrei Orliński	- 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. - TPG 2016-12 discussed the term in the context of ePhyto and recommended further studies to determine if "commodity class" and specific commodity class terms should be deleted from ISPM 5.
3. confinement (2016-002)	To SC 2017-05	Ebbe Nordbo	- TPG 2015-12 recommended inclusion on LOT for revision. - SC 2016-05 added to LOT. - TPG 2016-12 recommended for deletion in the draft 2017 Amendments.
4. contaminating pest, contamination (2012-001)	To SC-7 2017	Laurence Bouhot-Delduc	- SC 2012-04 added <i>contaminating pest</i> ; definition to be reviewed to make sure that it covers the concepts normally expressed by a hitch-hiker pest (see report of 2011 TPG meeting). - deletion proposed in Amendments 2013. - SC 2013-05 agreed with proposal. - TPG 2014-02 reviewed member comments. - 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. - SC 2014-05 agreed to withdraw from Amendments (2013) for the TPG to reconsider with <i>contamination</i> . - TPG 2014-12 discussed and proposed revisions to both terms in 2015 Amendments; to SC 2015-05 for approval for member consultation. - SC 2015-05 approved for MC 2016 (MC delayed one year as too few terms).

Term	Status	Lead	Comments & next steps
			- TPG 2016-12 considered consultation comments and adjusted the proposed revisions.
5.	contamination	To SC 2017-05	Beatriz Melcho - TPG 2016-12 proposed a cross-ISPMS review of the use of "contamination" based on a first consultation comment.
6.	cut flowers and branches (as a commodity class) (2012-007)	To SC 2017-05 / Pending EWG Cut flowers	Pending until EWG on International movement of cut flowers and branches (2008-005) - 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 <i>cut flowers and branches</i> . - TPG 2013 proposal submitted to SC May 2013 in Amendments (2013). - SC 2013-05 postponed the consideration of the revised definition of <i>cut flowers and branches</i> (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 whether the ISPM should be restricted to fresh material. - 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. - 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. - TPG 2016-12 invited SC to add all commodity class terms to the LOT to consider whether any should be deleted or revised. This recommendation was prompted by the discussions on "commodity class" in the context of ePhyto.
7.	detention	To SC 2017-05	- TPG 2016-12 proposed an ink amendment for consistency (when discussing "confinement") to delete "(see quarantine)" as this is not consistent with other Glossary terms. Cross references are made by indicating Glossary terms in bold.
8.	ecosystems (2016-003)	To SC 2017-05	John Hedley - TPG 2015-12 recommended inclusion to LOT to discuss if to delete term from Glossary. - SC 2016-05 included on LOT. - TPG 2016-12 recommended to be taken off LOT as agreed that the term is relevant and should stay in the Glossary.



Term	Status	Lead	Comments & next steps
9. endangered area (2014-009)	To SC-7 2017	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> <li>- TPG 2016-12 recommended to withdraw the term from the draft 2016 Amendments as the term is defined in IPPC and this definition is not incorrect. Note 1 in the Explanatory document on ISPM 5 would be adjusted.</li> </ul>
10. exclusion (2010-008)	To SC-7 2017	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> <li>- SC 2016-05 agreed to the inclusion and approved for MC.</li> <li>- TPG 2016-12 reviewed consultation comments and adjusted the proposed definition.</li> </ul>
11. fruits and vegetables (as a commodity class)	To SC 2017-05 (for addition to LOT)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- TPG 2016-12 invited SC to add all commodity class terms to the LOT to consider whether any should be deleted or revised. This recommendation was prompted by the discussions on "commodity class" in the context of ePhyto.</li> </ul>
12. grain (as a commodity class)	To SC 2017-05 (for addition to LOT)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- TPG 2016-12 invited SC to add all commodity class terms to the LOT to consider whether any should be deleted or revised. This recommendation was prompted by the discussions on "commodity class" in the context of ePhyto.</li> </ul>
13. growing period / growing season (2016-004)	To SC 2017-05	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> <li>- SC 2016-05 added to LOT.</li> <li>- TPG 2016-12 discussed the terms and recommended the revision of "growing period" and the deletion of "growing season" in the draft 2017 Amendments.</li> </ul>
14. habitat (2016-005)	To SC 2017-05	John Hedley	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- TPG 2015-12 recommended inclusion to LOT to discuss if to delete term from Glossary.</li> <li>- SC 2016-05 added to LOT.</li> <li>- TPG 2016-12 recommended to be taken off LOT as agreed that the term is relevant and should stay in the Glossary.</li> </ul>

