



## UPDATE ON ACTIVITIES OF THE TECHNICAL PANEL FOR THE GLOSSARY FROM MAY 2017 TO APRIL 2018

*(Prepared by the IPPC Secretariat with input from the TPG Steward)*

### 1. BACKGROUND

#### 1.1 Stewards

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

- Ms Laurence BOUHOT-DELDUC (Steward)

- Mr Ebbe NORDBO (Assistant steward)

#### 1.2 IPPC Secretariat support

[2] Ms Céline GERMAIN was the IPPC Secretariat lead for the Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG) from May 2017 up to March 2018, with Ms Eva MOLLER as support until December 2017.

[3] The current IPPC Secretariat lead for the TPG is Ms Sandra GORITSCHNIG.

#### Membership of the TPG as of April 2018:

Name	Language	End of term
Ms Stephanie BLOEM (NAPPO)	English	2018
Ms Laurence BOUHOT-DELDUC (Steward) (France)	French	2018
Ms Beatriz MELCHO (Uruguay)	Spanish	2020 (1 <sup>st</sup> term: 2010-2015)
Ms Hong NING (China)	Chinese	2022
Mr Ebbe NORDBO (Assistant steward) (Denmark)	English	2019 (1 <sup>st</sup> term: 2009-2014)
Ms Shaza Roshdy OMAR (Egypt)	Arabic	2022 (1 <sup>st</sup> term: 2012-2017)
Mr Andrei ORLINSKI (EPPO)	Russian	2020 (1 <sup>st</sup> term: 2010-2015)
Ms Asenath Abigael KOECH (Kenya)	English	2022

[4] It is noted that the terms of Ms Laurence BOUHOT-DELDUC (France) and Ms Stephanie BLOEM (USA) are ending in 2018. Ms Laurence BOUHOT-DELDUC confirmed her employer's support and her willingness to be considered for an additional term. However, Ms Stephanie BLOEM informed the IPPC Secretariat that she will not be seeking a second term as TPG member after her term expires at the end of 2018. The IPPC Secretariat will open a call for a new TPG member for English, as soon as possible, in order to ensure some overlap if possible.

[5] →Corresponding recommendation: (1).

#### 1.3 Volume of work for the TPG from May 2017 to April 2018

[6] Currently the TPG has 27 terms on their work programme, 25 of these terms are on the *List of topics for IPPC standards* and the remainder are terms that the TPG works on as a consequence of the TPG review of ISPMs for consistency.

- [7] The Technical Panel for the Glossary met in Rome, Italy, on 4-7 December 2017. The report from the meeting is available on the IPP<sup>1</sup>.
- [8] In 2017, the TPG worked on **16 terms** on the *List of topics for IPPC standards*:
- **5** terms are presented to the SC-7 May 2018 as part of the draft 2017 *Amendments to the Glossary*;
  - **10** terms are presented to the SC May 2018 meeting for approval for first consultation as part of the draft 2018 *Amendments to the Glossary*;
  - The use of **1** term (“contamination”) was reviewed for consistency across standards.
- [9] The issues discussed are summarized below and references given to the relevant sections in the TPG report. All recommendations for SC decisions are at the end of the document, and links to relevant proposed decisions are given under each section.

## **2. REVIEW OF DRAFT ISPMs SENT FOR FIRST CONSULTATION IN 2017 (1 JULY – 30 SEPTEMBER 2017)**

### **2.1 Draft 2017 Amendments to the Glossary (1994-001)**

- [10] The TPG reviewed comments from the 2017 first consultation on the draft 2017 *Amendments to the Glossary*, approved for consultation by the SC in May 2017. The TPG responded to all comments and modified where appropriate the draft Amendments that will be presented to the SC-7 2018 (see section 5.1 of the TPG 2017-12 report). Comments on translations of terms and definitions were also reviewed and suggestions will be forwarded to Translation-services when the draft Amendments are submitted for translation before adoption.

