



***REPORT***

Rome, Italy  
4-5 November 2011

# **Technical panel for the Glossary November, 2011**



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



## CONTENTS

1. Welcome and opening of the meeting .....	5
2. Reports.....	5
2.1 Previous meeting of the TPG (Oct. 2010).....	5
2.2 Extracts from other meeting reports of relevance to the TPG (SC Nov 2010, CPM-6, SC May 2011) .....	5
3. Review relating to Draft ISPMs Sent for Member Consultation in 2011 .....	5
3.1 Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms) (1994-001).....	5
3.2 Revision to ISPM 5 Glossary of phytosanitary terms Supplement 1 (official control, not widely distributed) (2005-008).....	6
3.3 Annex 4 Pest risk analysis for plants as quarantine pests (2005-001) to ISPM 11:2004 and consequential core text changes to ISPM 11:2004.....	7
3.4 Other drafts under member consultation .....	8
4. Consideration of New or Revised Terms/Definitions.....	8
4.1 Subjects already on the TPG work programme.....	8
4.2 Advice on new or revised terms in other recent draft standards i.e. those going out for consultation next year .....	8
4.3 Other terms and definitions as proposed by various bodies .....	8
5. Review of ISPMs for Consistency of Terms and Style .....	9
6. Annotated Glossary: 2010 Version and 2011 Amendments.....	9
7. Explanation of Glossary Terms .....	9
8. Review of Durations of Record Keeping in ISPMs.....	9
9. Terminology of the Montreal Protocol in Relation to the Glossary .....	9
10. TPG Activities in Relation to Languages .....	9
11. Development of Brief Guidance on the Use of <i>should, shall, must</i> and <i>may</i> for the IPPC Style Guide for ISPMs.....	11
12. Work Plan and Medium Term Plans for the TPG .....	11
13. Membership of the TPG .....	12
14. Other issues.....	12
14.1 ISO standard on definitions.....	12
15. Date and venue of the next meeting .....	12
16. Other business.....	12
17. Close.....	12
ANNEX 1 – ANNOTATED AGENDA.....	13
ANNEX 2 – DOCUMENTS LIST.....	16
ANNEX 3 – PARTICIPANTS LIST .....	18
ANNEX 4 - Compiled comments and TPG responses: Amendments to ISPM 5 <i>Glossary of phytosanitary terms</i> .....	20
ANNEX 5. AMENDMENTS TO ISPM 5 .....	41
ANNEX 6 - Compiled comments and TPG responses: Revised Supplement 1 to ISPM 5 .....	48

ANNEX 7 – SUPPLEMENT 1 TO ISPM 5.....82

ANNEX 8 - TPG RESPONSES TO SOME MEMBER COMMENTS ON DRAFTS FOR  
MEMBER CONSULTATION: PRA FOR PLANTS AS QUARANTINE PESTS  
(CONSISTENCY ONLY).....87

ANNEX 9 - DRAFT WORK PLAN 2011-2012.....89

## **1. Welcome and opening of the meeting**

The Secretariat welcomed members of the Technical panel for the Glossary (TPG) to Rome, and thanked them for participating in this special meeting. Resources were not available to fund participants, and consequently Mr Mohammad KATBEH-BADER (Jordan) had been unable to attend the meeting. It was also noted that the member for the Chinese language, Mr Yuxi WANG (China), had recently resigned.

A brief introduction of the roles of technical panels (TP) participants was given. The TPG adopted the agenda (Annex 1). The documents list (Annex 2), participants list (Annex 3) and local information were presented.

Mr John HEDLEY (New Zealand) was selected as Chairperson and Mr Ebbe NORDBO (Denmark) as rapporteur.

The meeting lasted two days instead of the usual five days. Many agenda items could not be discussed due to lack of time and are deferred to the next meeting. Agenda items and corresponding documents are nevertheless listed in the present report. The Secretariat included brief notes under some of these agenda items, to help the preparation of the next meeting.

## **2. Reports**

### **2.1 Previous meeting of the TPG (Oct. 2010)<sup>1</sup>**

### **2.2 Extracts from other meeting reports of relevance to the TPG (SC Nov 2010, CPM-6, SC May 2011)<sup>2</sup>**

These agenda items were not discussed.

## **3. Review relating to Draft ISPMs Sent for Member Consultation in 2011**

The TPG normally reviews member comments on terminology for all draft ISPMs sent for consultation, and makes recommendations on consistency in the use of terms in those drafts. At the present meeting, because of limited time, the TPG focused on member comments made on the *Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms, 1991-001)* and on the *draft revision to Supplement 1 to ISPM 5 on Guidelines for the interpretation and application of the concepts of official control and not widely distributed (2005-008)*. Only one of the other draft ISPMs under member consultation was reviewed.

### **3.1 Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms)<sup>3</sup> (1994-001)**

The TPG reviewed member comments and modified the draft *Amendments to ISPM 5*. The draft amendments and responses to member comments will be finalized by the Secretariat and the TPG steward, and be presented to the SC immediately after the present meeting. The TPG recommendations on member comments are detailed in Annex 4 and the resulting draft *Amendments to ISPM 5* is attached as Annex 5.

In particular, the term *confinement* and its definition were changed. This term has a general usage and a specific usage and the definition as intended applies to specific usage where phytosanitary measures are applied. Consequently, the term was changed to *confinement (of a regulated article)* and, in the definition, *official* measures was changed to *phytosanitary* measures. Another substantial proposal arising from member comments was to maintain the proposal to delete the term *plant pest* and its

---

<sup>1</sup> 2011\_TPG\_05

<sup>2</sup> 2011\_TPG\_13

<sup>3</sup> 2011\_TPG\_06, 2011\_TPG\_19

definition, but to propose a consequential change to the definition of *pest* in order to note that, in the IPPC, *plant pest* is sometimes used for the term *pest*.

In addition, to the proposals detailed in Annex 4, the following issues have an impact on the TPG work plan:

- Proposed definition for *exclusion*. The TPG maintained its opinion that it would be useful to have a definition for *exclusion*, in parallel with *containment*, *suppression*, *control* and *eradication*, which are already defined. However, in view of the member comments, it suggested that the definition for *exclusion* is reconsidered in association with the revision of the definitions above at a later date. The proposed definition of *exclusion* was consistent with the definitions for these other terms, while recognizing that these needed to be revised. Consequently if the definition of *exclusion* was adopted, it would need to be revised immediately afterwards. Two specific issues that will need to be considered are: to use *phytosanitary measures* instead of *official measures* in the definitions; to consider whether the term should apply to a pest (i.e. *exclusion (of a pest)*).
- Proposed revision of *consignment in transit*. Several comments wished to retain the old definition with the wording “(and that may be subject to phytosanitary measures)”, while the TPG generally supported the deletion of this wording as it expresses requirements. In view of the comments received, the TPG suggested that the revised definition needed further consideration in parallel with the definition of *re-export (of a consignment)* (already on the work programme). Possible deletion of these terms would also be considered. The Secretariat noted that *consignment in transit* is not on the *List of topics for IPPC standards*, although it had been sent for member consultation, and needed to be added.
- Proposed deletion of *hitch-hiker pest*. The TPG maintained its proposal that the term *hitch-hiker* and its definition (see *contaminating pest*) be deleted. However, the current definition of a *contaminating pest* is limited to a pest carried on a commodity, and does not express the idea normally associated with a hitch-hiker pest. The TPG proposed that the definition of *contaminating pest* be revised to more fully reflect the concept of hitch-hiking for the movement of pests, extending it beyond a pest being carried by a commodity.

