



REPORT

Technical Panel for the Glossary

Rome, Italy
18–20 November 2019

IPPC Secretariat

FAO. 2019. *Report of the Meeting of the Technical Panel on the Glossary, 18–20 November 2019*. Rome. Published by FAO on behalf of the Secretariat of the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC). 49 pages. Licence: CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO.

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

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

© FAO, 2019



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

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

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

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

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

CONTENTS

1.	Opening of the Meeting	5
1.1	Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat	5
2.	Meeting Arrangements	5
2.1	Selection of the Chairperson	5
2.2	Selection of the Rapporteur	5
2.3	Adoption of the agenda	5
2.4	Current specification: TP 5 (TPG, 2016 – for information)	5
3.	Administrative Matters	5
4.	Reports	5
4.1	Previous meeting report of the TPG (December 2018)	5
4.2	Extracts from other meeting reports of relevance to the TPG	6
4.3	Strategic discussion on the TPG work	8
5.	Review Relating to Draft ISPMs Sent for First Consultation in 2019 (1 July–30 September)	11
6.	Subjects on the TPG Work Programme	11
6.1	“inspection” (2017-005)	11
6.2	“incidence” (2018-010)	13
6.3	“emergency action” (2018-044)	14
6.4	“clearance (of a consignment)” (2018-045)	16
6.5	“general surveillance” (2018-046) and “specific surveillance” (2018-047)	16
6.6	Preview EWG on <i>focused revision of ISPM 12 (Phytosanitary certificates) in relation to re-export</i> (2015-011) and related subjects: “ <i>identity</i> ” (2011-001), “ <i>integrity (of a consignment)</i> ” (consequential), “ <i>phytosanitary security (of a consignment)</i> ” (2013-008)	19
7.	Review of ISPMs for Consistency of Terms and Style	21
7.1	General recommendations on consistency	21
7.2	Consistency of adopted ISPMs	21
8.	Annotated Glossary: 2019 Intermediate Version	21
9.	Explanation of Glossary Terms	22
9.1	Draft explanatory document on ISPM 16 (<i>Regulated non-quarantine pests: concept and application</i>)	24
10.	TPG Work Plan	24
10.1	TPG work plan for 2020–2021	24
11.	Any Other Business	24
12.	Date and Venue of the Next Meeting	25
13.	Close of the Meeting	25
	Appendix 1: Agenda	26
	Appendix 2: Documents List	29
	Appendix 3: Participants List	31
	Appendix 4: Proposed Amendments to ISPMs (for noting by the Standards Committee and archiving by the Secretariat for future revision of these ISPMs)	33

Appendix 5: TPG Work Plan 2020-2021 35

1. Opening of the Meeting

1.1 Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat

- [1] The IPPC Standard Setting Unit (SSU) lead welcomed the participants to the annual meeting of the Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG) and wished them a fruitful meeting. He extended a particular welcome to the TPG member for the English language, Mr Rajesh RAMARATHNAM (Canada), whose term on the TPG had started in January 2019. The SSU lead emphasized the importance of the work of the TPG in helping contracting parties to understand IPPC standards and encouraged the TPG members to promote IPPC standards and standard setting during the International Year of Plant Health in 2020. He finished by introducing the member of the IPPC Secretariat (hereafter referred to as the “Secretariat”) who had recently taken over the role of the Secretariat lead for the TPG.
- [2] The Secretariat informed TPG members that there would be an opportunity during the Tuesday morning coffee break to informally meet with representatives from the translation service of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), to discuss issues with translation of phytosanitary terms.

2. Meeting Arrangements

2.1 Selection of the Chairperson

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

2.2 Selection of the Rapporteur

- [4] The TPG selected Mr Ebbe NORDBO (Denmark) as Rapporteur.

2.3 Adoption of the agenda

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

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

- [6] The Secretariat presented the current specification for the TPG (TP 5)¹, which summarizes the tasks of the TPG, and explained that it had not changed since the last TPG meeting.

3. Administrative Matters

- [7] The Secretariat clarified local arrangements and introduced the documents list (Appendix 2) and the participants list (Appendix 3), inviting TPG members to verify their contact details. The Secretariat also informed the TPG that the document on inspection² had been submitted before the meeting, a table had been added to the document on clearance³, and some amendments had been made to the document on language review of ink amendments⁴.

4. Reports

4.1 Previous meeting report of the TPG (December 2018)

- [8] There were no comments on the report of the December 2018 meeting of the TPG⁵.

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

² 13_TPG_2019_Nov

³ 07_TPG_2019_Nov

⁴ 12_TPG_2019_Nov

⁵ TPG meeting reports: <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/standards-setting/expert-drafting-groups/technical-panels/technical-panel-glossary-phytosanitary-terms-ispm-5/>

4.2 Extracts from other meeting reports of relevance to the TPG

[9] The Secretariat presented extracts of meetings held since the last TPG meeting⁶ – the Fourteenth Session of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM-14) (2019), the May 2019 meeting of the Standards Committee (SC), the May 2019 meeting of the SC Working Group (SC-7), the June 2019 meeting of the CPM Bureau, the October 2019 meeting of the Strategic Planning Group (SPG) and the October 2019 meeting of the CPM Bureau – and drew attention to the following highlights:

- The IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030 had been endorsed by CPM-14 (2019) in advance of its prospective formal adoption by CPM in the ministerial segment of CPM-15 (2020). CPM-14 (2019) had also agreed that emerging pests would be a standing item on the agenda of CPM meetings, adopted ISPM 43 and the 2017 amendments to ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*), noted the diagnostic protocols adopted by the SC and noted the five ISPMs that had been reviewed by the Language Review Groups (LRGs) and FAO translation services. In addition, CPM-14 (2019) had noted the ink amendments to the use of “contamination” and that ink amendments will be translated into FAO official languages and implemented in the language versions of the relevant standards as resources permit. A financial contribution from France of EUR 250 000 to the Multi-Donor Trust Fund had also been announced, for work by the TPG, drafting of commodity standards, and the International Year of Plant Health.
- At the SC meeting in May 2019, the SC had agreed with the TPG’s proposal for revision of the term “detection survey” and had discussed various options regarding the draft standard on *Pest risk management* (2014-001) and the potential reorganization of adopted pest risk analysis (PRA) standards. The SC had discussed the International Year of Plant Health and had invited all technical panels to consider the impact of the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030 on their work and how to streamline their processes (see agenda item 4.3). The SC had agreed with all the proposals submitted by the TPG. As regards the TPG discussion paper on possibly defining ‘emerging pest’ the SC had decided that the underlying concept is currently not sufficiently clear and a definition is not feasible at this stage. During an SC e-decision earlier in 2019, the SC had agreed with the 2019 version of the Annotated Glossary (*Explanatory document on ISPM 5*), but with some SC members also proposing modifications as regards ‘entry (of a pest)’ and ‘country of origin’, for consideration when the next intermediate version is prepared.
- At its meeting in May 2019, the SC-7 had agreed with the TPG’s proposals on terms.
- At its meeting in June 2019, the Bureau had discussed further the issue of emerging pests and considered a draft action plan for strengthening pest outbreak alert and response systems.

[10] The TPG Steward provided a verbal update of the SC 2019-11 meeting , as follows:

[11] **Draft 2018 amendments to ISPM 5.** The TPG Steward informed the TPG that most consultation comments had agreed with the proposed revisions. The comments had been addressed by the Steward and Assistant Steward. The SC had agreed to their proposals without modification, so the proposed revisions will be presented to CPM-15 (2020) for adoption.

[12] **Draft Revision of ISPM 8 (*Determination of pest status in an area*) (2009-005).** The TPG Steward informed the TPG that, following the second consultation period in 2019, the SC had discussed this draft standard at length. This had included much discussion of the pest status category “present: transient”, with reference being made to the note in the Annotated Glossary which says that transience is “the presence of a pest which is not expected to establish, either because conditions are not suitable for it or because measures can readily be applied to destroy it (eradication)”. This had prompted a discussion about whether a pest can truly be regarded as transient if measures have been applied to eradicate it and some SC members had questioned what would be the difference between a transient pest and one that is “present: not widely distributed and under official control”. The SC had considered whether to remove reference to phytosanitary measures in the description of “transient” but, as no consultation comments had requested this, the SC had agreed to retain it but to delete the examples given.

⁶ 10_TPG_2019_Nov

- [13] The TPG Steward noted that the sentence “*Not widely distributed*’ is not a term included in the description of pest status listed in ISPM 8” would need to be deleted in Supplement 1 of ISPM 5 as a result of the proposed revisions to ISPM 8⁷.
- [14] The TPG Steward also informed the TPG that the SC had decided to remove the appendix on reliability of information from the draft revision of ISPM 8 and had recommended that it be simplified and included instead in the capacity development guide on pest status currently in preparation. A consequential ink amendment would be needed in ISPM 6 (*Surveillance*) where it cross-references to ISPM 8 in relation to reliability of information. Further consideration of this and other consequential ink amendments to ISPM 6 and other ISPMs had been deferred by the SC until their May 2020 meeting. The TPG may probably be asked to work on proposals for ink amendments.
- [15] The TPG Steward clarified that the pest status guide is being developed in parallel with the draft revision of the ISPM due to availability of funding and also as a pilot of closer collaboration between the SC and the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC). One TPG member commented that if the aim is harmonization the information should be included in an ISPM rather than in a guide. Another TPG member explained that the appendix did not contain any requirements and moving it to the guide provided the opportunity to streamline the appendix, while the standard core text did still include information on reliability of records. One TPG member queried whether the guide and prospective other guides would be similar to and are intended to substitute Explanatory Documents. Another TPG member referred to the recent pest free area guide as a better example of what the pest status guide would be like. The Secretariat noted that, in general, more clarification as to the purpose and content of IPPC guidelines is still needed.
- [16] **Authorization of entities.** The TPG Steward informed the TPG that the SC had agreed the title of this draft standard to become *Requirements for national plant protection organizations if authorizing entities to perform phytosanitary actions (2014-002)*, as revised by the SC-7 in May 2019 to address the concerns of some contracting parties.
- [17] One TPG member queried the meaning of “under the authority” of a national plant protection organization (NPPO). Another member responded that advice had been obtained from FAO Legal and the text of the draft standard had been revised to explain the situation clearly.
- [18] The TPG Steward noted that SC-7 during its May 2019 meeting had suggested that ‘audit’ be defined in the Glossary. However, the TPG earlier on had recommended that neither ‘audit’ (as a point-in-time exercise) nor ‘supervision’ (as a continuous process) have any particular IPPC meaning and therefore need not be defined. The TPG also noted that, although there may be a clear distinction between the terms “audit” and “supervision” in English, this may not be the case in all other FAO languages.
- [19] **Draft ISPM on “Requirements for the use of modified atmosphere treatments as a phytosanitary measure (2014-006)”.** The TPG Steward informed that the SC had agreed that controlled atmosphere treatments are a subset of modified atmosphere treatments, and had adjusted the Scope section accordingly.
- [20] **Draft standard on Pest Risk Management and Reorganization of pest risk analysis standards.** The TPG Steward informed the TPG that the title for the draft standard had been changed to *Pest risk management for quarantine pests*. The SC had agreed to put two options to CPM-15 (2020): revision of stage 3 of ISPM 11 (*Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests*) to include extra information on pest risk management; and revision of the PRA standards (ISPM 2 and 11, but retaining ISPM 21 unchanged) to give a suite of four standards – an overarching standard plus a standard on each of the three stages of PRA. Many SC members had preferred the latter option, but one SC member had preferred the former.
- [21] One TPG member commented on the enormity of the task to reorganize the PRA standards and to revise the information in ISPM 11, although acknowledged the need to revise ISPM 11. Another TPG member

⁷ As identified in 08_SC_2019_Nov, deferred to the SC May 2020 meeting

recalled that, even at the drafting stage of ISPM 2 (*Framework for pest risk analysis*), it had been envisaged that in future the PRA standards would probably need to be reorganized. The member then expressed a preference for there to be one standard covering all stages of PRA, as this would be easier to read and would allow inconsistencies to be dealt with, overlaps removed, and the text restructured to make it easier to add annexes on particular pests such as Plants as pests or Living modified organisms as pests. One TPG member envisaged that the suite of PRA standards might follow sequential ISPM numbers, to make the structure of the suite clear, but commented that the first priority is the standard on pest risk management, being the topic that had been adopted by CPM. The TPG noted that the review of all PRA standards had already been identified as a gap in the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030.

[22] **Content of section “Outline of requirements” in ISPMs.** The TPG Steward informed the TPG that the SC-7 in May 2019 had not agreed with the TPG’s proposal on this section of ISPMs, but the SC had not had time to consider the issue in general at their November 2019 meeting and so had deferred the matter until the SC meeting in May 2020.