### **2.2 Other draft ISPMs from the 2017 first consultation**

- [11] The draft ISPM on *International movement of cut flowers and foliage* (2008-005) was withdrawn from the TPG agenda as, in their November 2017 meeting, the SC had agreed to not forward this draft ISPM to the SC-7 in May 2018 and to postpone further discussion of the draft ISPM until after guidance had been provided by CPM-13 (2018).
- [12] The TPG reviewed comments on terms and consistency submitted on the draft ISPM on *Requirements for the use of fumigation as a phytosanitary measure* (2014-004) during the 2017 first consultation. The TPG provided recommendations, which were submitted to the steward of the ISPM.
- [13] Details on the main issues discussed by the TPG are reported in section 5.3 of the TPG 2017-12 report.
- [14] The TPG specifically considered consistency issues between this draft ISPM and the draft ISPM on *Requirements for the use of temperature treatments as phytosanitary measures* (2014-005), which was recommended by the November 2017 SC to the CPM for adoption. However, they felt that, where possible, it was better to try to improve the clarity of the draft ISPM on *Requirements for the use of fumigation as a phytosanitary measure* (2014-004) and ensure a correct use of terms. They felt that a complete consistency with the draft ISPM on *Requirements for the use of temperature treatments as phytosanitary measures* (2014-005) was not vital in cases where the latter draft was felt inappropriate or inconsistent with many other ISPMs.
- [15] The TPG also discussed and supported consultation comments stating that the Outline of requirements should (as the title implies) rather be a summary of the main requirements of the standard, than take the form of an extended scope. The TPG noted that the Outline of requirements of this draft ISPM and the draft ISPM on *Requirements for the use of temperature treatments as phytosanitary measure* (2014-005) had been made an elaborate contents list, inconsistent with how Outlines of requirements were previously written. They noted that the Outline of requirements should summarize the main requirements as spelled out in the core text of the standard, and obviously not add any other requirement.

<sup>1</sup> 2017-12 TPG meeting Report: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/85572/>

The TPG suggested that the SC examines further how Outline of requirements are written in current draft standards, as compared to earlier practice.

[16] →Corresponding recommendation: (2).

### 3. INDIVIDUAL TERMS AND DEFINITIONS AND AMENDMENTS TO THE GLOSSARY

#### 3.1 Consideration of terms in the *List of topics for IPPC standards*

[17] The TPG discussed terms on the *List of topics for IPPC standards* based on proposals prepared by its members. The outcome of the discussions is summarized below and details are given in section 6 of the TPG 2017-12 report.

[18] The TPG discussed the term “commodity class” (2015-003) and the other Glossary terms defining different commodity classes (see section 6.1 of the TPG 2017-12 report). They confirmed their previous findings regarding the Glossary term “commodity class”: since grouping commodities into higher levels and defining this hierarchy in the Glossary has proven not helpful, this term is not useful and has created confusion, particularly during the development of commodity standards. When discussing the Glossary terms defining different commodity classes, they also acknowledged that those definitions often created confusion and did not provide clarity and support for the drafting of commodity standards. The TPG decided to recommend that the term “commodity class” be deleted from the Glossary, and noted that not having it defined in ISPM 5 would not prevent countries from considering similar commodities together in phytosanitary regulations, whenever technically justified. The TPG reviewed the other commodity class terms and is proposing in the draft 2018 *Amendments to the Glossary* (1994-001) presented for consideration under agenda item 5.4 of the SC May 2018 agenda:

- the deletion from the Glossary of “commodity class” (2015-013), “fruits and vegetables (as a commodity class)” (2017-003), “cut flowers (as a commodity class)” (2012-007), “bulbs and tubers (as a commodity class)” (2017-001) and “plants in vitro (as a commodity class)” (2017-006),
- the revision of “wood (as a commodity class)” (2017-009), “grain (as a commodity class)” (2017-004) and “seeds (as a commodity class)” (2017-007).

[19] The TPG reviewed the use of “commodity class” in the IPPC and ISPMs and noted that “commodity class” is used as a qualifier in several Glossary terms and is used in several adopted ISPMs. They felt that ink amendments to adopted ISPMs removing “commodity class” could be easily applied without affecting the meaning of those standards, for instance by deleting “commodity class” or replacing it with “commodity”.