- (1) Redrafted *Amendments to ISPM 5* and responses to member comments will be transmitted to the SC immediately after this meeting.
- (2) The SC will be invited to:
  - . note that the definition of *exclusion* will be reconsidered in association with those of *containment*, *suppression*, *control*, *eradication* (already on the work programme) and the definition of *consignment in transit* in association with that for *re-export of a consignment* (already on the work programme)
  - . add *contaminating pest* as a subject to the *List of topics for IPPC standards* - note that *consignment in transit* will be added as a subject to the *List of topics for IPPC standards* (previously forgotten although part of *Amendments to ISPM 5*).

### 3.2 Revision to ISPM 5 Glossary of phytosanitary terms Supplement 1 (official control, not widely distributed)<sup>4</sup> (2005-008)

The Secretariat recalled that the steward for this draft was not a TPG member (Ms Julie ALIAGA, USA). However, the TPG was requested to review the draft and member comments as it had previously been requested by the SC to integrate the text on not widely distributed into the Supplement 1 to ISPM 5. The steward of this draft ISPM had already reviewed member comments and had sent a revised draft ISPM with her responses to member comments. The TPG reviewed and modified her proposals (draft ISPM and responses to member comments). The modified revision of Supplement 1 and responses to member comments will be finalized by the Secretariat and the TPG steward,

<sup>4</sup> 2011\_TPG\_07REV1, 2011\_TPG\_25, 2011\_TPG\_20REV1

discussed with the steward of the supplement and presented to the SC immediately. The combined steward-TPG responses to member comments are given in Annex 6 and the draft for SC in Annex 7.

In addition to the issues mentioned in the responses to comments, there was a discussion on how the concept of “endangered area” relates to “present but not widely distributed”, because the draft ISPM in several places implied that a pest that is not widely distributed may be present in an endangered area. One member noted that, when carrying out a Pest Risk Analysis (PRA), the endangered area is the area at risk of introduction of the pest, where it could establish and cause damage, but is not yet present; the current definition of *endangered area* is consistent with this. Having determined the *endangered area*, the *protected area* is then defined, i.e. where measures are applied to ensure protection of the endangered area. However, the definition of *quarantine pest*, as elaborated upon in the Supplement, implies that a pest that is present but not widely distributed may be present in the endangered area. The TPG noted that the current definition of *endangered area* therefore seems in contradiction with the definition of a *quarantine pest* and the revised supplement No. 1 to ISPM 5. If endangered areas are to be used in that way, the definitions of *endangered area* and *protected area* should be reviewed. In addition, these terms are widely used in ISPMs on PRA. These ISPMs should be reviewed to see with which understanding the terms *endangered area* and *protected area* had been used.

The TPG member with expertise in the Spanish language noted that the definition of *quarantine pest* in Spanish uses, for “not widely distributed” the words “no [está] extendida” and not “no [está] distribuida ampliamente” as in the revised Supplement 1, which expresses the concept more appropriately. This would cause problems in the understanding of the Supplement, and the definition of *quarantine pest* in Spanish should be amended. The Secretariat noted that this issue should be raised to the SC so that a proposal can be made.

- (3) The modified Supplement 1 to ISPM 5 and responses to member comments will be transmitted to the SC.
- (4) The SC will be invited to add *endangered area* and *protected area* to the *List of topics for IPPC standards*.
- (5) The issue of the definition of *quarantine pest* in Spanish will be raised in the SC.

### **3.3 Annex 4 Pest risk analysis for plants as quarantine pests (2005-001) to ISPM 11:2004 and consequential core text changes to ISPM 11:2004<sup>5</sup>**

The Secretariat had extracted some member comments relating to consistency in the use of terms. The recommendations made by the TPG (Annex 8) will be transmitted to the steward (and posted as a meeting document for the SC-7 meeting in May 2012).

One member noted that the lack of definitions, for instance for *location*, *intended*, *not intended*, *plant as pest*, *weed* and *invasive plant*, made understanding difficult. Another member (being also steward for the draft) explained that the new Annex dedicates a particular section to clarify the use of those terms, and this will need further revision to take into account member comments. However, the real challenge for the EWG and the steward had been to update the original core text of ISPM 11 to be in line with the current more comprehensive understanding of plants as pests. For that reason, the EWG had originally suggested that much of the original core text of ISPM 11 on plants should be removed from ISPM 11, rather than trying to adjust it, but some members of the SC had disagreed to this approach. It was noted that the terms *weed* and *invasive plant* had been intentionally avoided throughout the draft.

There was in particular a discussion on the use of the terms *habitat* and *location* in the draft ISPM, and the proposals from member comments that only *habitat* is used, or that *area* is used instead of *location*. One member noted that PRA is conducted for an area, i.e. PRA would define the risk of establishment for an area as a whole and not for individual locations in that area. However, other

---

<sup>5</sup> 2011\_TPG\_08, 2011\_TPG\_21

members (including the steward of the draft ISPM) acknowledged that the text attempts to highlight two different pest risks: one being that the plant may be able to establish in other habitats than the habitat where it was intentionally planted; the other being that the plant may spread to other geographical locations other than where it was intentionally planted. Several members (including the steward of the draft ISPM) noted that this distinction should be better explained in the text.

### **3.4 Other drafts under member consultation**

The TPG did not have time to review member comments on terms and the consistency in the use of terms for the draft standards listed below. It was noted that the TPG will not have input on these drafts for the stewards, SC-7 or SC, as the drafts will next be presented to the SC-7 in May 2102 (or to CPM for the diagnostic protocol and phytosanitary treatments).

- Revision of Annex 1 to ISPM 15 Approved treatments associated with wood packaging material (2006-011)
- Annex to ISPM 27:2006 *Trogoderma granarium* (2004-006)
- Annex to ISPM 28:2007 Vapour heat treatment of *Cucumis melo* var. *reticulatus* for *Bactrocera cucurbitae* (2006-110)
- Annex to ISPM 28: 2007 Heat treatment of wood packaging material using dielectric heat (2007-114).

## **4. Consideration of New or Revised Terms/Definitions**

### **4.1 Subjects already on the TPG work programme**

This agenda item was discussed only as part of the work plan (agenda item 12 and Annex 9) in order to identify volunteers to develop proposals for the next meeting for terms already on the work programme or to be proposed for addition to the SC.

### **4.2 Advice on new or revised terms in other recent draft standards i.e. those going out for consultation next year**

This agenda item was not discussed. At its meeting in August 2011, the TPF had asked the TPG for input<sup>6</sup> on four terms and definitions (natural host, non-natural hosts, non-host, host status) in the draft ISPM *Protocol to determine host status of fruits and vegetables to fruit fly infestations (Tephritidae)* (2006-031). These terms and definitions had been discussed at the 2010 TPG meeting, proposals submitted to the TPF and consequently amended. The present meeting was the opportunity to review the definitions prior to member consultation, as the draft standard should normally be presented to the SC in May 2012. However, the TPG did not have time to discuss this agenda item, and will therefore review these terms only when the draft ISPM is back from member consultation.