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

[24] The TPG:

- (1) *noted* the updates on relevant meetings
- (2) *invited* the SC to note that terms may be included in ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*) even if used in only one ISPM, provided they meet the criteria set out in the Guidelines for a consistent ISPM terminology in the *IPPC procedure manual for standard setting*.

4.3 Strategic discussion on the TPG work

Proposal for increased involvement of TPG in consistency review in languages

[25] The Secretariat introduced the paper⁸, explaining that ink amendments are currently presented to CPM in English only and are translated into the FAO official languages and implemented into the language versions of the standards concerned as resources permit (CPM-14 (2019)). The FAO Translation Office (CPAM) is in charge of translation once ink amendments have been noted by the CPM. However, there is no systematic further quality check (of provided translation) before ink amendments are implemented in the relevant standards, and the Secretariat had noted that in some language versions of ISPMs there are inconsistencies between the English versions and the translated versions of ink amendments.

[26] The Secretariat presented a proposed new process for consistency review and ink amendments for specific terms in languages. Under the proposed process, after CPM has noted the ink amendments in English the TPG would provide the corresponding ink amendments in the other FAO languages using the same tabular format as for English but without translating the explanation column. The tables would then be reviewed by CPAM for accuracy and from a legal point of view, after which the Secretariat would implement the ink amendments in all language versions of the ISPMs and publish the updated documents on the IPP.

[27] The TPG discussed the sequencing of stages in the process, querying whether ink amendments could be proposed to CPM in all languages at the same time, rather than the English ink amendments being adopted first, and whether the TPG could check the translations of ink amendments made by CPAM,

⁸ 12_TPG_2019_Nov

rather than the other way around. The Secretariat clarified that it is an official FAO policy that CPAM has the final approval of translated text, so if changes were to be made by the TPG after translation by CPAM, then the text would need to go back to CPAM for approval, adding another stage and consequential resource spending. The Secretariat clarified that translation into languages after CPM adoption is the most efficient approach, as it avoids the risk of translating ink amendments that ultimately are not adopted by CPM. The TPG also recalled that translation of ink amendments currently only proceeds when resources permit.

- [28] The Secretariat highlighted that the proposal was about improving the quality of the translated ink amendments, as the FAO translators have the language expertise but not the phytosanitary knowledge. There was a general consensus among the TPG members that, to achieve the best quality, it would be a good idea for the TPG to be involved. However, there was concern over the amount of work involved. One TPG member suggested that it would be quicker to make the translation directly into the language version of the standard, but other TPG members clarified that the only words requiring translation are the actual ink amendments themselves and not the surrounding text. Another TPG member commented that, in some languages, direct translation is not straightforward as there may be several possibilities for a single term and so it might be quite time consuming.
- [29] When asked as to who would prepare the tables of ink amendments in the FAO languages, the Secretariat responded that they do not have the resources to do this, nor the expertise in all FAO languages, although in the past have hired language consultants to do this. One TPG member suggested that if the Secretariat could prepare the table, possibly drawing upon language expertise from other units within the Secretariat, then the task for TPG members would be more manageable. On this basis, the TPG agreed to draft proposed translations for ink amendments, provided the Secretariat can prepare the table in languages beforehand.
- [30] With regard to timing, the TPG considered whether it would be best to translate the ink amendments after the annual TPG meeting, or after approval by the SC, or after noting by CPM. The Secretariat suggested that the best time, if the Secretariat were to prepare the tables, would be between the SC meeting in May and the following CPM. This was agreed by the TPG as an objection to an ink amendment at CPM is now a rare occurrence. The Secretariat confirmed that they would not initiate the ink amendment process unless there were resources to pay for the FAO translation, to ensure that the TPG effort was not wasted. The TPG and Secretariat agreed that this new translation process is in regard of future ink amendments only.
- [31] One TPG member commented that, when the TPG is considering ink amendments in English, it would also be a good time to start thinking about possible issues of translation into languages.
- [32] As a possible test, the TPG agreed to produce language versions of the ink amendments for “commodity class”, which had been discussed by TPG-2018⁹ and approved by SC May 2019.

The impact of the new strategic framework

- [33] The Secretariat introduced the paper¹⁰, prompted by an invitation from the SC for technical panels to comment on the potential impact of the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030¹¹ on the work of the panels. As an example, the Secretariat updated the TPG on comments made by the Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols about the impact of the Strategic Framework on their work and possible ways of streamlining processes. The SC will discuss this matter and comments made by the TPDP, TPPT and TPG at their May 2020 meeting.
- [34] The TPG Steward highlighted the significance of the TPG’s work to the IPPC Standard setting process, including the harmonization of terminology and the production of explanatory documents to facilitate

⁹ 17_TPG_2018_Dec, available at <https://www.ippc.int/en/work-area-publications/86745/>

¹⁰ 06_TPG_2019_Nov

¹¹ IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/87688/>

implementation. Within the new Strategic Framework, she highlighted the contribution that the TPG will be able to make to the terminology associated with item 5 of the IPPC development agenda 2020–2030 (strengthening pest outbreak alert and response systems).

- [35] Another TPG member suggested that the capacity development guides should use terms in the sense that they are used in Glossary, and that the TPG should promote the use of Glossary terms more widely than in ISPMs. The TPG agreed to recommend that all expert working groups, including those working under the IC direction, are provided with both ISPM 5 and the Annotated Glossary to ensure consistency of terms. One TPG member commented that documents produced by other IPPC units and bodies do not go through the same consultation and review process as standards, so they are unlikely to be as rigorous in their use of terms, and the Secretariat commented on the resource implications of subjecting such documents to the same level of editorial scrutiny as standards. The TPG recalled that only the SC can decide which terms are worked on by the TPG, but bodies other than the SC can submit proposals for terms to the SC. One TPG member noted that it might be useful if some terms used in implementation guides but not in ISPMs can be included in the Glossary, although the main priority is for terms used in ISPMs (as explained in the Guidelines for a consistent ISPM terminology).

Streamlining technical panel processes

- [36] The TPG discussed the Standard setting process and possible ways of streamlining it.
- [37] The TPG Steward expressed her view that the best time to undertake the consistency review is after the first consultation. The TPG discussed whether it would be possible to also review for consistency after the second consultation, but recognized that the relative timing of SC and TPG meetings will make this difficult. However, it was suggested that, if identifying particular concerns, the Steward of a draft ISPM could always call upon the TPG for advice. The TPG considered whether its members could be more involved in the LRG process, but the TPG Steward commented that, in her opinion, the TPG members would not have the time to do that. TPG members commented that, over and above their involvement with the TPG, they do already input to the LRG process.

Possible TPG contributions to IPPC processes and materials

- [38] **Reorganization of PRA standards.** The TPG considered whether it could play a role in the revision and reorganization of the PRA standards, considered by the SC November 2019 meeting, to ensure consistency and accuracy. The TPG Steward commented that it should be sufficient for the TPG to review the consultation comments for consistency in the usual way. Another TPG member asked what the most appropriate way would be for TPG members to submit their comments on the existing text of the draft standard on *Pest risk management for quarantine pests* (2014-001). The TPG noted that, because of the timings relating to the development of this standard, it might be more practical in this case for TPG members to submit comments as individuals or through their NPPO. Should the TPG itself wish to submit a paper it would need to be submitted to the SC.
- [39] **Explanatory documents.** The TPG discussed the merits of developing more explanatory documents to help the implementation of standards in clarifying the language used or the content of ISPMs, and whether the TPG could contribute to their development. The TPG agreed that the TPG should only work on the *Explanatory document on ISPM 5* and any explanatory documents that are linked to terms.
- [40] **Scope of the TPG.** The TPG discussed whether, taking into account the above discussions, it made sense to change or increase the scope of the TPG, but agreed that there was presently no need to.
- [41] **Revision and definition of terms.** The TPG noted that section 7.5.2 of the *IPPC procedure manual for standard setting* (Process for proposal of terms to be defined or revision of terms) needs to be corrected, because a list of all requests to define or refine terms is no longer appended to the TPG report and no executive summary is included.
- [42] The TPG:

- (3) *invited* the SC to consider revising the process for translation of ink amendments resulting from the consistency review of standards so that, where resources permit, initial translation is undertaken by TPG members following the SC May meeting each year, for subsequent checking by the FAO Translation Office
- (4) *invited* the SC to consider the comments made at this meeting regarding the potential impact of the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030 on the work of the TPG, streamlining technical panel processes, and the TPG contribution to IPPC processes and materials
- (5) *invited* the SC to recommend that all expert working groups, including both those working on standard setting and those working on capacity development topics, are provided with both ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*) and the Annotated Glossary (*Explanatory document on ISPM 5*) to ensure consistency of terms
- (6) *agreed* to include on the agenda of their next meeting a discussion of consistency issues with current ISPMs on PRA
- (7) *agreed* to develop the language versions of the ink amendments for “commodity class”, pending confirmation from the Secretariat of the availability of resources to prepare the consistency tables in languages
- (8) *requested* that the Secretariat amend section 7.5.2 of the *IPPC procedure manual for standard setting* (Process for proposal of terms to be defined or revision of terms) at its next revision to remove the requirements to include an executive summary in TPG reports and to attach as an appendix a list of all requests to define or refine terms, and *invited* the SC to note these changes.

5. Review Relating to Draft ISPMs Sent for First Consultation in 2019 (1 July–30 September)

[43] The Chairperson informed the TPG that, for the eight draft phytosanitary treatments at the first consultation period, no comments on consistency had been received.

[44] The TPG members confirmed that they had no comments on consistency.

[45] The TPG:

- (9) *noted* that the TPPT would be informed that there were no comments on consistency.

6. Subjects on the TPG Work Programme

[46] The TPG discussed the working documents prepared by its members on individual terms on the *List of topics for IPPC standards*. Proposals agreed by the TPG for new or revised terms and definitions, as well as justifications, are included in the *2020 Amendments to the Glossary*, which will be submitted to the SC in May 2020 for approval for consultation in 2020.

6.1 “inspection” (2017-005)

[47] The TPG lead introduced the paper¹², which included the following proposal for a revised definition of “inspection”: “Official checking of documents, verification of consignment identity and integrity, and visual examination of plant, plant products or other regulated articles to determine if pests are present or to determine compliance with phytosanitary regulations”

[48] He explained that the proposed definition, was clearly different from the concept of “clearance”, and included all three elements of inspection as outlined in ISPM 23 (*Guidelines for inspection*): checking of documents, verification of identity and integrity of the consignment, and visual examination of plants, plant products or other regulated articles to determine if pests are present or to determine compliance with phytosanitary regulations. . He also proposed some consequential changes to section 5.1.5.2.1 of ISPM 20 (*Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system*).

¹² 13_TPG_2019_Nov

- [49] One TPG member queried whether *both* the terms “identity” and “integrity” should be used as it could cause confusion and these terms are currently under consideration by the TPG. The TPG noted, however, that at present it is appropriate to include both of these terms in the definition of “inspection” as they are both referred to in ISPM 23.
- [50] One TPG member queried how identity and integrity could be checked at export because the phytosanitary certificate would not have been issued at that point, but another TPG member clarified that, in practice, this would relate to the forms that an exporter fills in to obtain the phytosanitary certificate. The TPG lead expressed his view that, to align with ISPM 23, “inspection” relates to both import and export situations.
- [51] One TPG member noted that the definition of “inspection” should clearly distinguish inspection from testing and commented that, if the definition were to include reference to checking of documents and verification of consignment identity and integrity, this might make the distinction less clear as it would not then simply be a question of whether it is a visual or non-visual examination. In response, another TPG member suggested that it might be better to use “visual examination” and “testing” rather than “inspection” and “testing”.
- [52] The TPG discussed whether the document checks and verification elements of inspection are carried out “to determine compliance with phytosanitary regulations”, or whether the latter phrase applies only to the visual examination element. The TPG lead commented that verification of consignment identity is not related to compliance with phytosanitary regulations. One TPG member commented, however, that inspection does not only take place at the point of export or import and that document checks may be carried out to determine compliance; for example, an inspector inspecting a nursery would look at the nursery’s records to determine whether the grower is complying with phytosanitary regulations. The TPG lead pointed out that, if document checks, verification and visual examination are all done in order to determine compliance, “inspection” would be no different to “clearance”. The TPG agreed, therefore, that compliance relates only to the visual examination element of inspection and not to the document checks or verification.
- [53] One TPG member reiterated that the distinction henceforward would be between “testing” and “visual examination” rather than between “testing” and “inspection”.
- [54] Furthermore, the TPG noted that compliance is with requirements rather than regulations, as regulations are at a higher level and may include not only requirements but some other element.
- [55] The TPG noted that:
- there is no need to insert “official” before “visual examination” as the word “official” at the start of the definition relates to everything that follows
 - as the compliance relates only to the visual examination element of inspection, the “or” after “present” should not be replaced by a comma
 - the phrase “other phytosanitary requirements”, which aligns with the introduction to section 2 of ISPM 23, is not “phytosanitary import requirements” as it relates to inspection at stages other than import, as well as at import.
- [56] TPG agreed not submit the new definition to the SC at this stage but to defer until next year, to give time for consideration of the terms “identity” and “integrity” as these are included in the definition of “inspection” and the expert working group on the revision of ISPM 12 (*Phytosanitary certificates*) may provide useful information.
- [57] **Suggestions for future revisions to ISPMs.** The TPG deferred the TPG lead’s proposal for consequential changes to relevant sections of ISPM 20 until their next meeting.
- [58] The TPG:

- (10) *agreed* to review at their next meeting the provisional definition of “inspection” (2017-005) drafted at this meeting
- (11) *deferred* consideration of consequential changes to relevant sections of ISPM 20 until their next meeting.