Term	Status	Lead	Comments & next steps
15. identity (2011-001)	Pending Focused revision of ISPM 12	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, integrity (of a consignment), 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, focused revision of ISPM 12 will be prepared. (Consider if apply "phytosanitary status" revisions as well).</li> <li>- Secretariat suggesting to wait with further work pending revision of ISPM 12 (SC not made pending).</li> </ul>
16. inspection	To SC 2017-05 (for possible addition to the LOT)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- TPG 2016 invited the SC to consider if inspection should be revised to adequately reflect current inspection practices that may also include examination methods other than visual and if so add this term to the LOT.</li> </ul>
17. integrity (of a consignment) consequential	Pending Focused revision of ISPM 12 (consequential)	Ebbe Nordbo (see identity)	<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 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 the LOT to be approved by CPM-11 (2016). If approved, focused revision of ISPM 12 will be prepared.</li> </ul>
18. kiln-drying (2013-006)	To SC-7 2017	Andrei Orłinski Secretariat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- TPG 2012-10, SC 2013-05 added.</li> <li>- TPG 2014 discussed and added to incorporate to Amendments (2014).</li> <li>- SC 2014-05 withdrew the proposal from the Amendments (2014) and asked TPG to rediscuss.</li> <li>- TPG 2014-12 discussed and agreed to propose for deletion from Glossary (in Amendments 2015).</li> </ul>

Term	Status	Lead	Comments & next steps
			<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> <li>- TPG 2016-12 noted there were no consultation comments on the deletion of this term.</li> </ul>
19. mark (2013-007)	To SC 2017-05	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> <li>- TPG 2016-12 recommended the deletion of "mark" from the Glossary.</li> </ul>
20. modern biotechnology (2016-006)	To SC 2017-05		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- TPG 2015-12 recommended inclusion to LOT to discuss if to delete term from Glossary.</li> <li>- SC 2016-05 added to LOT.</li> <li>- TPG 2016-12 recommended to be taken off LOT as agreed that the term is relevant and should stay in the Glossary.</li> </ul>
21. phytosanitary security (of a consignment) (2013-008)	Pending Focused revision of ISPM 12	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> <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, a focused revision of ISPM 12 will be prepared.</li> </ul>
22. plants <i>in vitro</i> (as a commodity class)	To SC 2017-05 (for addition to LOT)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- TPG 2016-12 invited SC to add all commodity class terms to the LOT to consider whether any should be deleted or revised. This recommendation was prompted by the discussions on "commodity class" in the context of ePhyto.</li> </ul>
23. practically free	To CPM-12 (2017)	Secretariat/ Consequential change or ink	<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> </ul>

Term	Status	Lead	Comments & next steps
		amendment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- TPG 2015-12 recommended this ink amendment for approval by SC.</li> <li>- SC 2016-05 agreed with proposed ink amendments.</li> </ul>
24. pre-clearance (2013-016)	To SC-7 2017	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 in the draft 2016 amendments as term cannot be revised (concept unclear) and as it is currently not correct. TPG 2015-12 agreed that if the term is deleted from the Glossary, a note should be added to the General recommendations for consistency. See report for suggestion.</li> <li>- SC agreed with proposed deletion and approved for 1<sup>st</sup> Cons.</li> <li>- TPG 2016-12 reviewed consultation comments and reconfirmed that it was not possible to propose a revised definition and retained the proposal for deletion from the Glossary.</li> </ul>
25. quarantine (2015-002)	To SC-7 2017	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> <li>- SC agreed with proposed revision (after extensive discussion) and approved for 1<sup>st</sup> Cons.</li> <li>- TPG 2016-12 reviewed consultation comments and adjusted the proposed revision of the definition.</li> </ul>
26. quarantine area (2012-006)	Pending revision of ISPM 8		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- TPG 2011.</li> <li>- SC 2012-04 added.</li> <li>- To be considered based on a draft revised definition proposed by the TPG.</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>
27. quarantine facility	To CPM-12 (2017)	Secretariat/ 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> <li>- SC 2016-05 approved the ink amendments.</li> </ul>
28. seeds (as a commodity class)	To SC 2017-05 (for addition to LOT)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- TPG 2016-12 invited SC to add all commodity class terms to the LOT to consider whether any should be deleted or revised. This recommendation was prompted by the discussions on "commodity class" in the context of ePhyto.</li> </ul>
29. survey (2013-015)	To SC 2017-05	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> </ul>

Term	Status	Lead	Comments & next steps
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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> <li>- SC 2016-05 approved draft revision to ISPM 6 for 1<sup>st</sup> Cons. but term still pending.</li> <li>- TPG 2016-05 reviewed the definition in connection with the review of terms and consistency in the draft ISPM, to ensure a holistic view on the terminology. The TPG proposed in the draft 2017 Amendments a revision to the term which was in accordance with the draft ISPM, the use of the term in other ISPMs and the three types of surveys defined in the Glossary.</li> </ul>
30. test (2015-003)	To SC-7 2017	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> <li>- TPG 2016-12 reviewed consultation comments and adjusted the proposed revision of the definition.</li> </ul>
31. trading partner (2013-009)	To CPM-12 (2017)	Secretariat/ Consequential change or ink amendment	<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> <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> <li>- SC 2016-05 approved the ink amendments.</li> </ul>
32. treatment	To SC 2017-05 (for addition to the LOT)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- TPG 2016-12 invited SC to add the term to the LOT for possible revision to make the term usable in a non-official sense.</li> </ul>
33. visual examination (2013-010)	To SC-7 2017	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> </ul>