[20] →Corresponding recommendation: (3).

[21] In addition, the TPG proposed the revision of the terms “inspection” (2017-005) and “treatment” (2017-008) in the draft 2018 *Amendments to the Glossary* (1994-001) presented for consideration under agenda item 5.4 of the SC May 2018 agenda (for detailed discussions, refer to sections 6.2 and 6.3 of the TPG 2017-12 report).

[22] For details on the status of terms, refer to the TPG work plan 2018-2019 (Appendix 6 of the TPG 2017-12 report).

#### 3.2 Proposed addition to the *List of topics for IPPC standards*

[23] When discussing the term “commodity class” (2015-003) and the other commodity class terms (see section 6.1 of the TPG 2017-12 report), the TPG briefly discussed the Glossary term “commodity” and the usefulness of its definition and felt they should consider it further. Thus, they proposed its addition to the *List of topics for IPPC standards*.

[24] →Corresponding recommendation: (4).

## 4. CONSISTENCY IN THE USE OF TERMS

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

[25] The TPG modified the *General recommendations on use of terms in ISPMs* (see section 7.1 and Appendix 4 of the 2017-12 TPG report) by:

- adding notes on “Dispersal, dissemination and spread”, “Hazard” and “(Non-)indigenous, (non-)native, exotic, endemic and alien”;
- modifying the notes on “Accredit, authorize and certify”, “Appropriate level of protection, acceptable level of risk”, “(Non-)compliance, (non-)conformity”, “Contamination, contaminating pest and contaminant”, “Country, contracting party, national plant protection organization (NPPO)” and “Phytosanitary measures, phytosanitary actions”.

[26] The guidance on the *General recommendations on consistency* is provided in the IPPC Procedure Manual for Standard Setting<sup>2</sup>, and the full list of terms is available in the IPPC Style guide<sup>3</sup>.

[27] →Corresponding recommendation: (5).

### 4.2 Consistency across standards: consistency review of the use of “contamination” across ISPMs (2017-002)

[28] In May 2017, the SC added “contamination” (consistency review of its use in ISPMs) (2017-002) to the *List of topics for IPPC Standards* because there may be some cases in adopted standards (e.g. ISPM 18 (*Guidelines for the use of irradiation as a phytosanitary measure*)) where “contamination” is used with a different meaning than its Glossary meaning.

[29] In December 2017, the TPG reviewed the use of “contamination” and its derivatives in ISPMs (see section 7.3 and Appendix 5 of 2017-12 TPG report for details). They agreed to propose ink amendments for consideration by the SC in order to ensure a consistent use of “contamination” and its derivatives in adopted ISPMs as follows:

- Ink amendments to ISPM 11 (section 1.1), ISPM 18 (annex 2), ISPM 21 (section 3.3.1), ISPM 33 (section 3.1) and ISPM 36 (Appendix 1) to avoid the use of “contamination” or one of its derivatives where the intended meaning does not correspond to the Glossary definition of “contamination”: see document 05\_SC\_2018\_May, table 1.
- An ink amendment to section 1.2.2 of ISPM 2 to use “contaminants” instead of “contamination” because “contamination” was used in relation to biological control agents and other beneficial organisms and not according its Glossary definition: see document 05\_SC\_2018\_May, table 2. “Contaminants” is a word commonly used in this context and well understood; using “contaminants” in this instance is also in line with the note on “contaminant” in the *General recommendation on use of terms in ISPMs*.
- Ink amendments to adopted ISPMs (ISPM 2, ISPM 11, ISPM 14, ISPM 20, ISPM 23, ISPM 33 and ISPM 41) where “contaminant” is used but the Glossary terms “contamination” or “contaminating pest” should be used instead: see document 05\_SC\_2018\_May, table 3.

[30] →Corresponding recommendation: (6).

[31] The SC is also reminded that a list of all proposed or approved ink amendments is posted on the IPP<sup>4</sup>.