### **4.3. Other terms and definitions as proposed by various bodies**

This agenda item was not discussed. The draft ISPM *Systems approaches for pest risk management of fruit flies* (2004-022) was revised at the 2011 May SC-7. The draft ISPM would be submitted to the SC in November 2011, for recommendation for adoption at CPM-7 (2012). In August 2011, as a result of its discussions in relation to several requests by the SC-7, the TPF had proposed a modification to the definition of *tolerance level (of a pest)*<sup>7</sup>. Because this impacted ISPM 5, this change was presented to the TPG for possible guidance to the SC in November 2011. This issue was not discussed due to lack of time. In discussing the outcome of the SC-7 and TPF in May 2012, the SC will decide what to do with the proposed revised definition.

---

<sup>6</sup> 2011\_TPG\_14

<sup>7</sup> 2011\_TPG\_18

## **5. Review of ISPMs for Consistency of Terms and Style**

This agenda item was discussed only as part of the work plan (agenda item 12 and Annex 9) to identify volunteers and deadlines for this task. The remaining ISPMs to be reviewed for consistency in the use of terms are ISPMs 5, 9, 16, 17, 20, 23, 25 and Supplement 2 to ISPM 5. Background documents were available as meeting documents for the present meeting (consistency amendments agreed to by CPM in March 2010 and March 2011<sup>8</sup>, general rules and process applied and general consistency changes<sup>9</sup>, proposals regarding ISPM 23 and 5<sup>10</sup> and additional considerations for ISPMs 20, 23 and 25<sup>11</sup>). The Secretariat will provide support to the new members as needed.

## **6. Annotated Glossary: 2010 Version and 2011 Amendments**

The annotated Glossary, version 2, was finalized at TPG 2010 and should be published shortly. The next version to be published should be finalized in 2013. Normally the TPG also considers at each meeting which revisions to the annotated glossary will be needed based on what happened since the last meeting (e.g. new or revised terms etc.). The TPG did not have time to discuss this issue, and intermediate amendments for 2011 and 2012 will be discussed at the next meeting. Deadlines for preparation were discussed as part of the work plan (Annex 9).

## **7. Explanation of Glossary Terms**

This is a standing agenda item for TPG meetings. Members identify before the meeting some glossary terms/definitions for which they would like further explanation (and not already explained in other places, such as the annotated glossary). The issues raised are then briefly discussed in the meeting, in order to see if further work is needed and should be recommended to the SC. This agenda item was not discussed, but deadlines were identified as part of the work plan.

## **8. Review of Durations of Record Keeping in ISPMs**

This agenda item was not discussed. The TPG in October 2010 had recommended to the SC that the durations for record keeping in ISPMs should be reviewed to determine whether they should be made consistent in all ISPMs. In May 2011, the SC had requested the TPG to perform this review and consider the need to make recommendations in this respect. This agenda item will be discussed at the next meeting (see work plan).

## **9. Terminology of the Montreal Protocol in Relation to the Glossary**

The SC in May 2011 reviewed the List of topics and recommended this topic be deleted. CPM-7 (2012) will consider the SC recommendation. A draft ISPM has been presented to the SC in May 2011, but the SC did not have time to review the draft and arranged for SC members to send comments to the steward, John HEDLEY (New Zealand). As the future of this draft ISPM is uncertain, no further work will be done but it is possible that the SC will consider it at a later date<sup>12</sup>.

## **10. TPG Activities in Relation to Languages**

The areas of activity of the TPG in relation to languages as per its current terms of reference, past experience, current standard setting procedures and other elements were presented by the Secretariat. A representative of the FAO translation services, Mr. Fernando SERVAN LOPEZ (Senior Programme Officer), participated in this discussion. The Secretariat emphasised that the Secretary is responsible for providing translations of ISPMs. The ultimate authority on translation is the FAO translation

---

<sup>8</sup> 2011\_TPG\_15

<sup>9</sup> annexes 13 and 14 in TPG 2010 report

<sup>10</sup> 2011\_TPG\_16, 2011\_TPG\_17, 2011\_TPG\_26

<sup>11</sup> 2011\_TPG\_26

<sup>12</sup> Secretariat note: The SC in November 2011 proposed this topic for deletion at CPM-7 (2012).

services, even if several groups intervene in the translation process. The following issues were raised during the discussion:

- One member enquired about member comments, for example substantive comments, made in another language. The Secretariat noted that, when these comments were not translation issues, they were forwarded to stewards. Comments in other languages are generally in Spanish or French. If stewards could not understand these comments, the Secretariat may provide assistance but this was subject to available resources.
- It was noted that the procedures for the language review groups (LRG) that review adopted ISPMs provides that the TPG member, with expertise in that language, should be invited to participate in the LRG. However, this has not been the case for all LRG this year.
- The TPG raised the issue of consistency. The TPG had been given a task in relation to the review of adopted standards to verify consistency in the use of terms. Significant progress has been made for English since the first meeting that had discussed this topic in June 2009, and ink amendments for several ISPMs were noted at CPM-5 and CPM-6. A similar attempt had been made for certain ISPMs in Spanish, but had not been pursued. No similar activity had been started for other languages. The TPG proposed that it may be time to address the issue of consistency of ISPMs in other languages and proposed that this issue be raised with the SC.
- One member noted that although FAO translators provide excellent translations and are professional translators, they should rely on and trust phytosanitary experts in relation to correct phytosanitary and technical terms. The representative of the FAO translation services acknowledged that LRG are a good mechanism to address this issue and improve the translations.
- In reaction to enquiries from one member, the TPG reconfirmed, and the representative of the FAO translation services agreed, that a translation should convey the correct meaning and not necessarily a word-by-word translation.
- LRG intervene only once the ISPMs are adopted. If resources were available, one member noted that it would be beneficial to involve the LRG prior to CPM, in order to improve the translations presented to CPM. The Secretariat noted that this point had implications not only of resources, but also of timing, as there is little time available between when the SC agrees to present an ISPM for adoption to CPM (in November) and when the ISPM needs to be posted in all languages prior to CPM (6 weeks prior to the meeting).
- One member suggested that the language versions of ISPMs adopted at CPM should be held back and not published until the version is modified by the LRGs is available. The Secretariat explained this was not the process and that CPM needed to note the LRG versions.
- One member proposed that a stronger cooperation could be created between the LRGs and the FAO translation service, by ensuring that a representative of the relevant FAO translation group attends regional workshops to review draft ISPMs where draft ISPMs are discussed in languages, in particular in Russian. The representative of FAO translation services noted that this had resource and planning implications, as in particular the FAO translation services plan their activities well in advance and often the dates for regional workshops are not known well in advance. The Secretariat also noted that the FAO translation services had expressed concerns about resources needed to liaise with LRGs and Secretariat if the volume of work increased.
- The Secretariat noted that funds were available for Russian translations through a special FAO Trust Fund until the end of 2012. It was planned to have all ISPMs translated in Russian, but it was not certain that enough resources would be provided to complete this task. Russian versions of ISPMs, when available, would also need to be presented to the CPM for adoption.
- The TPG member with expertise in the Russian language informed the TPG that the translation of the name of the IPPC into Russian was currently creating problems. In Russian countries, it has long been translated as “International plant protection and quarantine convention” as plant protection is separate from plant quarantine, and it was considered important that plant quarantine is reflected. If plant quarantine was not used in the name of the convention, as envisaged by FAO translation service, there were indications that some NPPOs would withdraw

from the European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization (EPPO) and give notice of denunciation of the IPPC. The Secretariat noted that this issue was currently being discussed by the FAO translation and legal services.