6.2 “incidence” (2018-010)

- [59] The TPG lead introduced the paper¹³. During the 2018 Call for topics, a proposed topic had been submitted to revise the definition of the term “incidence” and define the term “prevalence”, as their meaning can be confused in epidemiological and phytosanitary contexts. In response, the SC at its meeting in November 2018 had instead proposed that “incidence” be deleted from the Glossary and that the terms “incidence” and “prevalence” be used in their common, dictionary sense in ISPMs. The SC had therefore added the term “incidence” to the TPG work programme and requested that the TPG consider deleting it from the Glossary.
- [60] The TPG lead highlighted the definitions that are linked with the definition of “incidence” (“tolerance level” and “area of low pest prevalence”) and the note on “incidence” in the Annotated Glossary. She also presented relevant extracts from meetings and documents where the terms “incidence” or “prevalence” had been discussed or challenged and an analysis of the use of these terms in adopted ISPMs. The initial TPG intention had been to define the term “prevalence” but, following a lengthy process of consideration and consultation on the terms “prevalence”, “incidence” and “tolerance”, the term and definition of “incidence” had been adopted in 2009 and included in the Glossary instead of “prevalence”.
- [61] The TPG lead explained that the terms “prevalence” and “incidence” are well defined in epidemiology and that the Glossary definition of “incidence”, although fitting well with the use of the term in plant protection, corresponds to the epidemiological definition of “prevalence” used in human and animal health. In human health, for example, “prevalence” may be defined as the proportion of people in a population with a specific disease or condition at a given time, usually expressed as a proportion of the total population, whereas “incidence” is the number of new cases of a disease or condition in a population at risk over a given period¹⁴. However, considering the extensive past discussions on the possible definitions of the terms “prevalence” and “incidence” and the divergent points of view expressed, the TPG lead expressed her view that it is unlikely that an agreement could be reached on a revised Glossary definition of “incidence” and a new Glossary definition of “prevalence”, and so the simplest solution would be to delete the definition of “incidence” from the Glossary. She explained that an analysis of dictionary definitions of “incidence” appears to be consistent with its Glossary definition, so the term “incidence” could be removed from the Glossary, and the terms “prevalence” and “incidence” used in their general sense, without hindering the correct understanding of the term in adopted standards. She presented proposals for a consequential revision to the definition of “tolerance level” and amendments to the Annotated Glossary.
- [62] The TPG discussed the issues presented by the TPG lead, considering the relative merits of retaining “incidence” in the Glossary, replacing it by “prevalence”, or having both terms in the Glossary.
- [63] One TPG member commented that “prevalence” is not as commonly used in plant protection as is “incidence” and saw no problem with the current Glossary definition of “incidence”, which reflects the usage of the term in plant protection. The member also commented that, similarly, there is no need to change the definition of “tolerance level” (which refers to “incidence”). The TPG lead agreed that the Glossary definition of “incidence” aligns with the use of this term in plant protection, even if it does not align with the use of the term in epidemiological contexts relating to animal or human health.
- [64] One TPG member supported the deletion of “incidence” and the use of the term in its dictionary sense. The member commented that the difference between the two terms appears to be that “incidence” relates

¹³ 04_TPG_2019_Nov

¹⁴ Definitions as in Termium Plus dictionary: <http://www.btb.termiumplus.gc.ca>

to a given point in time, but that a given point in time is also implied in the definition of “tolerance level”, which refers back to “incidence”: “the incidence of a pest specified as a threshold for action to control that pest ...” The member suggested that if one term were to be used, “prevalence” would be preferable as this is more appropriate in relation to a threshold for action to control.

[65] Another TPG member commented that the dictionary definitions for “incidence” and “prevalence” vary, and so dictionary definitions may not be relied upon to ensure consistency in the use of these terms and important information would be lost if “incidence” were deleted from the Glossary. The member highlighted, for example, that the Glossary definition of “incidence” refers to the proportion *or number* of units, which is not a concept captured by all the dictionary definitions. The member’s first preference was therefore to retain the definition of “incidence” in the Glossary. As an alternative, the member suggested that – as an exception to the usual practice – perhaps both terms could be in the Glossary, but with the same definition.

[66] One TPG member pointed out that both “incidence” and “prevalence” are quantitative and describe the frequency of a pest. This was elaborated by other TPG members, who commented that “incidence” is an expression of the quantity of the pest in a defined population (e.g. the number of affected packages in a consignment), whereas “prevalence” relates to an area or to how often a pest is present; the concept of “area of low pest prevalence” relates to a low frequency of the pest in the area (e.g. a low number of places of production affected by the pest) and therefore also a low probability that the pest will be found.

[67] TPG members recalled that the SC had made a pragmatic decision and had asked for the deletion of the term “incidence” because they had recognized that it would be difficult to reach agreement on a definition of “prevalence”. Some TPG members commented that it was unfortunate that the proponents for deleting the term had used examples from animal and human health instead of plant protection, as simple definitions are available from plant protection. One TPG member noted that there is precedence for the different use of terms in an IPPC context compared to other international conventions, citing the example of the different use of “introduction” in the IPPC and the Convention on Biological Diversity.

[68] Recognizing the direction set out by the SC, the TPG proposed that the term “incidence” be deleted from the Glossary, but with no ink amendments to the definition of “tolerance level”, and that the words “incidence” and “prevalence” be used in ISPMs with their general, dictionary meaning. The TPG also noted that, if “incidence” is deleted, corresponding changes will be needed to the Annotated Glossary (as described in the paper for this agenda item¹⁵).

[69] The TPG:

(12) *proposed* the deletion of “incidence” (2018-010) in the draft 2020 Amendments to the Glossary (1994-001) to be presented to SC May 2020.

6.3 “emergency action” (2018-044)

[70] The TPG lead introduced the paper¹⁶. At their meeting in December 2018, the TPG had discussed how the term “emergency action” would apply for a new or an emerging pest that is discovered – for instance a pest that is not yet regulated being discovered in an imported consignment. The TPG had considered it appropriate that this situation could be covered by “emergency action” but had noted that, since the definition of “emergency action” refers back to “phytosanitary action” and therefore to the implementation of a “phytosanitary measure”, it is directed against regulated pests only. Recalling that Article VII.6 of the IPPC states that “nothing in this Article shall prevent any contracting party from taking appropriate emergency action on the detection of a pest posing a potential threat to its territories or the report of such a detection”, the TPG had considered that the text of the Convention justifies NPPOs taking action on any pest posing “a potential threat”, including non-regulated pests. The TPG

¹⁵ 04_TPG_2019_Nov

¹⁶ 05_TPG_2019_Nov

had therefore concluded that the definition of “emergency action” needed to be revised to cover non-regulated pests and in May 2019 the SC had agreed to add this term to the TPG work programme.

- [71] The TPG lead presented an analysis of the use of the terms “emergency action” and “phytosanitary action” in adopted ISPMs and proposed that, as suggested by the TPG December 2018 meeting, the definition of “emergency action” should be revised by:
- removing “phytosanitary” from “phytosanitary action” to clarify that an emergency action can target both regulated and non-regulated pests; and
 - replacing “phytosanitary” with “official” to emphasize that any emergency action should be taken under the authority of the NPPO.
- [72] The TPG agreed with the definition proposed by the TPG lead, subject to a minor amendment to replace “action” with “operation”, for consistency with the definition for “phytosanitary action”. The TPG proposed the revised definition of “emergency action” :
- A prompt ~~phytosanitary~~ **official** ~~action~~ operation undertaken in a new or unexpected phytosanitary situation
- [73] This revision would not necessitate any ink amendments in adopted ISPMs because the proposed change to the definition of “emergency action” is consistent with the current use of this term. The TPG lead pointed out that when drafting of ISPMs, care should be taken to use:
- the term “phytosanitary action” for actions taken to implement phytosanitary measures (e.g. in case of non-compliance of a consignment with phytosanitary import requirements)
 - the term “emergency action” for new or unexpected phytosanitary situations, such as the detection in an imported consignment of a pest not previously assessed.
- [74] The TPG agreed some minor amendments to Note 10 of the Annotated Glossary (see agenda item 8), to include mention of phytosanitary actions to help distinguish them from emergency actions.
- [75] **Suggestions for future revisions to ISPMs.** The TPG also considered some amendments proposed by the TPG lead to ISPM 18 (*Guidelines for the use of irradiation as a phytosanitary measure*), ISPM 20 and ISPM 26 (*Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)*), made some modifications and recommended that the resulting amendments (Appendix 4) be archived and applied at any future revision of the relevant ISPMs.
- [76] **Emergency measure.** The TPG considered whether the definition of “emergency measure” needed amending, because it refers to “phytosanitary measure” and “provisional measure”, which in turn relate to “phytosanitary regulation”, which relates to regulated pests. The TPG also noted that “phytosanitary procedure” is not commonly used and may also benefit from review. The TPG therefore recommended to the SC that “emergency measure”, “provisional measure”, “phytosanitary procedure” and “phytosanitary action” be added to the TPG work programme.
- [77] **Provisional measure.** In relation to the Glossary definition of “provisional measure”, one TPG member queried whether “procedure” should be set in bold, to indicate that it refers to a “phytosanitary procedure”. However, the TPG noted that it may not be a “phytosanitary procedure” and so the definition should be left as it is for now until further review as recommended.
- [78] The TPG:
- (13) *proposed* the revision of “emergency action” (2018-044) in the draft 2020 Amendments to the Glossary (1994-001) to be presented to SC May 2020
 - (14) *invited* the SC to note the TPG’s proposed amendments to ISPM 18 (*Guidelines for the use of irradiation as a phytosanitary measure*), ISPM 20 (*Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system*) and ISPM 26 (*Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)*) and *requested* that the Secretariat archive these amendments for future revision of these ISPMs (Appendix 4)

- (15) *invited* the SC to add the terms “emergency measure”, “provisional measure”, “phytosanitary procedure” and “phytosanitary action” to the TPG work programme in the *List of topics for IPPC standards*.

6.4 “clearance (of a consignment)” (2018-045)

- [79] The TPG lead introduced the paper¹⁷. At its meeting in December 2018, the TPG had noted that it is not clear whether “clearance” as defined in the Glossary is the *result* of an “inspection” or the *process* of a particular type of inspection.
- [80] The TPG lead presented definitions of Glossary terms linked to “clearance”, dictionary definitions of “clearance”, and an analysis of the use of the term in adopted ISPMs. She proposed a revised definition for “clearance (of a consignment)” to make it clear that clearance is the *process*, which results in either release or interception:
- [81] The TPG supported the contention that clearance is a process, but noted that “results in release or interception” would restrict the term to import only and not allow for clearance in the context of export. For export, clearance results either in issuance of a phytosanitary certificate or such issuance being declined. The TPG also noted that the process is “official”.
- [82] In comparing clearance with inspection, one TPG member commented that clearance is a process which could include not only inspection but also, for example, testing.
- [83] The TPG agreed to the following definition of “clearance (of a consignment)”:
~~Verification~~ **Official** process of verifying compliance with **phytosanitary regulations**
- [84] **Suggestions for future revisions to ISPMs.** One TPG member suggested that “by clearance” be deleted from section 3.2.2 in ISPM 9 (*Guidelines for pest eradication programmes*), as the reference to “release ... following verification of compliance” makes “by clearance” redundant. The TPG agreed to forward this suggestion to the SC for archiving and consideration when revising ISPM 9 in future.
- [85] The TPG:
- (16) *proposed* the revision of “clearance (of a consignment)” (2018-045) in the draft 2020 Amendments to the Glossary (1994-001) to be presented to SC May 2020
- (17) *invited* the SC to note the TPG’s suggested amendment to ISPM 9 (*Guidelines for pest eradication programmes*) and *requested* that the Secretariat archive this amendment for future revision of ISPM 9 (Appendix 4).