<sup>2</sup> IPPC Procedure Manual for Standard Setting: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/1086/>

<sup>3</sup> IPPC Style guide: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/132/>

<sup>4</sup> List of all proposed or approved ink amendments: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/82115/>

## 5. ISSUES RELATED TO THE ORGANIZATION AND CONTENT OF TPG WORK

### 5.1 Annotated Glossary

[32] The version 4 of the explanatory document on ISPM 5, the “Annotated Glossary”, was finalized at the 2015-12 TPG meeting and published in March 2016<sup>5</sup>. The publication of the next version of the Annotated Glossary is expected for 2019. Meanwhile, the TPG reviews yearly intermediate versions of the “Annotated Glossary”; these versions take account of any relevant decisions taken by the TPG, SC and CPM. The TPG lead for the Annotated Glossary prepared the 2017 intermediate version, which was further reviewed during the 2017-12 TPG meeting. She will prepare a 2018 intermediate version based on the outcomes of the 2017-12 TPG meeting, the November 2017 SC, the April 2018 CPM and the May 2018 SC (to be shared with the TPG after the May 2018 SC).

### 5.2 TPG work plan

[33] The TPG updated its work plan for 2018-2019 (section 10 and Appendix 6 of the 2017-12 TPG report). This document provides a clear overview of TPG tasks and related deadlines, as well as the status and history of the terms the TPG is working on.

[34] During the 2017-12 TPG meeting, the Secretariat informed the TPG that, due to the cancellation of a project post in the Standard Setting Unit to support the work of the TPG and the scheduled departure of some staff, a meeting of the TPG would not be planned for 2018 unless the appropriately skilled staff could be recruited early in 2018. However, tentative dates for the 2018 TPG meeting (week of 3-7 December 2018) were identified, in case the needed staff resources could be recruited.

[35] The Secretariat highlighted the main consequences of the cancellation of the 2018 meeting, if confirmed, in terms of TPG work plan:

- Consultation comments on 2018 draft *Amendments to ISPM 5*, if approved by the SC for first consultation, would only be reviewed by the TPG in 2019.
- Consultation comments on consistency in use of terms and definitions in other draft ISPMs submitted to the first consultation in 2018 would not be reviewed by the TPG.
- The TPG discussions of terms and definitions on the work programme, to be submitted to the SC, would have to be deferred to 2019.
- The publication of the new version of the Annotated Glossary might have to be deferred to 2020.

[36] 2017 draft Amendments, if submitted to the 2018 second consultation, will not be affected by the cancellation of the meeting and will be finalized by the Steward before the November 2018 SC meeting.

[37] TPG members expressed serious concerns regarding the cancellation of the 2018 TPG meeting, which would jeopardize the continuity of their work as most of their tasks cannot be carried out virtually. They highlighted that the importance of having a harmonized terminology is recognized by contracting parties and that a break in the continuity of TPG meetings could have consequences on the availability of some of the TPG members for the following years. They also recognized that experienced skilled Secretariat staff was needed to support the TPG given the complexities of their work and they agreed to try to help seeking solutions to the staffing issue. Given that the SC at its November 2017 meeting had already expressed concerns to the proposed cancellation of the 2018 TPG meeting, TPG members decided to submit a note stating their concerns to CPM Bureau members before the December 2017 Bureau meeting, and to explore the possibility of having those concerns highlighted at CPM-13 (2018) through several contracting parties. The TPG agreed that the SC should also be made aware of those concerns of TPG members.

---

<sup>5</sup> Explanatory document on ISPM 5, the “Annotated Glossary”: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/42/>



[38] Fortunately a Consultant joined the Standard Setting Unit in January 2018 and on 21 March 2018 the TPG members were informed that the IPPC Secretariat was committed to organizing a TPG meeting in December 2018.

[39] →Corresponding recommendation: (7)

### 5.3 Future joint call for topics “Standards and Implementation” and proposals for terms to be worked on

[40] The TPG discussed whether proposals for addition, revision or deletion of Glossary terms could be submitted during the joint calls for topics for standards and tools for implementation (see section 4.2 of the 2017-12 TPG report). The TPG agreed that, since the SC and expert drafting groups can make proposals for terms to be worked on, contracting parties should also be allowed to do so.