- (6) Recommendation will be made to the SC that it should address the issue of consistency in the use of terms in language versions others than English.
- (7) The SC will be asked to note the discussion above on TPG activities in relation to languages.

### **11. Development of Brief Guidance on the Use of *should*, *shall*, *must* and *may* for the IPPC Style Guide for ISPMs**

The SC in May 2011 agreed that the TPG develop brief guidance on the use of *should*, *shall*, *must* and *may* for the IPPC Style Guide. The TPG did not have time to discuss this issue. However, Mr Ian SMITH (EPPO) noted that the issue of the French translation of *should* was being raised. The current translation with the conditional tense *devrait* weakens the standards, and it should be recognized that shades of meaning expressed by *should* cannot be translated with only one tense in some languages. The Secretariat noted that France and EPPO had raised this of the French translation of *should* and it would be included on the agenda of CPM-7 (2012).

The TPG member with expertise in the Russian language noted that *should* and *must* are translated by the same word in Russian. The member with expertise in the Spanish language supported that *should* in English corresponds to a conditional in Spanish. The member with expertise in the French language however noted that *should* in English was a conditional, but not of choice, i.e. some actions that should be made in standards must be made if the standard is to be implemented.

It was agreed that the Secretariat will prepare brief guidance on the use of *should*, *shall*, *must* and *may* for the IPPC Style Guide for consideration by the TPG at its next meeting, taking into account decisions at CPM-1 (2006), further discussion and views at CPM-3 (2008) and possible new elements arising from CPM-7 (2012).

- (8) The Secretariat will develop a draft brief guidance on the use of *should*, *shall*, *must* and *may* for the IPPC Style Guide for the next meeting of the TPG.

### **12. Work Plan and Medium Term Plans for the TPG<sup>13</sup>**

The TPG reviewed and updated its 2011-2012 work plan based on the outcomes of SC November 2010, CPM-6, SC May 2011, and discussions at the present meeting. Volunteers and deadlines were identified for most tasks. The work plan is presented as Annex 9. It will be kept up-to-date and an updated version will be presented to the SC in May 2012.

In addition the SC in May 2011 had requested all TPs to review their medium term plans annually. The TPG did not have time to review its medium term plan as developed in October 2010, as it focused instead on developing a coherent work plan until the next meeting. The medium term plan will be considered at the next meeting.

The TPG also agreed to ask the SC to add *production site* to the list of terms on the work plan in order to develop a definition. Currently, 'production site' is mentioned within the definition of, 'place of production', but in an unclear manner and not defining its meaning.

- (9) The SC will be invited to:
- note the work plan (to be updated before the relevant SC meeting)
  - add *production site* as a subject to the *List of topics for IPPC standards*
  - note that the medium term plan will be reviewed at the next meeting.

<sup>13</sup> 2011\_TPG\_28, 2011\_TPG\_27

### **13. Membership of the TPG**

The terms of three TPG members expire in 2013. As requested by the SC in May 2011, the Secretariat and Chairperson of the SC will be proposing a strategy for membership to the SC in November 2011 in order to ensure some continuity of membership and some renewal. The proposed strategy was outlined by the Secretariat: renewing Mr John HEDLEY (New Zealand) as a member for an additional term (2013-2018); Mr Ian SMITH (EPPO) resigning as a member at the end of his current term in 2013, but continuing as invited expert with funding provided by EPPO; renewing the composition by calling for new members with expertise in: Arabic (to replace Mr Mohammad KATBEH BADER (Jordan) at the end of his term in 2013), French (to replace Mr Ian SMITH (EPPO) at the end of his term in 2013) and Chinese (as the previous member resigned in August 2011). TPG members considered that the strategy proposed was appropriate to maintain continuity and ensure renewal.

Under that agenda item, members are also expected to notify any expected change in membership, so that calls can be organized in good time. No such change was notified.

### **14. Other issues**

#### **14.1 ISO standard on definitions**

This agenda item was not discussed.

### **15. Date and venue of the next meeting**

The Secretariat informed the TPG that resources have been allocated to hold a TPG meeting in 2012. The meeting is tentatively planned on 15-19 October 2012 in FAO.

### **16. Other business**

No other issue was raised.

### **17. Close**

The Secretariat thanked the participants for their participation, and in reviewing member comments and consistency, also on a Saturday.

**ANNEX 1 – ANNOTATED AGENDA****MEETING OF THE TPG  
(4-5 NOVEMBER 2011) (09.30 –17.00 HRS)**

FAO headquarters, Canada room: A356/7

*Updated 28 Oct. 2011 (vers. 6)*

Note. Due to the short duration of the meeting and its main focus on the outcome of the member consultation 2011, the order below is proposed for agenda items. Some items will not be discussed and are deferred to a future meeting.

The meeting will deal with agenda items:  
1, 3, 2

Sufficient time will be saved at the end of the meeting to deal with the following agenda items (even briefly):  
10, 12, 13, 15

If time is available, the following items will be taken after agenda item 2 (in the order proposed below):  
4.2, 4.3, 6, 11, 5, 16

Note: The following agenda items will not be discussed and are deferred to the next meeting:  
4.1, 7, 8, 9, 14

<b>AGENDA ITEM</b>	<b>DOCUMENT NO.</b>
<b>1. Welcome and opening of the meeting</b>	
1.1 Meeting information (documents list, participants list) and logistics, local information	2011_TPG_02 2011_TPG_03 2011_TPG_04
1.2 Review and adoption of the agenda	2011_TPG_01
1.3 Introductions	-
<b>1.4</b> Brief presentation and roles (IPPC Secretariat, steward, rapporteur, chairperson)	-
<b>1.5</b> Selection of the Chairperson	-
<b>2. Reports</b>	
<b>2.1</b> Previous meeting of the TPG (Oct. 2010)	2011_TPG_05
<b>2.2</b> Extracts from other meeting reports of relevance to the TPG (SC Nov 2010, CPM-6, SC May 2011)	2011_TPG_13
<b>3. Review relating to draft ISPMs sent for member consultation in 2011</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amendments to ISPM 5 Glossary of phytosanitary terms</li> <li>• Revision to ISPM 5 Glossary of phytosanitary terms Supplement No. 1 (official control, not widely distributed)</li> <li>• Annex 4 Pest risk analysis for plants as quarantine pests to ISPM 11:2004 and consequential core text changes to ISPM 11:2004</li> <li>• Revision of Annex 1 to ISPM 15 Approved treatments associated with wood packaging material</li> <li>• Annex to ISPM 27:2006 <i>Trogoderma granarium</i></li> <li>• Annex to ISPM 28:2007 Vapour heat treatment of <i>Cucumis melo</i> var. <i>reticulatus</i> for <i>Bactrocera cucurbitae</i></li> <li>• Annex to ISPM 28: 2007 Heat treatment of wood packaging material using dielectric heat.</li> </ul>	

AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT NO.
<p><b>3.1</b> Review of country comments on new and revised terms The TPG will review country comments made on terms and definitions. Recommendations will be transmitted to stewards and the SC-7 (November 2010 or May 2011 as appropriate). The deadline for country comments is 30 September and the comments will be made available to the TPG only in October (or just before the meeting). When countries make requests for definitions for new terms, the TPG also considers the requests and make a recommendation for the SC to add, or not, these terms to the work programme. Volunteers for each term are also identified as needed during TPG meetings. The TPG will also review the French and Spanish translations of new and revised terms/definitions in the Amendments to the Glossary.</p>	2011_TPG_06 to 12 (draft ISPMs); 2011_TPG_19 to 24 (member comments)
<p><b>3.2</b> Review of draft ISPMs for consistency The TPG reviews draft ISPMs for member consultation for consistency in the use of terms. It makes recommendations, which are transmitted to the ISPMs' stewards and the SC-7/SC. Members should prepare in advance and come to the meeting with their proposals.</p>	
<p><b>3.3</b> Review of comments on the draft Supplement 1 to ISPM 5 Because the TPG was involved in the revision of Supplement 1 on official control and not widely distributed, it will review member comments. Suggestions will be addressed to the steward of this draft, Julie Aliaga (USA).</p>	2011_TPG_07REV1 , 2011_TPG_25, 2011_TPG_20REV1
<p><b>4. Consideration of new or revised terms/definitions</b></p>	
<p><b>4.1 Subjects already on the TPG work programme</b> The November 2010 and May 2011 SC agreed to subjects to be worked on by the TPG. Volunteers were identified at the last meeting for some terms (see 2011-TPG-XX). Other terms need volunteers and this will be discussed as part of the revised work plan in 3.2 above. Deferred to next meeting, only to be considered as part of the work plan.</p>	
<p><b>4.2 Advice on new or revised terms in other recent draft standards i.e. those going out for consultation next year</b> This point relates to draft terms and definitions proposed by expert drafting groups in new draft standards which would be presented to the SC in May 2012. The Secretariat will compile those already available.</p>	2011_TPG_14
<p><b>4.3. Other terms and definitions as proposed by various bodies</b> Between the SC May 2011 and the TPG 2011, some groups might ask for guidance on new definitions or make recommendations. The TPG will review the proposals and possibly make a proposal for the SC to decide whether to include these terms as subjects to the TPG work programme, and identify volunteers. So far, only one such proposal was made, by the TPF, and might be discussed at the meeting.</p>	2011_TPG_18
<p><b>5. Review of ISPMs for consistency of terms and style</b> The first batch of consistency amendments was agreed to by CPM in March 2010 and Amendments to ISPM 5 in March 2011. Some of the latter were rejected by the SC May 2011 and need to be reconsidered. The SC requested the TPG to continue work and agreed to a number of decisions. The ISPMs identified below on the list result from SC decisions. Review of some ISPMs will need to be allocated to TPG members (when considering the work plan). At this meeting, only proposals that are ready will be considered, i.e. ISPM 23, ISPM 5 (and possibly ISPM 20).</p>	
<p>5.1 Background document: consistency amendments agreed to by CPM-5 and CPM-6 (for info)</p>	2011_TPG_15
<p>5.2 Background documents: (as noted by SC) (for info) - general rules and process applied - general consistency changes</p>	See annexes 13 and 14 in TPG 2010 report
<p>5.3 Draft consistency tables (to be prepared in the appropriate format to go to SC)</p>	-
<p>ISPM 23 [Ebbe Nordbo]</p>	2011_TPG_16
<p>ISPM 5 (some proposals returned by the SC November 2011)</p>	2011_TPG_17
<p>ISPM 9, 16, 17, 25</p>	
<p>Additional issues to be considered in the review of consistency for ISPMs 23, 20, 25</p>	2011_TPG_26
<p><b>6. Annotated glossary: 2010 version and 2011 amendments</b> The annotated glossary, version 2, was finalized at TPG 2010 and should have been published at the time of the TPG meeting 2011. The next version should be finalized in 2013. Normally the TPG considers yearly which amendments need to be made. This year, only one aspect may be discussed (if available).</p>	

AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT NO.
<p>7. Explanation of glossary terms  <b>Note:</b> unless someone has a strong issue with this (in this case, please let me know), it will not be discussed at the TPG 2011 meeting.  This is now a standing agenda item for TPG meetings. Members should identify before the meeting some glossary terms/definitions requiring further explanations (and not already explained in other places, such as the annotated glossary). These terms/definitions will be discussed during the TPG meeting and explanations added to the annotated glossary as appropriate. In order to leave enough time for long-term members to think about explanations, members are required to send to Fabienne suggestions for terms to be explained by 30 July (not only term but also short statement on what is the issue with the definition). Process and document to be assembled for meeting will depend on what is received. –</p>	
<p><b>8. Review of durations of record keeping in ISPMs</b>  The TPG in October 2010 recommended to the SC that the durations for record keeping indicated in ISPMs should be reviewed in order to determine whether these durations should be made consistent in all ISPMs. In May 2011, the SC requested the TPG do perform this review and consider the need to make recommendations in this respect.</p>	
<p><b>9. Terminology of the Montreal Protocol in relation to the Glossary</b>  Pending further action. In May 2011, the SC did not have time to review the draft and SC members were invited to send comments to the steward (John Hedley). The draft will be reconsidered by the SC at a later date.</p>	
<p><b>10. TPG activities in relation to languages</b>  The areas of activity of the TPG in relation to languages as per its current terms of reference, past experience, current standard setting procedures and other elements will be listed by the Secretariat.</p>	
<p><b>11. Development of brief guidance on the use of “should”, “shall”, “must” and “may” for the IPPC Style Guide for ISPMs</b>  The SC May 2011 agreed that the TPG develop brief guidance on the use of “should”, “shall”, “must” and “may” for the IPPC Style Guide for ISPMs. The TPG will consider what was already in the IPPC Style Guide for ISPMs and agree on what should be done (and by who) before the next meeting.</p>	-
<p><b>12. Work plan and medium term plans for the TPG</b>  The TPG will review and update its 2011-2012 work plan as amended following SC November 2010, CPM-6, SC May 2011, and discussions at the meeting. The work plan will be updated for presentation to the SC in May 2012. In addition the May 2011 SC requested all TPs to review their medium term plans annually.</p>	2011_TPG_28 2011_TPG_27
<p><b>13. Membership of the TPG</b>  The terms of some members expire in 2013. A proposal for renewal of membership while maintaining continuity will be proposed to the SC November, and will be outlined by the Secretariat. Under that agenda item, members are also expected to notify any expected change in membership, so that calls can be organized in good time.  <b>Note:</b> the Chinese member resigned in August 2011, and a call will be organized at a future date.</p>	See 2011_TPG_03 under agenda item 1.1
<p><b>14. Other issues</b></p>	
<p>14.1 ISO standard on definitions  Deferred to the next meeting</p>	
<p><b>15. Date and venue of the next meeting:</b> 15-19 October 2012, FAO, Rome</p>	-
<p><b>16. Other business</b>  Only urgent issues please. Others should be kept for the next meeting.</p>	-
<p><b>17. Close</b></p>	-