6.5 “general surveillance” (2018-046) and “specific surveillance” (2018-047)

- [86] The TPG lead introduced the paper¹⁸. During the TPG December 2018 meeting, it had been noted that the revised ISPM 6 (*Surveillance*) had resulted in a slight change in the meaning of general and specific surveillance, with the previous version of ISPM 6 referring to “specific surveys” for what is now called “specific surveillance”. The TPG had proposed to the SC that the terms “general surveillance” and “specific surveillance” be added to the TPG work programme for inclusion in the Glossary, to provide clarity without having to read ISPM 6, and the terms had been added to the work programme by the SC at its meeting in May 2019.
- [87] The TPG lead presented the Glossary definitions of terms linked to “general surveillance” and “specific surveillance”, together with an analysis of the use of the term in adopted ISPMs. She expressed her view that the definitions in ISPM 6 miss certain key elements and observed that “surveillance” in the Glossary is different to how the term is used in ISPM 6 because the latter refers to “surveillance programmes”. She suggested that “specific survey” is almost synonymous with “surveillance”. The TPG lead proposed that “general surveillance” and “specific surveillance” be included in the Glossary, but modified

¹⁷ 07_TPG_2019_Nov

¹⁸ 11_TPG_2019_Nov

compared to the explanations in ISPM 6. She also commented that, in the current Glossary definition of “surveillance”, it is not clear whether “other procedures” includes “other sources”. She commented that the Glossary definition of “survey” appears to mean the same as “specific surveillance” but also noted that, in some ISPMs, “survey” is used in its general, dictionary sense.

[88] The TPG lead proposed definitions for “specific surveillance” and “general surveillance”, adding that they align with the use of these terms in ISPM 6.

[89] The TPG then discussed these and the Glossary definition of “surveillance”.

Specific surveillance

[90] **Sources of data.** The TPG lead expressed her view that specific surveillance includes the collection of data from testing and inspection, as well as from surveys. Another TPG member was of the opinion that specific surveillance only includes data from surveys and is essentially a series of surveys. The TPG lead reiterated, however, that the ISPM 6 explanation of “specific surveillance” is not restricted only to surveys, so suggested that the Glossary definition for “specific surveillance” should allow for other means of collecting data.

[91] One TPG member commented that survey includes visual examination, taking samples, testing, use of pheromone traps, use of dogs, and as such is much more than inspection. Another TPG member commented that the definition of “specific surveillance” does not need to go into detail about how surveillance is conducted.

[92] The Russian language lead commented that in Russian, collection of data in the field is called “survey” regardless of the purpose for which the data are collected. The Chinese language lead commented that the only difference between “survey” and “surveillance” in Chinese is in terms of whether it is one survey or more than one, so “surveillance” only refers to surveys.

[93] One TPG member suggested that the definition of “surveillance” in the Glossary be revised to explicitly incorporate both specific and general surveillance.

[94] With reference to the data or information resulting from the surveillance, the TPG noted that “data” refers to the raw material, which then becomes “information” once it has been processed, and that data are not official until they are approved by the NPPO.

[95] The TPG noted that reference to “presence or absence” of a pest in the definition would be too restrictive as it would exclude information on other characteristics of a pest population such as pest biology or distribution. The current Glossary definition of “survey” allows for such characteristics (although the Glossary definition of “surveillance” refers only to pest presence or absence).

[96] The TPG considered whether the definition should refer to surveys of specific pests, because the Glossary term “survey” has the qualifier “(of pests)”. One TPG member noted that in ISPM 6 the target of the specific surveillance may be a pest, a host, a commodity, a pathway, or a combination of these, so plural would be appropriate for “pests” and would allow, for example, for a survey on potato pests.

[97] The TPG considered whether to refer to “an area” in the definition, noting that this includes places of production and production sites (which are mentioned in the Glossary definition of “survey”), but noted that if a survey is of a pathway, then reference to “an area” may not be appropriate.

[98] One TPG member commented that, to allow for surveys of commodities and pathways as well as pests, it may be better to keep the definition very simple and not refer to either pests or an area.

[99] The TPG clarified that the only distinction between general and specific surveillance is the source of the data, as both types of surveillance can be directed to *specific* pests.

[100] **Proposed definition.** The TPG considered various options for a definition and eventually agreed on the following definition for “specific surveillance”, which was the simplest and had no redundancy of words:

Surveillance carried out through **surveys**

General surveillance

[101] The TPG considered whether general surveillance includes specific surveillance. Opinions differed. One TPG member commented that the two types of surveillance should be mutually exclusive.

[102] Some TPG members commented that, for general surveillance, the process does not stop with the collection of data, as verification and analysis are also key important parts of the process, when non-official data-sources are being used.

[103] One TPG member commented that, in the current definition of “surveillance”, the survey and monitoring would be specific surveillance and other procedures would be general surveillance.

[104] **Possible definitions.** The TPG considered various options for a definition for “general surveillance”. No agreement was reached, but the final two possibilities under consideration were as follows:

Surveillance carried out by collecting, verifying and analysing data, originating from various sources, on **pests** in an **area**

Surveillance using data originating from various sources other than **surveys**

[105] The TPG considered whether to refer to “various official and unofficial sources” but agreed not to do this. Some TPG members commented that the second of these definitions would exclude the use of survey data from other NPPOs.

Surveillance

[106] The TPG considered various possible definitions, ranging from modifications of the current Glossary definition of “surveillance” to one that simply said that surveillance was “general surveillance and specific surveillance”.

[107] The TPG recalled their earlier discussion about data and information and that “information” is basically data that have been processed and analysed. One TPG member commented that “information” relates to “pest records”, but other TPG members commented that pest records do not include analysis.

[108] The TPG lead commented that when both general and specific surveillance are referred to in ISPM 6, the term “surveillance programme” is used.

[109] One TPG member commented that it is important to mention the recording of data, as this implies that the data are retained.

[110] Another TPG member suggested that surveillance is to determine pest status, but a further TPG member responded that it also includes other characteristics of the pest.

[111] **Provisional definition.** The TPG concluded their discussion by provisionally agreeing the following revision of the current Glossary definition of “surveillance”:

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

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

[113] The TPG:

(18) *agreed* to continue consideration of “general surveillance” (2018-046) and “specific surveillance” (2018-047) at their next meeting

(19) *invited* the SC to add “surveillance” to the TPG work programme in the *List of topics for IPPC standards*.

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

[114] The TPG lead introduced the paper¹⁹. When adopting the revised ISPM 12 (*Phytosanitary certificates*) in 2011, the CPM had requested that the SC consider the need to define “identity (of a consignment)”, as being significant to the understanding of ISPM 12 and other ISPMs. At the SC’s request, in 2012 the TPG had initiated its analyses of the use in ISPMs of “identity” in the consignment context, and of the related terms “integrity (of a consignment)” and “phytosanitary security (of a consignment)”. In 2014, the SC had requested that the TPG draft text amendments to certain parts of ISPM 12 dealing with re-export, where the meaning was not clear, and subsequently to produce a draft specification for a focused revision of ISPM 12. In 2015, the SC had decided upon a two-step approach of first arranging a focused revision of ISPM 12 through a new expert drafting group and subsequently finalizing definition issues with the usual TPG assistance. In the resulting Specification 67, the expert drafting group was asked to provide explanations in “plain wording” and avoid using the three terms under scrutiny. The focused revision is of sections 4 and 6 of ISPM 12. The expert working group (EWG) is due to meet in December 2019, which provides an opportunity for the TPG to discuss and provide input to the focused revision of ISPM 12.

[115] The TPG discussed the following issues.

Sections 4 and 6 of ISPM 12

[116] The TPG recalled that the TPG’s 2015 proposal for amending sections 4 and 6 of ISPM 12 had been produced still using the terms “identity” and “phytosanitary security”, and noted that the TPG lead (TPG Assistant Steward) and the TPG Steward, as EWG member and EWG Steward respectively, will be preparing a discussion paper for the EWG as a follow-up to the 2015 proposal.

Inconsistencies and unclear text in ISPM 12 other than sections 4 and 6

[117] The TPG lead explained that there are inconsistencies in other sections of ISPM 12 and the TPG has an opportunity to make the SC aware of these, noting them for the EWG. The TPG considered the proposed amendments to ISPM 12 prepared by the TPG lead and the TPG Steward²⁰ and made the following additional modifications.

[118] **Outline of requirements.** The TPG agreed to insert text clearly identifying the various countries at stake, but recommended the deletion of ‘the issuance of’ (as regards a phytosanitary certificate), and that “applied” be changed to “implemented” with reference to phytosanitary measures, as “applied” would not be appropriate for all types of phytosanitary measures (e.g. survey).

[119] **Section 1.2.** The TPG agreed to change ‘phytosanitary status’ to ‘pest risk’, in line with earlier and analogue decisions by the SC.

[120] **Section 3.2.** The TPG agreed to recommend that “phytosanitary” be inserted before “import requirements” in the heading and the first sentence, as this is the full Glossary term.

[121] **Section 5, 1.sentence.** The TPG agreed to change ‘commodity’ to ‘consignment’, in line with its earlier consistency analysis of the use of the two terms.

¹⁹ 08_TPG_2019_Nov

²⁰ Appendix 1 of 08_TPG_2019_Nov

[122] **Section 5, II Additional declaration, 1. paragraph.** The TPG agreed to add ‘or regulated articles’ at the end, to conform with the revised definition of ‘*additional declaration*’.

[123] **Section 5, II Additional declaration, paragraphs 5 and 6.** The TPG agreed to simplify reference to “this section of the phytosanitary certificate for export” (in paragraph 5) to “this section” and to replace “here” (in paragraph 6) with “this section”.

[124] **Section 5, Name of authorized officer.** One TPG member commented that the phrase “authenticated electronic certification data” is ambiguous as it could be interpreted as referring to electronic phytosanitary certificates, or electronic data for certification, or data relating to electronic certification. The TPG agreed, however, that as this sentence does not appear to have caused problems for contracting parties, no changes should be proposed at this stage.

[125] **Other terminology issues in ISPM 12.** The TPG agreed that, although “phytosanitary security” is under consideration, it is acceptable to retain it in ISPM 12 for now.

[126] The TPG agreed to recommend the proposed amendments as modified to the SC in May 2020 for consideration, but not to the EWG as the EWG’s remit is restricted only to those parts of the ISPM opened for focused revision.

Use of “phytosanitary status” in section 5 of ISPM 12

[127] The TPG lead recalled that there were still some references to “phytosanitary status” in ISPM 12 that had been considered difficult to resolve through ink amendments at the time of the TPG’s previous consideration of this consistency issue throughout ISPMs.

[128] The TPG recalled the proposal, prepared by the TPG and endorsed by the SC in 2014, on proposed changes to section 5 in relation to uses of “phytosanitary status”²¹ The TPG asked the Secretariat to forward the proposal to the EWG and noted that it would be referred to in the TPG report to the SC May 2020.

Glossary amendments for “identity (of a consignment)”, “integrity (of a consignment)” and “phytosanitary security (of a consignment)”

[129] The TPG lead invited the TPG to start of the process of re-considering the three terms “identity (of a consignment)” (2011-001), “integrity (of a consignment)” (consequential) and “phytosanitary security (of a consignment)” (2013-008). The TPG lead and the TPG Steward had provided some initial, tentative thoughts on possible definitions for these three terms²², but the TPG lead suggested not to draw final conclusions at this meeting but continue to work on this next year.

[130] One TPG member referred to the paper discussed by the TPG in February 2014²³, discussing the definitions and uses of the three terms.

[131] Further discussion was deferred to the TPG’s next meeting.

[132] The TPG:

- (20) noted that a discussion paper was being prepared by the TPG Steward and TPG Assistant Steward for the EWG on the “Focused revision of ISPM 12 (Phytosanitary certificates) in relation to re-export (2015-011)” on sections 4 and 6 and Outline of Requirement of ISPM 12”.
- (21) invited the SC to consider the proposed amendments to ISPM 12 (Phytosanitary certificates) other than in sections 4 and 6, as modified in this meeting

²¹ Appendix 3 of 08_TPG_2019_Nov

²² Appendix 2 of 08_TPG_2019_Nov

²³ 12_TPG_2014_Feb

- (22) invited the EWG on the “Focused revision of ISPM 12 (Phytosanitary certificates) in relation to re-export (2015-011)” to take account of the TPG’s recommendation, as endorsed by the SC, to avoid using the term “phytosanitary status” when revising ISPM 12
- (23) *agreed* to continue to work on the Glossary terms “identity (of a consignment)” (2011-001), “integrity (of a consignment)” (consequential) and “phytosanitary security (of a consignment)” (2013-008) in the next meeting.