Term	Status	Lead	Comments & next steps
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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> <li>- SC 2016-05 approved for first consultation.</li> <li>- TPG 2016-12 reviewed consultation comments and adjusted the proposed revision of the definition. The TPG had considerable discussion on whether to propose the term be withdrawn from the Amendments and reconsidered together with "inspection". TPG agreed that the revision is still correct and that the SC may consider the issue.</li> </ul>
34. wood (as a commodity class)	To SC 2017-05 (for addition to LOT)		- TPG 2016-12 invited SC to add all commodity class terms to the LOT to consider whether any should be deleted or revised. This recommendation was prompted by the discussions on "commodity class" in the context of ePhyto.
Related to consistency			
35. Review of the use of and/or in adopted ISPMs (2010-030)	Ongoing	Stays on the work programme to be implemented during the consistency review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- TPG discussion 2009.</li> <li>- Modified SC November 2010.</li> <li>- Consistent with general recommendations on consistency, but require a review of every occurrence. Will be considered during consistency study.</li> </ul>
36. Use of "contracting party" and "country" in ISPM 5	To SC 2017-05 in update	Andrei Orlinski	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- When TPG 2015-12 reviewed "trading partner", it noted that "contracting party", "country" etc. was used inconsistently.</li> <li>- TPG 2016-12 reviewed the use of the terms in standards and noted that there were some inconsistencies but that they did not warrant ink amendments.</li> </ul>
37. "contamination"	To SC 2017-05 for addition to LOT		TPG 2017-05 agreed, based on a consultation comment from first consultation 2016, that it would be valuable to review the use of "contamination" across standards.

**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
2017-01-20	2. ISPMs from 1 <sup>st</sup> cons.	Language leads	Check accuracy of translations of in Fr and Es and propose translations in Ar, Ru and Zih in revision to ISPM 6 (via email to Secretariat)

Deadline	Activity in tables	Resp.	Task
2017-01-20	3. Terms and defs	ALL	Review draft 2016 Amendments following TPG 2016-12 meeting and provide comments in track changes
2017-01-20	3. Terms and defs	ALL	Review draft 2017 Amendments following TPG 2016-12 meeting and provide comments in track changes
2017-01-27	1. Meeting reports	ALL	Review report of TPG 2016-12 meeting and provide comments in track changes
2017-01-27	8. Other tasks	ALL	Review general recommendations on consistency for inclusion in the 2017 version of the IPPC Style guide
2017-02-09	8. Other tasks	ALL	Provide comments on finalized "concept of terminology" paper (for presentation to SC 2017-05)
2017-05-31	4. Ann. Gloss.	ALL	Comment on intermediate version of Annotated Glossary
2017-10-02	5. Explanation of glossary terms	ALL	Identify terms that need explanation (and which are not explained elsewhere) and provide a paper for TPG 2017 meeting.
2017-10-02	8. Other tasks	Ebbe Nordbo / John Hedley	Provide draft notes for the general recommendations on consistency on "contamination", "dispersal, spread, dissemination" "exotic, non-indigenous, non-naturally present" and "hazard"
2017-10-02	3. Terms and defs	TBD	Paper on "bulbs and tubers (as a commodity class)"
2017-10-02	3. Terms and defs	TBD	Paper on "commodity class"
2017-10-02	3. Terms and defs	TBD	Paper on "cut flowers and branches (as a commodity class)"
2017-10-02	3. Terms and defs	TBD	Paper on "fruits and vegetables (as a commodity class)"
2017-10-02	3. Terms and defs	TBD	Paper on "grain (as a commodity class)"
2017-10-02	3. Terms and defs	TBD	Paper on "plants <i>in vitro</i> (as a commodity class)"
2017-10-02	3. Terms and defs	TBD	Paper on "seeds (as a commodity class)"
2017-10-02	3. Terms and defs	TBD	Paper on "wood (as a commodity class)"
2017-10-02	3. Terms and	TBD	treatment

Deadline	Activity in tables	Resp.	Task
	defs		
2017-10-02	7. Review of ISPMs	Beatriz Melcho	Analysis on the use of "contamination" across standards
<b>2017-12 4 to 7</b>			TPG Meeting
2018-01-10	3. Terms and defs	Language leads	Check of translations of draft 2016 Amendments going for adoption