**ANNEX 2 – DOCUMENTS LIST****(by document number)**

<b>DOCUMENT NO.</b>	<b>AGENDA ITEM</b>	<b>DOCUMENT TITLE</b>	<b>DATE POSTED / DISTRIBUTED</b>
2011_TPG_01v6	1.1	Agenda v6	28-10-2011
2011_TPG_02	1.1	Documents list	28-10-2011
2011_TPG_03	1.1 & 13	Participants list (reposted)	24-10-2011
2011_TPG_04	1.1	Local information	27-09-2011
2011_TPG_05	2	Report of the previous meeting of the TPG	27-09-2011
2011_TPG_06	3	Amendments to ISPM 5 Glossary of phytosanitary terms	27-09-2011
2011_TPG_07 REV1	3.3	Revision to ISPM 5 Glossary of phytosanitary terms Supplement No. 1 (official control, not widely distributed) – with steward's modifications	28-10-2011
2011_TPG_08	3	Annex 4 Pest risk analysis for plants as quarantine pests to ISPM 11:2004 and consequential core text changes to ISPM 11:2004	27-09-2011
2011_TPG_09	3	Revision of Annex 1 to ISPM 15 Approved treatments associated with wood packaging material	27-09-2011
2011_TPG_10	3	Annex to ISPM 27:2006 <i>Trogoderma granarium</i>	27-09-2011
2011_TPG_11	3	Annex to ISPM 28:2007 Vapour heat treatment of Cucumis melo var. reticulatus for Bactrocera cucurbitae	27-09-2011
2011_TPG_12	3	Annex to ISPM 28: 2007 Heat treatment of wood packaging material using dielectric heat.	27-09-2011
2011_TPG_13	2	Extracts from other meeting reports of relevance to the TPG (SC Nov 2010, CPM-6, SC May 2011)	27-09-2011
2011_TPG_14	4.2	Terms in the draft ISPM "Protocol to determine host status of fruits and vegetables to fruit fly infestations (Tephritidae)"	27-09-2011
2011_TPG_15	5.1	Background document: consistency amendments agreed to by CPM-5 and CPM-6 (for info)	27-09-2011
2011_TPG_16	5.3	Draft consistency tables (to be prepared in the appropriate format to go to SC): ISPM 23 [Ebbe Nordbo]	27-09-2011
2011_TPG_17	5.3	Draft consistency tables (to be prepared in the appropriate format to go to SC): ISPM 5 (some proposals returned by the SC November 2011)	27-09-2011
2011_TPG_18	4.3	Other terms and definitions as proposed by various bodies: tolerance level / TPF	10-10-2011
2011_TPG_19	3	Member comments - Amendments to ISPM 5 Glossary of phytosanitary terms	10-10-2011

DOCUMENT NO.	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE	DATE POSTED / DISTRIBUTED
2011_TPG_20 REV1	3.3	Member comments - Revision to ISPM 5 Glossary of phytosanitary terms Supplement No. 1 (official control, not widely distributed) – with steward's responses	28-10-2011
2011_TPG_21	3	Member comments - Annex 4 Pest risk analysis for plants as quarantine pests to ISPM 11:2004 and consequential core text changes to ISPM 11:2004	17-10-2011
2011_TPG_22	3	Member comments - Annex to ISPM 27:2006 <i>Trogoderma granarium</i>	17-10-2011
2011_TPG_23	3	Member comments - Annex to ISPM 28: 2007 Heat treatment of wood packaging material using dielectric heat.	17-10-2011
2011_TPG_24	3	Member comments - Revision of Annex 1 to ISPM 15 Approved treatments associated with wood packaging material	17-10-2011
2011_TPG_25	3.3	Additional remarks on supplement 1 to ISPM 5	17-10-2011
2011_TPG_26	5.3	Draft consistency tables (to be prepared in the appropriate format to go to SC): Additional issues to be considered in the review of consistency for ISPMs 23, 20, 25	17-10-2011
2011_TPG_27	12	Medium term plans for the TPG	24-10-2011
2011_TPG_28	12	Work plan for the TPG	22-10-2011
2011_TPG_29	10	TPG work in relation to languages	At meeting

**ANNEX 3 – PARTICIPANTS LIST****Steward: John Hedley (New Zealand)**

Country	For FAO language	Name, Mailing address, telephone	E-mail	Term begins	Term ends
New Zealand	English & Steward	Mr John HEDLEY Policy Branch Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry Pastoral House, 25 The Terrace P.O. Box 2526 Wellington, New Zealand Tel: (+64) 4 894 0428 Fax: (+1) 64 4 894 0731	<a href="mailto:john.hedley@maf.govt.nz">john.hedley@maf.govt.nz</a>	2008 (CPM-3)	2013
Uruguay	Spanish	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 165 Fax: (+598) 2 309 8410 ext 267	<a href="mailto:bmelcho@mgap.gub.uy">bmelcho@mgap.gub.uy</a> ; <a href="mailto:bemelcho@hotmail.com">bemelcho@hotmail.com</a>	Nov. 2010	2015
Denmark	English	Mr Ebbe NORDBO Danish Plant Directorate Skovbrynet 20 DK - 2800 Lyngby, Denmark Tel: (+45) 45 263 891 Fax: (+45) 45 263 613	<a href="mailto:eno@naturerhverv.dk">eno@naturerhverv.dk</a>	Nov. 2009	2014
EPPO	Russian	Mr Andrei ORLINSKI European Plant Protection Organization 21 bd. Richard Lenoir 75011 Paris, France Tel: +33 1 45 20 77 94 Fax: +33 1 70 76 65 47	<a href="mailto:Orlinski@epo.fr">Orlinski@epo.fr</a>	Nov. 2010	2015
EPPO	French	Mr Ian SMITH c/o EPPO, 21 bd. Richard Lenoir 75011 Paris, France	<a href="mailto:ian@ianclaresmith.com">ian@ianclaresmith.com</a>	2008 (CPM-3)	2013
IPPC Secretariat		Ms Fabienne GROUSSET Mr Brent LARSON Ms Eva MOLLER Ms Sayuri INAFUKU Mr Koji ONOSATO Standard Setting AGP – IPPC Secretariat FAO, Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00153 Rome, Italy	<a href="mailto:fabienne.grousset@fao.org">fabienne.grousset@fao.org</a> <a href="mailto:brent.larson@fao.org">brent.larson@fao.org</a> <a href="mailto:eva.moller@fao.org">eva.moller@fao.org</a> <a href="mailto:sayuri.inafuku@fao.org">sayuri.inafuku@fao.org</a> <a href="mailto:koji.onosato@fao.org">koji.onosato@fao.org</a>		

Country	For FAO language	Name, Mailing address, telephone	E-mail	Term begins	Term ends
FAO Translation Services		Mr Fernando SERVAN LOPEZ CSCM FAO, Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00153 Rome, Italy	<a href="mailto:fernando.servan@fao.org">fernando.servan@fao.org</a>		

*Not attending*

Jordan	Arabic	Mr Mohammad <b>KATBEH-BADER</b> Phytosanitary Department Plant Protection Directorate Ministry of Agriculture P.O. Box 961043 or 2099 Jordan University Street Amman, Jordan Tel: (+962) 6 568 6151 Fax: (+962) 6 565 0920 / 568 6310	<a href="mailto:katbehbader@moa.gov.jo">katbehbader@moa.gov.jo</a>	2008 (CPM-3)	2013
--------	--------	---	--	-----------------	------