7. Review of ISPMs for Consistency of Terms and Style

7.1 General recommendations on consistency

[133] The TPG noted that the *General recommendations on use of terms in ISPMs*, as modified at the 2018 TPG meeting, had subsequently been published in the *IPPC style guide*²⁴ and the SC informed at their meeting in May 2019. No amendments had been proposed prior to or during this meeting.

[134] The TPG:

- (24) *invited* the SC to note that the *General recommendations on use of terms in ISPMs* remain unchanged.

7.2 Consistency of adopted ISPMs

List of standards that have gone through the consistency review

[135] The Secretariat informed that the *List of proposed or approved ink amendments for ISPMs* includes those standards which have been republished after the incorporation of approved ink amendments since the last TPG meeting²⁵. The list will be updated again in 2020.

8. Annotated Glossary: 2019 Intermediate Version

[136] The Annotated Glossary, version 5, had been finalized by the TPG meeting in December 2018 and published in March 2019²⁶. The next version is due for publication in 2022. The TPG lead recalled that she had prepared the 2019 intermediate version, which was submitted to the TPG for comments in June 2019, and noted that one TPG member had submitted comments²⁷.

[137] The TPG reviewed these comments, together with suggestions made in the meeting, and agreed on the following changes to the Annotated Glossary, as well as some minor amendments to improve clarity:

- Country of origin: The TPG deleted the notes for all three of these terms, as the consistency issue with these terms had been resolved.
- “Dose mapping” and “minimum absorbed dose (Dmin)”: The TPG reworded the notes to avoid them being misunderstood as meaning that these terms are only *valid* in the ISPMs specified, rather than that currently they are only *used* in these ISPMs.
- “Entry (of a pest)”: The TPG reviewed a suggestion from a former SC member to add some further text concerning transience to the note. The TPG considered, however, that the additional text may result in more confusion rather than less and so instead deleted reference to transience from the note altogether.
- Incidence: The TPG recalled the SC’s proposal to delete this term and the TPG’s conclusion about this earlier in their meeting (see agenda item 6.2), but noted that no change would be made to the Annotated Glossary until the fate of the term is finally known.

²⁴ *IPPC style guide*: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/132/>

²⁵ List of ink amendments proposed or approved for ISPMs: <https://www.ippc.int/en/work-area-pages/technical-panel-for-the-glossary-tpg/>

²⁶ 2019 Annotated Glossary: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/87049/>

²⁷ 2019 intermediate version of Annotated Glossary: <https://www.ippc.int/en/work-area-pages/technical-panel-for-the-glossary-tpg/>

- Phytosanitary certification: The TPG did not accept a proposal to add a note for this term.
- Required response: The TPG deleted the sentence “The present definition may not be suitable for the more general case” as the presence of the term in the Glossary already means that it is recognized as being suitable for general use in ISPMs, and contracting parties have not expressed any problems with the term.
- SIT: The TPG accepted to delete the note to this term, except for the cross-reference to note 13.
- Note 1: The TPG accepted that the sentence “This terminology was established at a relatively early stage in the development of the Glossary, but has remained rather theoretical” be deleted from the third paragraph as it may not be possible to make such a judgement.
- Note 2: In the last paragraph, the TPG lead agreed to confirm and insert the date when the Scope of the Glossary had been amended with regard to algae and fungi being included within the concept of “plants”.
- Note 10: The TPG corrected the quoted definition of “phytosanitary action” to include the word “official” and amended the third paragraph to clarify the distinction between emergency action and phytosanitary action, as agreed earlier in the meeting.
- Note 11, third and fourth paragraphs: The TPG noted that these paragraphs, including the reference to ISPM 8, would need review once the draft revision to ISPM 8 has been adopted.
- Note 11, second and fifth paragraphs: The TPG added a sentence to the end of the fifth paragraph to make it clear that spread of a pest can be by means other than by humans. For consistency and clarity, the TPG also changed “agency” to “means” in the second paragraph, although retained the first instance of “agency” in quotation marks as this is the term used in the Convention on Biological Diversity definition of “introduction”.
- Appendix 1, kiln-drying: The TPG made an editorial amendment for accuracy and clarity, and also changed “phytosanitary measure” to “heat treatment” to be more specific.
- Appendix 2, phytosanitary status: One TPG member had proposed that the sentence “the intended meaning of the term in that context remains unclear” be added to the end of the note for this term, but this was not accepted by the TPG and the note was left unchanged.
- Appendix 2, soil: The TPG made minor amendments to the note for this term. They considered adding “and for which medium” to the end of the note, but agreed not to do this.
- Appendix 3, first paragraph (after the numbered list): The TPG considered whether to delete the penultimate sentence (“Thus it was possible ...”), but agreed to retain it.

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

[139] The TPG:

- (25) *agreed* that the intermediate version of the Annotated Glossary would be modified after the meeting by Ms Beatriz MELCHO (Uruguay)²⁸.

9. Explanation of Glossary Terms

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

[141] The following terms were discussed.

[142] **Pest reporting.** One TPG member suggested that this would be useful as a new defined term, to avoid having to refer to ISPM 17 (*Pest reporting*) for an explanation and to highlight the fact that pest reporting is exclusively official, in contrast to pest recording by others (academic researchers, foresters, etc.). The

²⁸ For circulation within the TPG after 2020-05 SC meeting

member suggested that a definition could link to “pest record”. Another TPG member cautioned that care would need to be taken to make clear the distinction between “pest record”, “pest status” and “pest reporting” (or its derivative “pest report”). This member added that ISPM 8 would also need to be analysed when developing proposals for this term. Some TPG members acknowledged that there is potential confusion between “pest record” and “pest report” and gave examples from their experience.

[143] One TPG member commented that it would be useful to see what the pest status guide, currently under development, says about pest reporting, so that the TPG could decide whether the explanation of terms is covered sufficiently there without a new Glossary term being defined. Another member added that it would be useful to have some collaborative input into the development of the pest status guide, but the Secretariat noted that such activity is not currently within the remit of the TPG.

[144] The TPG agreed to not recommend this subject to the SC at this stage, but to wait until the pest status guide is more developed and review the matter at their meeting next year.

[145] **Free from.** One TPG member queried why the qualifier for this term in the Glossary mentions consignments, fields or places of production, but not areas, given that there can be pest free areas (another Glossary term) and that Note 12 in the Annotated Glossary says that “pest freedom” (which is not a Glossary term) should relate to an area, place of production or production site. Another TPG member responded that the existence of the Glossary term “pest free area” means that areas do not need to be covered by the term “free from”. The TPG noted that the text of Note 12 of the Annotated Glossary, concerning the use of the term “pest freedom”, would need to be revised and the TPG lead agreed to do this.

[146] **Germplasm.** One TPG member commented that the Annotated Glossary currently suggests that the definition for “germplasm” be revised to replace “plants” with “plants for planting”, so either the term needed to be revised or the text in the Annotated Glossary needed to be changed. The TPG agreed to ask the SC to add this to the TPG work programme.

[147] **Infection vs infestation.** The Spanish language lead informed the TPG that one of the FAO Spanish translators had requested an amendment to the Glossary regarding the definition of “infestation”. Another TPG member clarified that “infestation” should be used when it covers both “infestation” and “infection”, but when the meaning is solely “infection” (e.g. in a diagnostic protocol relating to a pathogen) then it is appropriate to use “infection”. The Russian language lead commented that in Russian “infestation” is used more commonly to refer to field infestation or infection, whereas “infection” is more likely to be used for intentional infection in the laboratory. [The TPG agreed that no changes were necessary]

[148] **Invasive species.** One TPG member queried whether greater clarity is needed on this term, but the TPG recalled that guidance already exists in Appendix 1 of the Glossary.

[149] **Pest risk.** One TPG member highlighted concerns with the qualifiers to the two “pest risk” terms relating to quarantine pests and RNQPs, respectively. He was concerned that the pest risk term and definition, with the current qualifier preposition “for”, could be understood as applying only to pests once they had become regulated, whereas in fact the pest risk (using those very definitions) is actually most often evaluated prior to any decision on whether and how to possibly regulate the pest. The TPG noted, however, that “for” means “in relation to” in this context and so agreed that no changes were necessary.

[150] The member suggested that the qualifier be deleted altogether from the first “pest risk” term, relating to quarantine pests, so that the term could be used for any pest considered under the IPPC domain, including e.g. emerging pests; and then the definition of the second term, relating to RNQPs, be amended to make it clear that this is a special case and subset of the first term. Other TPG members commented that the definition of the first term does not apply to regulated non-quarantine pests, so the second term could not be a subset of the first term, and that the first term needs to be in relation to quarantine pests as that is what being regulated. The TPG therefore agreed not to recommend any changes.

[151] The TPG:

- (26) *agreed* to review the need for the term “pest reporting” at their meeting in 2020
- (27) *agreed* that Note 12 of the intermediate version of the Annotated Glossary, concerning “pest freedom”, would be modified after the meeting by Ms Beatriz MELCHO (Uruguay)²⁹
- (28) *invited* the SC to consider adding the term “germplasm” to the *List of topics for IPPC standards*.

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

[152] The TPG lead introduced the document³⁰. She recalled that the SC in May 2018 had tasked the TPG with reviewing and finalizing the draft explanatory document on ISPM 16 (*Regulated non-quarantine pests: concept and application*) in collaboration with the IC, with a view to having it published. At their meeting in December 2018, the TPG had concluded that they would need to thoroughly revise the document before sharing it with the IC and had agreed to continue working on it at their next meeting.

[153] The TPG reviewed the document and made some changes as follows:

- In the section on section 4.4 of ISPM 16, the text was amended to refer to “pest control” rather than “pest control actions” and to refer to the Glossary term “tolerance level”.
- The last sentence of the penultimate paragraph was amended to improve clarity, including giving some examples.
- In the last paragraph, “domestic consignments” was changed to “domestic plants for planting” as the term “consignment” only relates to import; and “compliance” was changed to “conformity” as “compliance” relates to consignments.

[154] The TPG agreed that the document, as modified in this meeting, could now be shared with the IC, but asked that the Secretariat undertake an editorial review of the text beforehand.

[155] The TPG:

- (29) *invited* the SC to share the draft explanatory document on ISPM 16 (*Regulated non-quarantine pests: concept and application*), as modified in this meeting, with the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee for their comment.

10. TPG Work Plan

10.1 TPG work plan for 2020–2021

[156] The TPG updated its work plan for 2020 (Appendix 5), to be presented to the SC meeting in May 2020. The Secretariat reminded TPG members that the work plan, available on the TPG restricted work area, is updated throughout the year³¹. The Secretariat also circulates the work plan by email when needed.

[157] The TPG:

- (30) *invited* the SC to note the TPG work plan for 2020 (Appendix 5).

11. Any Other Business

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

²⁹ For circulation within the TPG after 2020-05 SC meeting

³⁰ 09_TPG_2019_Nov

³¹ TPG work plan: <https://www.ippc.int/en/work-area-publications/5988/>

2019³², as a document rather than a database, to make it clear that it is not subject to ongoing updates. A link to the document will be provided on the TPG webpage in due course.

[159] **TPG membership.** The Secretariat noted that the terms of Ms Beatriz MELCHO (Uruguay) and Mr Andrei ORLINSKI (EPPO) would be ending in 2020. Ms MELCHO informed the TPG that she would be willing to continue as a member for a third term. Mr ORLINSKI informed the TPG that, pending approval by the SC and continued support by his employer, he would be willing to continue as a member for one further year. The TPG supported continuing the membership of Ms MELCHO and Mr ORLINSKI for a third term and for one year, respectively. The Secretariat invited Mr ORLINSKI to confirm his employer's support by the end of February 2020, so that a Call for experts could be launched if necessary.

[160] The TPG:

(31) *invited* the Secretariat to issue a Call for experts as appropriate.

12. Date and Venue of the Next Meeting

[161] The next meeting of the TPG was tentatively scheduled for November or December 2020. The Secretariat confirmed that the meeting would take place at FAO headquarters in Rome, Italy, subject to room availability.

13. Close of the Meeting

[162] The Secretariat thanked the TPG members for their contributions to the work of the TPG and invited them to respond to the evaluation survey for the meeting³³.

[163] The Chairperson thanked the TPG members and Secretariat, and the TPG members expressed their gratitude to the Chairperson and thanked the Secretariat for their support.

[164] The SSU lead encouraged TPG members to submit any suggestions they have for improving the work of the SSU, and wished everyone a safe return journey and best wishes for the new year.

[165] The Chairperson closed the meeting.