[41] In addition, the TPG discussed the possibility of working on terms that are not used in ISPMs, but used e.g. in IPPC manuals. While they recognized the usefulness of a common understanding of the terms used in IPPC manuals, they cautioned on the addition of a wide range of new terms in the Glossary because of the complexities of terminology work and the resources involved at all stages in developing and adopting terms and definitions.

[42] The TPG eventually agreed that proposals for terms used in IPPC manuals to be defined in the Glossary could be made during the joint call, provided that the SC continues to exclusively decide on the addition of terms to the TPG work programme and the review of draft amendments to ISPM 5. They emphasized that submissions for new terms to be added to the Glossary should be accompanied by a clear explanation of the concept to be defined and a solid justification for including the term in the Glossary thus seeking harmonization of the definition. At the same time, authors of manuals and other phytosanitary resources are encouraged to use Glossary terms whenever appropriate.

[43] →Corresponding recommendation: (8).

### 5.4 CBD Cartagena protocol terms and ISPM 5

[44] In 2017, the TPG reviewed by e-decision (TPG\_2017-08\_e-decision\_01) the entries associated with the IPPC in the draft compilation of terms used in the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, the Glossary of Phytosanitary Terms, and other Relevant Instruments, which was initiated by the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD). The IPPC Secretariat had sent the outcome of the TPG review to the CBD Secretariat.

### 5.5. Concept of “Regulated non-quarantine pest”

[45] The TPG discussed the Glossary definition “Regulated non-quarantine pest” in the December 2017 meeting (see section 9 of 2017-12 TPG report). Several TPG members highlighted that the concept of regulated non-quarantine pests is still not clear for many NPPOs and they wondered why the explanatory document on ISPM 16 (*Regulated non-quarantine pests: concept and application*) which was drafted several years ago was not finalized. They felt that this explanatory document would help clarify the concept. The Secretariat explained that the latest version of the draft explanatory document on ISPM 16 found in the archived folders was dated 2010 and that any endorsement of that version by the SC could not be retrieved. She added that she was unsure why it was not finalized, but assumed the reason was a lack of resources in the Secretariat to process explanatory documents, which is still the case.

[46] The TPG agreed that it would be useful to have the explanatory document on ISPM 16 finalized and felt it might not require much additional work. They recognized that this might not be strictly considered as part of the TPG tasks described in the Specification TP 5; however, because it relates to clarifying the concept covered by a Glossary term, they proposed to take on this work provided the SC agrees. They noted that, once the explanatory document is finalized, a link to it could be added in the Annotated Glossary to clarify the concept covered by the term “regulated non-quarantine pest”.

[47] →Corresponding recommendation: (9).

## 6. TPG RECOMMENDATIONS FOR SC DECISIONS

[48] The SC is invited to:

- (1) *agree* that Ms Laurence BOUHOT-DELDUC (France) be renewed as TPG member for French for another five-year term, starting in January 2019.
- (2) *examine* further how the section on “Outline of requirements” are written in current draft standards, taking into account the above discussion in section 2.2.
- (3) *agree* that the TPG propose ink amendments to adopted ISPMs to avoid the use of the term “commodity class”.
- (4) add the term “commodity” to the List of topics for IPPC standards.
- (5) *note* the *General recommendations on use of terms in ISPMs* as presented in Appendix 4 of the 2017-12 TPG report.
- (6) *review* and *approve* the ink amendments proposed by the TPG to ensure a consistent use of “contamination” and its derivatives in adopted ISPMs, as presented in tables 1, 2 and 3 of document 05\_SC\_2018\_May.
- (7) *note* the TPG work plan 2018-2019 (as presented in Appendix 6 of the 2017-12 TPG report) and the work performed by the TPG over the last year.
- (8) *invited* the SC to consider the possibility of allowing submissions, during the call for topics “Standards and Implementation”, of terms to be worked on by the TPG at the exclusive decision of the SC, including terms that are not used in ISPMs (e.g. terms used in IPPC manuals), taking into account the above discussion (see section 5.3).
- (9) *agree* that the TPG review and finalize the draft explanatory document on ISPM 16 (*Regulated non-quarantine pests: concept and application*).