**ANNEX 4 - Compiled comments and TPG responses: Amendments to ISPM 5 Glossary of phytosanitary terms**

Comment no.	Paragraph no.	Comment type	Comment	Explanation	Country	TPG Responses
[1]	G	Substantive	<a href="#">We suggest, instead of deleting the terms Gray, dosimeter, dosimetry and ionizing radiation, a link or a reference be provided in the Glossary to help users understand these terms.</a>	Some of the irradiation-related terms proposed for deletion are physics terms and of no direct relevance to the IPPC. Yet, they are used extensively in phytosanitary applications of radiation. Therefore, we would like to keep the terms in the Glossary as a reference instead of defining them so interested parties could look up the definition.	United States of America	See above comment 86, and responses to comments on these terms
[2]	G	Substantive		We suggest the revision of the glossary term "phytosanitary legislation" to determine if it covers the appropriate laws and regulations.	Costa Rica ,Mexico ,Nicaragua	See above comment 98
[3]	G	Substantive		In addition to the comments provided below, we suggest the revision of the glossary term "phytosanitary legislation" to determine if it covers the appropriate laws and regulations.	Uruguay	See above comment 98
[4]	G	Substantive	<a href="#">In addition to the comments provide below, we suggest the revision of the glossary term "phytosanitary legislation" to determine if it covers the appropriate laws and regulations.</a>		Paraguay	See above comment 98
[5]	G	Substantive		In addition to the comments provided below, we suggest the revision of the glossary term "phytosanitary legislation" to determine if it covers the appropriate laws and regulations.	COSAVE,Chile,Brazil	See above comment 98
[6]	G	Substantive		In addition to the comments provided below, we suggest the revision of the glossary term "phytosanitary legislation" to determine if it covers the appropriate laws and regulations.	Argentina	See above comment 98
[7]	G	Substantive		We suggest the revision of the glossary term "phytosanitary legislation" to determine if it includes the appropriate laws and regulations.	El Salvador	See above comment 98
[8]	G	Substantive	<a href="#">We suggest the revision of the glossary term "phytosanitary legislation" to determine if it includes the appropriate laws and regulations.</a>		OIRSA	See above comment 98
[9]	2	Editorial	<b>1- DRAFT AMENDMENTS TO ISPM 5: GLOSSARY OF PHYTOSANITARY TERMS</b>	Referring to the paragraph numbering, number 1 was assigned twice, once for paragraph #2 and again for paragraph #4.	Mexico	-

Comment no.	Paragraph no.	Comment type	Comment	Explanation	Country	TPG Responses
			CONFINEMENT	<p>Based on the consideration of comments, the TPG proposed that:</p> <p>Confinement has a general usage and a specific usage and the definition as intended applies to specific usage where phytosanitary measures are applied.</p> <p>Consequently, that the term be changed to “confinement (of a regulated article)”, and to change official measures to phytosanitary measures in the definition</p>		
[10]	7	Editorial	<p><i>Confinement</i> is now the term used in ISPM 34:2010. When the draft of that ISPM had been sent for member consultation, some member comments had suggested using <i>containment</i>. However, it was recommended that there was a need for two terms as used in the IPPC context with their current meaning, i.e. <i>containment</i> in relation to areas and <i>confinement</i> in relation to a facility.</p> <p>As in the definition of <i>containment</i>, it is the process of <i>confinement</i> that is described, not the result.</p> <p>Measures are not <i>phytosanitary measures</i>. Confinement might have a wider use than for regulated pests. It might also be used as a preventive measure, with no specific pest being directly targeted.</p> <p><i>Confinement</i> is used to retain a pest in a quarantine facility or a regulated area, while <i>containment</i> aims at keeping it out of an area.</p> <p>It is recommended to not mention <i>regulated pests</i> or <i>quarantine</i> as confinement might have a broader use.</p>	<p>"Phytosanitary measures" is a wider concept than official measures (according to ISPM 5) and can be applied not only to a specific targeted pest (according to the change in the definition)</p>	Russian Federation	Official measures are wider than phytosanitary measures
[11]	7	Editorial	<p><i>Confinement</i> is now the term used in ISPM 34:2010. When the draft of that ISPM had been sent for member consultation, some member comments had suggested using <i>containment</i>. However, it was recommended that there was a need for <u>the</u> two terms as used in the IPPC context with their current meaning, i.e. <i>containment</i> in relation to areas and <i>confinement</i> in relation to a facility.</p> <p>As in the definition of <i>containment</i>, it is the process of <i>confinement</i> that is described, not the result.</p> <p>Measures are not <i>phytosanitary measures</i>. Confinement might have a wider use than for regulated pests. It might also be used as a preventive measure, with no specific pest being directly targeted.</p> <p><i>Confinement</i> is used to retain a pest in a quarantine facility or a regulated area, while <i>containment</i> aims at keeping it out of an area.</p> <p>It is recommended to not mention <i>regulated pests</i> or <i>quarantine</i></p>	For clarity	Nigeria	incorporated

Comment no.	Paragraph no.	Comment type	Comment	Explanation	Country	TPG Responses		
			as confinement might have a broader use.					
[12]	7	Substantive	<p><i>Confinement</i> is now the term used in ISPM 34:2010. When the draft of that ISPM had been sent for member consultation, some member comments had suggested using <i>containment</i>. However, it was recommended that there was a need for two terms as used in the IPPC context with their current meaning, i.e. <i>containment</i> in relation to areas and <i>confinement</i> in relation to a facility.</p> <p>As in the definition of <i>containment</i>, it is the process of <i>confinement</i> that is described, not the result.</p> <p>Measures are not <i>phytosanitary measures</i>. Confinement might have a wider use than for regulated pests. It might also be used as a preventive measure, with no specific pest being directly targeted.</p> <p><i>Confinement</i> is used to retain a pest in a quarantine facility or a regulated area, while <i>containment</i> aims at keeping it out of an area.</p> <p>It is recommended to not mention <i>regulated pests</i> or <i>quarantine</i> as confinement might have a broader use.</p>	Seek further clarification on bullet No. 3. Question: Is there any official measures which are considered as not a phytosanitary measures as 'confinement' of regulated articles are done mainly at PEQ stations and all activities at PEQ are considered as official measures related to phytosanitary.	Malaysia	incorporated		
[13]	9	Substantive	<table border="1"> <tr> <td><del>confinement</del></td> <td><del>Application of official measures to a regulated article to prevent the escape of pests</del></td> </tr> </table>	<del>confinement</del>	<del>Application of official measures to a regulated article to prevent the escape of pests</del>	It is acknowledged that the SC intended to keep the scope of the term broad by defining it as 'official measures' rather than 'phytosanitary measures'. However, EPPO proposes that the TPG considers whether the definition of 'phytosanitary measures' indeed does exclude measures against pests for which the status is yet unknown if the ultimate purpose of those measures are to prevent the introduction and spread of regulated pests. If such broader re-interpretation of phytosanitary measures was applied, 'phytosanitary measures' could be used in the definition of 'confinement' to provide a stronger link to the ultimate purpose of confining regulated articles. At the same time, however, EPPO acknowledges that such re-interpretation of the term 'phytosanitary measures' may have wide implications for the use of the term throughout other ISPMs.	EPPO,Russian Federation ,Ukraine ,Morocco ,Uzbekistan	See above comment 10
<del>confinement</del>	<del>Application of official measures to a regulated article to prevent the escape of pests</del>							
[14]	9	Substantive	<table border="1"> <tr> <td><del>confinement</del></td> <td>Application of official measures to a regulated article to prevent the escape of pests</td> </tr> </table>	<del>confinement</del>	Application of official measures to a regulated article to prevent the escape of pests	DELETE term. Why is a definition necessary and why limit it? The dictionary definition is appropriate and expresses what is needed. Are there other activities within the IPPC madate that have concept of confinement? If so, what term would then be used?	Australia	The term is still considered useful in parallel with containment
<del>confinement</del>	Application of official measures to a regulated article to prevent the escape of pests							