³² Compilation of selected terms used in the Cartagena Protocol and the IPPC: <https://bch.cbd.int/protocol/whathasbeendone/Art18/paragraph3.shtml>; <https://bch.cbd.int/article%2018/compilation%20of%20terms.pdf>

³³ Survey: <https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/2019TPG>

Appendix 1: Agenda

AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER
1. Opening of the meeting	-	
1.1 Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat	-	Secretariat
2. Meeting arrangements		
2.1 Selection of the Chairperson	-	-
2.2 Selection of the Rapporteur	-	Chairperson
2.3 Adoption of the agenda	01_TPG_2019_Nov	Chairperson
2.4 Current specification: TP5 (TPG) (2016) [Posted June 2016 in three languages]	Link to TP 5	Secretariat
3. Administrative Matters	-	
3.1 Documents list	02_TPG_2019_Nov	Secretariat
3.2 Participants list	03_TPG_2019_Nov	Secretariat
3.3 Local information	Local information	Secretariat
4. Reports	-	
4.1 Previous meeting report of the TPG (December 2018), including the TPG work plan	Link to TPG reports Link to the TPG work plan (work area; log on needed)	BOUHOT-DELDUC
4.2 Extracts from other meeting reports of relevance to the TPG (including SC, CPM) - Recommendations from the SC, if any	10_TPG_2019_Nov	Secretariat
4.3 Strategic discussion on the TPG work - proposal for increased involvement of TPG in consistency review in languages - the impact of the new strategic framework - Streamlining TP processes - Possible TPG contributions to IPPC processes and materials. - possible recommendations to the SC	12_TPG_2019_Nov Link to IPPC Strategic Framework 2020-2030 ³⁴ 06_TPG_2019_Nov	Secretariat/ BOUHOT-DELDUC
5. Review relating to draft ISPMs sent for first consultation in 2019 (1 July- 30 September) 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 2019).		

³⁴ IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030 as presented to and endorsed by the SPG 2019

AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER
5.1 Eight draft PTs under consultation: – Irradiation treatment for <i>Bactrocera dorsalis</i> (2017-015) – Cold treatment for <i>Ceratitis capitata</i> on <i>Prunus avium</i> , <i>Prunus domestica</i> and <i>Prunus persica</i> (2017-022A) – Cold treatment for <i>Bactrocera tryoni</i> on <i>Prunus avium</i> , <i>Prunus domestica</i> and <i>Prunus persica</i> (2017-022B) – Cold treatment for <i>Ceratitis capitata</i> on <i>Vitis vinifera</i> (2017-023A) – Cold treatment for <i>Bactrocera tryoni</i> on <i>Vitis vinifera</i> (2017-023B) – Irradiation treatment for <i>Bactrocera tau</i> (2017-025) – Irradiation treatment for <i>Carposina Sasakii</i> (2017-026) – Irradiation treatment for the genus <i>Anastrepha</i> (2017-031)	2017-015 2017-022A 2017-022B 2017-023A 2017-023B 2017-025 2017-026 2017-031	CHAIRPERSON/ GORITSCHNIG
6. Subjects on the TPG work programme Proposals for new or revised terms/definitions will be compiled into new draft Amendments to the Glossary, to be submitted to the SC in May 2020.		
6.1 “inspection” (2017-005)	13_TPG_2019_Nov	RAMARATHNAM
6.2 “incidence”(2018-010)	04_TPG_2019_Nov	BOUHOT-DELDUC
6.3 “emergency action” (2018-044)	05_TPG_2019_Nov	BOUHOT-DELDUC
6.4 “clearance (of a consignment)” (2018-045)	07_TPG_2019_Nov	KOECH
6.5 “general surveillance” (2018-046) and “specific surveillance” (2018-047)	11_TPG_2019_Nov	OMAR
6.6 preview EWG on <i>focused revision of ISPM 12</i> (Phytosanitary certificates) <i>in relation to re-export</i> (2015-011) and related subjects: “ <i>identity</i> ” (2011-001), “ <i>integrity (of a consignment)</i> ” (consequential), “ <i>phytosanitary security (of a consignment)</i> ” (2013-008)	08_TPG_2019_Nov	NORDBO
7. Review of ISPMs for consistency of terms and style		
7.1 General recommendations on consistency (as modified following the TPG 2018 and noted by the SC. To be reviewed and completed as needed)	Link to IPPC Style Guide	Secretariat
7.2 Consistency of adopted ISPMs (standard by standard) - List of standards that have gone through the consistency review	List of ink amendments proposed or approved for ISPMs (work area; log on needed)	Secretariat

AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER
<p>8. Annotated glossary: 2019 intermediate version</p> <p><i>[The annotated glossary, version 5, was finalized at TPG 2018 and published in March 2019. The next version should be finalized for publication in 2022. The TPG considers yearly which amendments need to be made and produces an intermediate version. The 2019 intermediate version is posted in the TPG work area. The 2019 intermediate version was prepared by Ms Beatriz Melcho and submitted to the TPG for comments (in June 2019). Mr Ebbe Nordbo provided comments]</i></p>	<p>Web link to the 2018 Annotated Glossary</p> <p>Web link to the 2019 intermediate version (work area; log on needed)</p>	MELCHO
<p>9. Explanation of Glossary terms</p> <p>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.</p>		Secretariat
<p>9.1 Draft explanatory document on ISPM 16 <i>(Regulated non-quarantine pests: concept and application)</i></p>	<p>09_TPG_2019_Nov Link to ISPM 16</p>	MELCHO
10. TPG work plan	-	
<p>10.1 TPG work plan for 2020-2021</p> <p>The TPG will update its work plan for the coming year, based on discussions at the meeting, to be presented to the SC May 2020 for noting.</p>	To be prepared during the meeting	Secretariat
11. Any other business		
12. Date and venue of the next meeting	-	Secretariat
<p>13. Close of the meeting</p> <p>- Evaluation</p>	Link to survey	Chairperson

Appendix 2: Documents List

DOCUMENT NO.	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE	DATE POSTED / DISTRIBUTED
Draft PTs			
2017-015	5.1	Draft PT: Irradiation treatment for <i>Bactrocera dorsalis</i>	2019-10-18
2017-022A	5.1	Draft PT: Cold treatment for <i>Ceratitidis capitata</i> on <i>Prunus avium</i> , <i>Prunus domestica</i> and <i>Prunus persica</i>	2019-10-18
2017-022B	5.1	Draft PT: Cold treatment for <i>Bactrocera tryoni</i> on <i>Prunus avium</i> , <i>Prunus domestica</i> and <i>Prunus persica</i>	2019-10-18
2017-023A	5.1	Draft PT: Cold treatment for <i>Ceratitidis capitata</i> on <i>Vitis vinifera</i>	2019-10-18
2017-023B	5.1	Draft PT: Cold treatment for <i>Bactrocera tryoni</i> on <i>Vitis vinifera</i>	2019-10-18
2017-025	5.1	Draft PT: Irradiation treatment for <i>Bactrocera tau</i>	2019-10-18
2017-026	5.1	Draft PT: Irradiation treatment for <i>Carposina Sasakii</i>	2019-10-18
2017-031	5.1	Draft PT: Irradiation treatment for the genus <i>Anastrepha</i>	2019-10-18
Other Documents			
01_TPG_2019_Nov	2.3	Draft Annotated Agenda	2019-09-28 2019-10-18 2019-11-01
02_TPG_2019_Nov	3.1	Documents List	2019-10-18 2019-11-01
03_TPG_2019_Nov	3.2	Participants List	2019-10-18 2019-11-01
04_TPG_2019_Nov	6.2	Discussion "incidence" (2018-010)	2019-10-18
05_TPG_2019_Nov	6.3	Discussion "incidence" (2018-044)	2019-10-18
06_TPG_2019_Nov	4.3	Strategic discussion on the TPG work	2019-10-18
07_TPG_2019_Nov	6.4	Discussion "clearance (of a consignment)" (2018-045)	2019-10-18 2019-11-18
08_TPG_2019_Nov_	6.6	preview EWG on <i>focused revision of ISPM 12</i> (Phytosanitary certificates) <i>in relation to re-export</i> (2015-011) and related subjects: " <i>identity</i> " (2011-001), " <i>integrity (of a consignment)</i> " (consequential), " <i>phytosanitary security (of a consignment)</i> " (2013-008)	2019-10-18
09_TPG_2019_Nov	9.1	Draft explanatory document on ISPM 16 (<i>Regulated non-quarantine pests: concept and application</i>)	2019-10-18
10_TPG_2019_Nov	4.2	Update from various meetings of relevance to the TPG	2019-11-01

DOCUMENT NO.	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE	DATE POSTED / DISTRIBUTED
11_TPG_2019_Nov	6.5	Discussion paper on “general surveillance” (2018-046) and “specific surveillance” (2018-047)	2019-11-01
12_TPG_2019_Nov	7.2	Proposal for increased involvement of TPG in consistency reviews in languages	2019-11-01 2019-11-15
13_TPG_2019_Nov	6.1	Discussion paper on “inspection” (2017-005)	2019-11-18

IPP LINKS:	Agenda item
Current specification: TP5 (TPG, 2016)	2.4
Local information	3.3
Previous meetings of the TPG (December 2018)	4.1
Current work plan (work area; log on needed)	4.1
IPPC Strategic Framework 2020-2030	4.3
Link to IPPC Style Guide	7.1
List of ink amendments proposed or approved for ISPMs	7.2
2018 Annotated Glossary	8
Web link to the 2019 intermediate version (work area; log on needed)	8
Link to ISPM 16	9.1

Appendix 3: Participants List

TPG members:

Participants details			TPG member's term	
Name, mailing, address, telephone	Participant role	Email address	begins	ends
Ms Laurence BOUHOT-DELDUC Ministry of Agriculture and Food, General directorate for food Sub-directorate for plant quality, health and protection 251 rue de Vaugirard 75732 Paris Cedex 15 FRANCE Tel: (+33) 149558437 Fax: (+33) 149555949	Steward / French	laurence.bouhot-delduc@agriculture.gouv.fr	May 2013	2023 (2 nd term)
Ms Asenath Abigael KOECH Pest Risk Analysis expert/Plant health inspector Kenya Plant Health Inspectorate Service (KEPHIS) KEPHIS Headquarters OLOOLUA RIDGE , KAREN P.O. BOX 49592-00100, NAIROBI, KENYA Mobile: +254 -722973535 Office: +254 – 709891110 Fax: +254 -020 3536175	English	akoech@kephis.org ; abigakoech@gmail.com	May 2017	2022 (1 st term)
Ms Beatriz MELCHO Ministry of Livestock, Agriculture and Fisheries, General Direction of Agricultural Services, Plant Protection Division Avda. Millan 4703 CP 12900 Montevideo, URUGUAY Tel: (+598) 2 309 8410 ext 267	Spanish	bmelcho@mgap.gub.uy ; bemelcho@hotmail.com	Nov 2010	2020 (2 nd term)
Ms Hong NING Plant Quarantine Station of Sichuan Agricultural Department No. 4 Wuhouci Street, Chengdu, Sichuan, 610041 PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA Tel: (+86) 28 85505251 Fax: (+86) 28 85505251	Chinese	ninghong2006@aliyun.com	Sept 2012	2022 (2 nd term)
Mr Ebbe NORDBO DENMARK Tel: (+45) 46358095 Mobile: (+45) 28740095	English	ebbenordbo@outlook.com	2009	2024 (3 rd term)

Participants details			TPG member's term	
Name, mailing, address, telephone	Participant role	Email address	begins	ends
Ms Shaza Roushdy OMAR 8 Kamal El-Din Salah street Garden City, Cairo EGYPT Mobile: (+20) 227972454 Fax: (+20) 227963989	Arabic	shaza.roshdy@gmail.com	Oct 2012	2022 (2 nd term)
Mr Andrei ORLINSKI European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization 21 bd. Richard Lenoir 75011 Paris, FRANCE Tel: (+33) 1 45 20 77 94 ; (+33) 1 84790743 Fax: (+33) 1 70 76 65 47	Russian	Orlinski@eppo.int	Nov 2010	2020 (2 nd term)
Mr Rajesh RAMARATHNAM Senior Specialist (International Phytosanitary Standards): International Phytosanitary Standards Section Plant Protection Division, CFIA-ACIA 59 Camelot Drive, Ottawa ON K1A OY9 CANADA Tel: (+1) 613-773-7122 Fax: (+1) 613-773-7252	English	rajesh.ramarathnam@canada.ca	Jan 2019	2023 (1 st term)

Others:

Participants details		
Name, mailing, address, telephone	Participant role	Email address
Ms Artur SHAMILOV Standard Setting Officer IPPC Secretariat, Rome, ITALY Tel: (+39) 06570 50160	IPPC Secretariat	Artur.Shamilov@fao.org ;
Ms Adriana MOREIRA Standard Setting Officer IPPC Secretariat, Rome, ITALY Tel: (+39) 065705 5809	IPPC Secretariat	Adriana.Moreira@fao.org ;
Ms Aixa DEL GRECO Standard Setting Associate IPPC Secretariat, Rome, ITALY Tel: +(39) 06 570 50285	IPPC Secretariat	Aixa.DelGreco@fao.org
Mr Avetik NERSISYAN Standard Setting Unit Leader IPPC Secretariat, Rome, ITALY Tel: +(39) 06 570 50170	IPPC Secretariat	Avetik.Nersisyan@fao.org
Ms Karen ROUEN IPPC Secretariat	IPPC Secretariat	Karen@karenrouen.com

Appendix 4: Proposed Amendments to ISPMs (for noting by the Standards Committee and archiving by the Secretariat for future revision of these ISPMs)

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

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

Appendix 5: TPG Work Plan 2020-2021

(Prepared by the Secretariat, last updated 2020-02-04)

[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 **November-December 2020. Tentative deadline for submitting meeting documents is 1 October 2020.**

TABLE 1 - REGULAR TASKS

Regular tasks		Detailed task	Responsible	Deadline	Comments
1. Meeting reports: preparation and update to SC	November 2019	Draft report to Steward, Chairperson and rapporteur	Secretariat	2020-01-15	
		Steward, Chairperson and rapporteur send back draft report	Steward, Chair & rapporteur	2020-01-22	
		Secretariat finalizes report and sends to TPG	Secretariat	2020-01-25	
		TPG reviews report and send comments	All	2020-02-05	
		Final report	Secretariat	2020-02-12	(To allow review in Secretariat)
	Update for SC May 2020	Prepare update (incl. decisions) from November 2019 meeting for SC May 2020	Secretariat with stewards	2020-03-16	Secretariat to draft; steward to respond by 23/03 tent.
2. Draft ISPMs in 1st consultation (except Amendments, see 3)	Going to SC-7 / 2 nd consultation	Terms and consistency comments extracted. (tentative: PRM, Audits, revISPM12, PTs)	Secretariat	2020-10-05	
		Review for possible inconsistencies and consideration of comments	All	at TPG meeting	
		Reactions to comments/consistency review integrated in tables: all drafts, and send to stewards via Secretariat	Secretariat with stewards	2020-12-05	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.

Regular tasks	Detailed task	Responsible	Deadline	Comments
				responses to comments and revised draft)
	Check accuracy of translation of definitions in draft ISPMs and propose translations for Chinese, Arabic and Russian	French, Spanish Russian, Chinese, Arabic	2020-12-05	These will be submitted to translation-services when drafts go for translation before CPM
3. Terms and definitions (incl. Amendments to the Glossary)	2019 Amendments Volunteers sends draft meeting papers to Secretariat	ALL, as allocated in Table 3	2018-10-01	TPG 2018
	Draft 2019 Amendments compiled based on discussions at TPG 2018-12	Secretariat and steward	2018-12-21	Back to Secretariat by 2019-01-10
	TPG members' help to translate new terms proposed for the draft amendments in languages for the List of topics (LOT)	Secretariat	TPG meeting	
	Draft 2019 Amendments finalized	ALL	2019-01-26	
	Amendments processed for SC	Secretariat	2019-02-17	Posting deadline for SC May 2019 is 1 March
	Draft amendments to 1st Consultation		2020-07 to 09	1 st consultation postponed to 2020
	Draft amendments and 1st Cons. comments reviewed		TPG 2020	
	Finalize amendments and responses	Secretariat and steward	2020-12-21	Back to Secretariat by 2020-01-09
	Amendments and responses for TPG comments	ALL	2021-01-28	Draft Amendments and responses to compiled comments to be posted by 1 March for SC-7 / 2 nd Cons.
	Check accuracy of translation of definitions in draft ISPMs and propose translations for Chinese, Arabic and Russian	French, Spanish Russian, Chinese, Arabic	2021-01-28	These will be submitted to translation-services when drafts go for translation before CPM

Regular tasks	Detailed task	Responsible	Deadline	Comments
	Draft amendments in 2 nd Consultation		2021-07 to 09	
	Consultation by email on 2 nd Cons. comments	ALL	TBD, in 2021-10	If Steward feels consultation is needed. The draft Amendments and responses to 2 nd 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 2022-01	The translations will be ready for review around the beginning of January and must be posted by 1 March for CPM.
2020 Amendments	Volunteers sends draft meeting papers to Secretariat	ALL, as allocated in Table 3	2019-10-01	TPG 2019
	Draft 2020 Amendments compiled based on discussions at TPG 2019-11	Secretariat and steward	2019-12-21	Back to Secretariat by 2020-01-10
	TPG members' help to translate new terms proposed for the draft amendments in languages for the List of topics (LOT)	Secretariat	TPG meeting	
	Draft 2020 Amendments finalized	ALL	2020-01-26	
	Amendments processed for SC	Secretariat	2020-02-17	Posting deadline for SC May 2020 is 1 March
	Draft amendments to 1st Consultation		2020-07 to 09	
	Draft amendments and 1st Cons. comments reviewed		TPG 2020	
	Finalize amendments and responses	Secretariat and steward	2020-12-21	Back to Secretariat by 2020-01-09
	Amendments and responses for TPG comments	ALL	2021-01-28	Draft Amendments and responses to compiled comments to be posted by

Regular tasks	Detailed task	Responsible	Deadline	Comments
				1 March for SC-7 / 2 nd Cons.
	Check accuracy of translation of definitions in draft ISPMs and propose translations for Chinese, Arabic and Russian	French, Spanish Russian, Chinese, Arabic	2021-01-28	These will be submitted to translation-services when drafts go for translation before CPM
	Draft amendments in 2 nd Consultation		2021-07 to 09	
	Consultation by email on 2 nd Cons. comments	ALL	TBD, in 2021-10	If Steward feels consultation is needed. The draft Amendments and responses to 2 nd 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 2022-01	The translations will be ready for review around the beginning of January and must be posted by 1 March for CPM.
2021 Amendments	Volunteers sends draft meeting papers to Secretariat	ALL, as allocated in Table 3	2020-10-02	TPG 2020
	Draft 2018 Amendments compiled based on discussions at TPG 2017-12	Secretariat and steward	2020-12-21	Back to Secretariat by 2021-01-10
	TPG members' help to translate new terms proposed for the draft amendments in languages for the List of topics (LOT)	Secretariat	TPG meeting	N/A
	Draft 2018 Amendments finalized	ALL	2021-01-26	
	Amendments processed for SC	Secretariat	2021-02-17	Posting deadline for SC May 2021 is 1 March
	Draft amendments to 1st Consultation		2021-07 to 09	
	Draft amendments and 1st Cons. comments reviewed		TPG 2021	

Regular tasks		Detailed task	Responsible	Deadline	Comments
		Finalize amendments and responses	Secretariat and steward	2021-12-21	Back to Secretariat by 2021-01-09
		Amendments and responses for TPG comments	ALL	2022-01-28	Draft Amendments and responses to compiled comments to be posted by 1 March for SC-7 / 2 nd Cons.
		Check accuracy of translation of definitions in draft ISPMs and propose translations for Chinese, Arabic and Russian	French, Spanish Russian, Chinese, Arabic	2022-01-28	These will be submitted to translation-services when drafts go for translation before CPM
		Draft amendments in 2 nd Consultation		2022-07 to 09	
		Consultation by email on 2 nd Cons. comments	ALL	in 2022-10	If Steward feels consultation is needed. The draft Amendments and responses to 2 nd 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 2023-01	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, last published in March 2019)	2019 (intermediate)	To prepare intermediate update based on TPG comments, outcomes of CPM 2019, SC May 2019	Beatriz Melcho	2019-06-15	
		To review intermediate update	All	2019-06-30	
	2020 (intermediate)	To prepare intermediate update based on TPG comments, outcomes of TPG 2019, including updates from SC Nov. 2019, CPM 2020, SC May 2020	Beatriz Melcho	After SC 2020-05	All to review / provide comments by end June 2020
	2021 (intermediate)	To prepare intermediate update based on TPG comments, outcomes of TPG 2020, including updates from SC Nov. 2020, CPM 2021, SC May 2021	Beatriz Melcho	After SC 2021-05	All to review / provide comments by end June 2021
	2022 (for publishing)	To prepare update based on TPG comments, outcomes of TPG 2021, including updates from SC Nov. 2021.	Beatriz Melcho	2022-02-15	All to review / provide comments during TPG 2021 meeting

Regular tasks	Detailed task	Responsible	Deadline	Comments
	To review update	All	TPG meeting	To be approved by SC via e-decision asap in 2022.
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	2020-10-01	
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
8. Other tasks	General recommendations on consistency: yearly updates as needed	Secretariat with stewards	2020-01-07	
	General recommendations on consistency	ALL	2020-01-28	Appended to TPG report
	Review the draft explanatory document on ISPM 16 (Regulated non-quarantine pests: concept and application):	Beatriz Melcho	2019-10-01	For discussion at the TPG 2019-12 meeting

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 SC / 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) (2017-001)	To CPM-15 2020	Shaza Roshdy Omar	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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. - SC 2017-05 added “bulbs and tubers (as a commodity class)” to the LOT. - TPG 2017-12 proposed deletion in the 2018 Amendments. - SC 2018-05 agreed with TPG proposal for deletion and approved it for the first consultation. - TPG 2018-12 discussed first consultation comments and left their proposal for deletion unchanged. - SC-7 2019-05 agreed with TPG proposal for deleting and approved for 2nd consultation -SC -2019-11 agreed with deletion and approved for CPM 15 for adoption as 2018 Amendments to ISPM 5
2.	clearance (of a consignment) (2018-045)	To SC May 2020	Asenath Abigael Koech	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -TPG 2018-12 proposed to add to the LOT following discussions on the definition of inspection. - SC 2019-05 added to LOT -TPG 2019-11 proposed the revision to be presented to SC May 2020 as a draft 2020 Amendments to ISPM 5
3.	commodity class (2015-013)	To CPM-15 2020	Andrei Orlinski	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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. - SC 2017-05 noted that the TPG will consider further the term “commodity class” in combination with the review of the different commodity classes included in the Glossary. - TPG 2017-12 proposed deletion in the 2018 Amendments. - SC 2018-05 agreed with TPG proposal for deletion and approved it for the first consultation. - TPG 2018-12 discussed first consultation comments and left their proposal for deletion unchanged. - SC-7 2019-05 agreed with TPG proposal and approved for 2nd consultation

Term	Status	Lead	Comments & next steps
			-SC -2019-11 agreed with deletion and approved for CPM 15 for adoption as 2018 Amendments to ISPM 5
4. cut flowers and branches (as a commodity class) (2012-007)	To CPM-15 2020	Laurence Bouhot-Delduc	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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. - SC 2017-05 removed the pending status of “cut flowers and branches (as a commodity class)”. - TPG 2017-12 proposed deletion in the 2018 Amendments. - SC 2018-05 agreed with TPG proposal for deletion and approved it for the first consultation. - TPG 2018-12 discussed first consultation comments and left their proposal for deletion unchanged. - SC-7 2019-05 agreed with TPG proposal for deleting and approved for 2nd consultation -SC 2019-11 agreed with deletion and approved for CPM 15 for adoption as 2018 Amendments to ISPM 5
5. detection survey (consequential to the revision of “survey” (2013-015))	To 1 st Consultation 2020	Laurence Bouhot-Delduc	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SC-7 2018-05 asked the TPG to consider whether the definition of “detection survey” should be amended to include “or absence”. - TPG 2018-12 discussed the term and proposed revision in 2019 Amendments to ISPM5. - SC 2019-05 agreed with TPG proposal and approved it for first consultation, noting that the consultation would be postponed until 2020.
6. emergency action (2018-044)	To SC May 2020	Laurence Bouhot-Delduc	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -TPG 2018-12 proposed to add to the LOT following discussions on the definition of treatment. - SC 2019-05 added to LOT -TPG 2019-11 proposed the revision to be presented to SC May 2020 as a draft 2020 Amendments to ISPM 5
7. emergency measure	To SC May 2020	Rajesh Ramarathnam	- TPG 2019-11 invites the SC to add it to the work programme
8. emerging pest (2018-003)	To SC May 2019	Ebbe Nordbo	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SC 2018-05 considered proposal from TC-RPPOs and agreed to include the term in the TPG work programme - TPG 2018-12 TPG proposed a draft definition of “emerging pest” – for SC to consider future steps.

Term	Status	Lead	Comments & next steps
			- SC 2018-05 considered TPG proposal and agreed to not send the definition for consultation for inclusion in ISPM 5 at this time. Discussions on the topic were forwarded to CPM Bureau as input into the wider discussion on the concept of “emerging pests”.
9. fruits and vegetables (as a commodity class) (2017-003)	To CPM-15 2020	Andrei Orlinski	- 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. - SC 2017-05 added “fruits and vegetables (as a commodity class)” to the LOT. - TPG 2017-12 proposed deletion in the 2018 Amendments. - SC 2018-05 agreed with TPG proposal for deletion and approved it for the first consultation. - TPG 2018-12 discussed first consultation comments and left their proposal for deletion unchanged. - SC-7 2019-05 agreed with TPG proposal for deleting and approved it for 2 nd consultation - SC -2019-11 agreed with deletion and approved for CPM 15 for adoption as 2018 Amendments to ISPM 5
10. general surveillance (2018-046)	To TPG 2020	Beatriz Melcho	-TPG 2018-12 proposed to add to the LOT following discussions on the note on “surveillance” in the Annotated Glossary. - SC 2019-05 added to LOT TPG 2019-11 agreed to continue working on term
11. germplasm	To SC May2020	Abigael Koech	- TPG 2019-11 invites the SC to add it to the work programme
12. grain (as a commodity class) (2017-004)	To CPM-15 2020	Laurence Bouhot-Delduc	- 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. - SC 2017-05 added “grain (as a commodity class)” to the LOT. - TPG 2017-12 proposed a revision of the term in the 2018 Amendments. - SC 2018-05 agreed with TPG proposal (no change) and approved it for the first consultation. - TPG 2018-12 discussed first consultation comments and left their proposal unchanged. - SC-7 2019-05 agreed with TPG proposal and approved it for 2 nd consultation -SC 2019-11 agreed with proposed revision and approved for CPM 15 for adoption as 2018 Amendments to ISPM 5
13. identity (2011-001)	Pending Focused revision of ISPM 12	Ebbe Nordbo	- 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. - TPG 2012 suggested an approach, but asked SC to validate before further work. - SC 2013-05 agreed (see TPG 2012-10 report and SC 2013-05 report). - TPG 2014 discussed and incorporated into Amendments (2014). - SC 2014-05 withdrew from Amendments (2014) for TPG to reconsider <i>identity</i> , <i>integrity (of a consignment)</i> , <i>phytosanitary security (of a consignment)</i> and section 6.1 of ISPM 12 be reviewed together, and possibly propose revised definitions of the terms and possible consistency changes to section 6.1 of ISPM 12.

Term	Status	Lead	Comments & next steps
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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). - 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. - 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. - 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). - Secretariat suggesting to wait with further work pending revision of ISPM 12 (SC not made pending). - CPM-11 (2016) approved the addition of the <i>Revision of ISPM 12 on Phytosanitary certificates</i> (2015-011), with priority 2. The draft specification will be submitted to consultation in July 2017. - SC 2017-11 agreed to review the comments and consider the draft specification by SC e-decision. - SC approved Specification 67: <i>Focused revision of ISPM 12 (Phytosanitary certificates) in relation to re-export</i> by e-decision (2018_eSC_May_03). -TPG 2019-11 TPG Steward and TPG Assistant Steward prepared discussion paper for EWG on sections 4 and 6 of ISPM 12 and agreed to continue working on term
14.	incidence (2018-010)	To SC May 2020	Laurence Bouhot-Delduc <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Topic submitted during 2018 joint call for topics: standards and implementation to revise the definition of the term "incidence" and define the term "prevalence" as their meaning can be confused in epidemiological and phytosanitary context. - SC 2018-11 discussed TFT recommendation and noted that these terms had been discussed in depth previously. SC agreed to include the term "incidence" in TPG work programme and requested the TPG consider deleting it from the Glossary and using the dictionary definition of incidence and prevalence in ISPMs. TPG 2019-11 agreed to proposed to SC May 2020 deletion as a draft 2020 Amendments to ISPM 5
15.	inspection (2017-005)	To TPG 2020	Rajesh Ramarathnam <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - TPG 2016-12 invited the SC to consider if inspection should be revised to adequately reflect current inspection practices that may also include examination methods other than visual and if so add this term to the LOT. - SC 2017-05 added "inspection" to the LOT. - TPG 2017-12 proposed a revision of the term in the 2018 Amendments. - SC 2018-05 discussed TPG proposal and agreed to further consider this term in an SC e-forum. - 2018_eSC_Nov_01: SC decided that the term requires further discussion during SC November 2018 and TPG 2018-12. - TPG 2018-12 discussed the term and agreed to continue discussion during TPG 2019 based on current TPG working definition to potentially include meaning as in ISPM23. TPG 2019-11 agreed to continue working on it
16.	integrity (of a consignment) consequential)	Pending Focused revision of ISPM 12 (consequential)	Ebbe Nordbo (see identity) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - See <i>identity</i>. - SC 2014-05 withdrew from Amendments (2014). - TPG to reconsider. - 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).

	Term	Status	Lead	Comments & next steps
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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. - 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. - 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. - CPM-11 (2016) approved the addition of the <i>Revision of ISPM 12 on Phytosanitary certificates</i> (2015-011), with priority 2. The draft specification will be submitted to consultation in July 2017. - SC 2017-11 agreed to review the comments and consider the draft specification by SC e-decision. - SC approved Specification 67: <i>Focused revision of ISPM 12 (Phytosanitary certificates) in relation to re-export</i> by e-decision (2018_eSC_May_03). -TPG 2019-11 TPG Steward and TPG Assistant Steward prepared discussion paper for EWG on sections 4 and 6 of ISPM 12 and agreed to continue working on term
17.	phytosanitary action	To SC May 2020	Rajesh Ramarathnam	TPG 2019-11 invites the SC to add it to the work programme
18.	phytosanitary procedure	To SC May 2020	Rajesh Ramarathnam	TPG 2019-11 invites the SC to add it to the work programme
19.	phytosanitary security (of a consignment) (2013-008)	Pending Focused revision of ISPM 12	Ebbe Nordbo	<p>See identity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - TPG 2012, added SC 2013-05. Details in TPG 2012-10 report. - SC 2013-05 added term to List of topics. - TPG 2014 incorporated to Amendments (2014). - SC 2014-05 withdrew from Amendments (2014). - TPG to reconsider. - 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). - 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. - 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. - 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. - CPM-11 (2016) approved the addition of the <i>Revision of ISPM 12 on Phytosanitary certificates</i> (2015-011), with priority 2. The draft specification will be submitted to consultation in July 2017. - SC 2017-11 agreed to review the comments and consider the draft specification by SC e-decision. - SC approved Specification 67: <i>Focused revision of ISPM 12 (Phytosanitary certificates) in relation to re-export</i> by e-decision (2018_eSC_May_03). -TPG 2019-11 TPG Steward and TPG Assistant Steward prepared discussion paper for EWG on sections 4 and 6 of ISPM 12 and agreed to continue working on term

Term	Status	Lead	Comments & next steps
20. plants <i>in vitro</i> (as a commodity class) (2017-006)	To CPM-15 2020	Shaza Roshdy Omar	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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. - SC 2017-05 added “plants <i>in vitro</i> (as a commodity class)” to the LOT. - TPG 2017-12 proposed deletion in the 2018 Amendments. - SC 2018-05 agreed with TPG proposal for deletion and approved it for the first consultation. - TPG 2018-12 discussed first consultation comments and left their proposal for deletion unchanged. - SC-7 2019-05 agreed with TPG proposal for deleting and approved it for 2nd consultation -SC -2019-11 agreed with deletion and approved for CPM 15 for adoption as 2018 Amendments to ISPM 5
21. provisional measure	To SC May 2020	Rajesh Ramarathnam	TPG 2019-11 invites the SC to add it to the work programme
22. quarantine area (2012-006)	To SC May 2019	Laurence Bouhot-Delduc	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - TPF 2011. - SC 2012-04 added. - To be considered based on a draft revised definition proposed by the TPF. - TPG 2012-2013 considered definition, but proposed it should be postponed until ISPM 8 is revised. (details in TPG 2012 and 2013 reports). - SC 2013-05 changed the status to pending until after the revision of ISPM 8 (Determination of pest status in an area). - SC 2018-05 changed the status to active as the revision of ISPM8 was approved for first consultation. - TPG 2018-12 discussed, suggests no change but recommends retaining on LOT until revision of ISPM8 is adopted. - SC 2019-05 agreed with TPG proposal
23. seeds (as a commodity class) (2017-007)	To CPM-15 2020	Laurence Bouhot-Delduc	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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. - SC 2017-05 added “seeds (as a commodity class)” to the LOT. - TPG 2017-12 proposed a revision of the term in the 2018 Amendments. - SC 2018-05 agreed with TPG proposal (no change) and approved it for the first consultation. - TPG 2018-12 discussed first consultation comments and left their proposal unchanged. - SC-7 2019-05 agreed with TPG proposal and approved it for 2nd consultation -SC 2019-11 agreed with proposed revision and approved for CPM 15 for adoption as 2018 Amendments to ISPM 5
24. specific surveillance (2018-047)	To TPG 2020	Beatriz Melcho	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -TPG 2018-12 proposed to add to the LOT following discussions on the note on “surveillance” in the Annotated Glossary. - SC 2019-05 added to LOT - TPG 2019-11 agreed to continue working on it

Term	Status	Lead	Comments & next steps
25. surveillance	To SC May 2020	Beatriz Melcho	- TPG 2019-11 agreed to recommend to SC to add it to the work programme
26. treatment (2017-008)	To CPM-15 2020	Stephanie Bloem	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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. - SC 2017-05 added "treatment" to the LOT as proposed by TPG. - TPG 2017-12 proposed a revision of the term in the 2018 Amendments. - SC 2018-05 agreed with TPG proposal (no change) and approved it for the first consultation. - TPG 2018-12 discussed first consultation comments and left their proposal unchanged. - SC-7 2019-05 agreed with TPG proposal and approved it for 2nd consultation -SC 2019-11 agreed with proposed revision and approved for CPM 15 for adoption as 2018 Amendments to ISPM 5
27. wood (as a commodity class) (2017-009)	To CPM-15 2020	Andrei Orlinski	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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. - SC 2017-05 added "wood (as a commodity class)" to the LOT. - TPG 2017-12 proposed a revision of the term in the 2018 Amendments. - SC 2018-05 agreed with TPG proposal (no change) and approved it for the first consultation. - TPG 2018-12 discussed first consultation comments and modified the definition to exclude "rattan". - SC-7 2019 agreed with TPG proposal and approved it for 2nd consultation -SC 2019-11 agreed with proposed revision and approved for CPM 15 for adoption as 2018 Amendments to ISPM 5
Related to consistency			
28. 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"> - TPG discussion 2009. - Modified SC November 2010. - Consistent with general recommendations on consistency, but require a review of every occurrence. Will be considered during consistency study.
29. commodity class (consistency review; 2018-004)	To CPM-15 2020	Andrei Orlinski	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - TPG 2017-12 discussed the term "commodity class" and proposed its deletion in the 2018 Amendments. TPG 2017-12 also proposed to review adopted standards to avoid the use of the term "commodity class", for instance by deleting it or replacing it with "commodity". - SC 2018-05 agreed with TPG proposal and added this consistency review to the TPG work programme. - TPG 2018-12 proposed ink amendments to adopted ISPMs for approval by SC. - SC 2019-05 approved the ink amendments that will be processed for CPM noting.

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
2019-11-18 to 20			TPG meeting
2020-01-15	3. Terms and defs	Language leads	Check of translations of draft 2018 Amendments to ISPM5 going for adoption
N/A	2. ISPMs from 1 st cons.	Language leads	Check accuracy of translations of draft ISPMs from first consultation, and for terms and definitions of draft 2019 Amendments to ISPM5 check translations in Fr and Es and propose translations in Ar, Ru and Zh (via email to Secretariat)
2020-01-28	3. Terms and defs	ALL	Review draft 2020 Amendments to ISPM5 following TPG 2019-11 meeting and provide comments in track changes
2020-01-29	1. Meeting reports	ALL	Review report of TPG 2019-11 meeting and provide comments in track changes
2020-01-29	8. Other tasks	ALL	Review general recommendations on consistency for inclusion in the 2020 version of the IPPC Style guide
2020-06-30	4. Ann. Gloss.	ALL	Comment on 2020 intermediate version of Annotated Glossary
2020-06-30	8. Other tasks	ALL	Provide comments on the draft explanatory document on ISPM 16 (Regulated non-quarantine pests: concept and application) to Beatriz
2020-10-01	3. Terms and defs		
2020-10-01	8. Other tasks		
2020-10-01	5. Explanation of glossary terms	ALL	Identify terms that need explanation (and which are not explained elsewhere) and provide a paper for TPG 2019 meeting.
2020-12 XX-			TPG meeting