Comment no.	Paragraph no.	Comment type	Comment	Explanation	Country	TPG Responses
[15]	9	Substantive	confinement Application of official measures to a regulated article to prevent the escape of pests  <a href="#">Seeking further clarification on the use of 'official control' instead of 'phytosanitary measures'.</a>	What activities are considered as official measures but not phytosanitary measures in relation to confinement of regulated articles or pests?	Malaysia	See above comment 10
[16]	9	Substantive	confinement <del>Application of official measures to a regulated article to prevent the escape of pests</del> <a href="#">Application of phytosanitary measures to a regulated article to prevent the escape of pests</a>	"Official measures" needs to be changed to "phytosanitary measures" because the IPPC deals specifically with phytosanitary measures. Even a regulated "article" such as a biological control agent could potentially become a pest.	United States of America	incorporated
[17]	9	Substantive	confinement Application of official measures to a regulated article to prevent the escape of pests	The term "official measures" is not defined. Propose adding a definition of "official measures" to the glossary.	Yemen	It is suggested that a definition of official measures is not necessary as official is already defined
[18]	9	Substantive	confinement Application of <a href="#">phytosanitary official</a> measures to a regulated article to prevent the escape of pests	Although confinement might have a wider use than for regulated pest in the context of ISPM 34, it applies to regulated pest. In addition, the inclusion of the term "regulated article" in the definition, restricts it to regulated pest. For this reason it is proposed to replace "official measures" with "phytosanitary measures".	Costa Rica ,Nicaragua ,El Salvador	incorporated
[19]	9	Substantive	confinement Application of <a href="#">official phytosanitary</a> measures to a regulated article to prevent the escape of pests	Although confinement might have a wider use than for regulated pests in the context of ISPM 34, it applies to regulated pests. In addition, the inclusion of the term "regulated article" in the definition restricts it to regulated pests. For this reason it is proposed to replace official measure with phytosanitary measure.	Uruguay	incorporated
[20]	9	Substantive	confinement Application of official measures to a regulated article to prevent the escape of pests	The term "official measures" is not defined. Propose adding a definition of "official measures" to the glossary.	Oman	See comment 17
[21]	9	Substantive	confinement Application of <a href="#">official phytosanitary</a> measures to a regulated article to prevent the escape of pests	To clarify and be consistent with the terms already defined in Glossary of ISPM 5.	Paraguay	incorporated
[22]	9	Substantive	confinement Application of <a href="#">official phytosanitary</a> measures to a regulated	To clarify and be consistent with the terms already defined in glossary of ISPM 5.	COSAVE,Chile,Brazil	incorporated

Comment no.	Paragraph no.	Comment type	Comment	Explanation	Country	TPG Responses
			article to prevent the escape of pests			
[23]	9	Substantive	confinement	Application of <del>official measures to a regulated article to prevent the escape of pests</del>	European Union	See above comment 10
				It is acknowledged that the SC intended to keep the scope of the term broad by defining it as 'official measures' rather than 'phytosanitary measures'. However, EU and its 27 Member States (hereinafter as the 'EU') proposes that the TPG considers whether the definition of 'phytosanitary measures' indeed does exclude measures against pests for which the status is yet unknown if the ultimate purpose of those measures are to prevent the introduction and spread of regulated pests. If such broader re-interpretation of phytosanitary measures was applied, 'phytosanitary measures' could be used in the definition of 'confinement' to provide a stronger link to the ultimate purpose of confining regulated articles. At the same time, however, EU acknowledges that such re-interpretation of the term 'phytosanitary measures' may have wide implications for the use of the term throughout other ISPMs.		
[24]	9	Substantive	confinement	Application of <del>official</del> <u>phytosanitary</u> measures to a regulated article to prevent the escape of pests	Mexico	Incorporated
				Replace "official measures" by "phytosanitary measures" because phytosanitary measures is a term defined in ISPM No. 5 that includes any legislation, regulation or official procedure having the purpose to prevent the introduction and/or spread of quarantine pests.		
[25]	9	Substantive	confinement	Application of official measures to a regulated article to prevent the escape of pests <u>from a facility or a regulated area.</u>	Singapore	It is suggested that this would unnecessarily limit the application of the term
				To further distinguishes it from containment which applies to containing within an infested area or area in or around it.		
[26]	9	Substantive	confinement	Application of <del>official</del> <u>phytosanitary</u> measures to a regulated article to prevent the escape of pests	Argentina	incorporated
				To clarify and be consistent with the terms already defined in Glossary of ISPM 5.		
[27]	9	Substantive	confinement	Application of <del>official measures to a regulated article to prevent the escape of pests</del>	Canada	The TPG suggested that the current explanation makes the differentiation clear. See proposed changes above comment 10
				The initial statement in para. 7 appears inconsistent with the existing definition of containment ( Application of phytosanitary measures in and around an infested area to the prevent spread of a pest ]. The statement in para. 7 is also contrary to the usual usage of containment as per dictionary definitions and containment standards used for plants, animals and humans. Canada would like the Technical Panel on the Glossary (TPG) to reconsider the terms "confinement" and "containment" in light of the		

Comment no.	Paragraph no.	Comment type	Comment	Explanation	Country	TPG Responses	
				above explanation. The term "confinement" and its definition should therefore not be adopted until the TPG has had the chance to review both terms concurrently.			
[28]	9	Substantive	confinement	Application of official measures to a regulated article to prevent the escape of pests	SA agrees with the proposed addition of this term as it further elaborates that the pest is confined to an area	South Africa	-
[29]	9	Substantive	confinement	Application of <del>official</del> <u>phytosanitary</u> measures to a regulated article to prevent the escape of pests	Although confinement might have a wider use than for regulated pests in the context of ISPM 34, it applies to regulated pests. In addition, the inclusion of the term "regulated article" in the definition restricts it to regulated pest. For this reason it is proposed to replace official measure with phytosanitary measure.	OIRSA	incorporated
[30]	9	Technical	confinement	Application of official measures to a regulated article to prevent the escape of pests	The workshop agreed to addition of the word "confinement " with the proposed meaning to the glossary	Solomon Islands	-
			<b>EXCLUSION</b>	The TPG considered the member comments and suggested that it would be useful to have a definition of exclusion in parallel with containment, suppression, control , eradication are already defined. In view of the country comments, it is suggested that the term does not go forward on its own and is reconsidered in association with <i>containment, suppression, eradication, control</i> .			
[31]	12	Editorial	The definition should be broad as the term has a wider application than only fruit fly management. It is useful to have a definition of this term, in a similar way as there are definitions for <i>eradication</i> and <i>suppression</i> . It is recommended to use <i>phytosanitary</i> and not <i>official</i> measures. Although <i>official</i> might have been more appropriate for such measures applied against pests within a country, the definitions of <i>eradication</i> and <i>suppression</i> use <i>phytosanitary measures</i> , and it is not <del>be</del> desirable to introduce inconsistency between the three definitions. The term <i>introduction</i> (i.e. <i>entry</i> and <i>establishment</i> ) is used and not <i>entry</i> . A package of exclusion measures might include measures to prevent <i>establishment</i> in cases of transience or incursion. As the definition of <i>introduction</i> already refers to an area, it is recommended <del>to</del> not <u>to</u> refer to an area in the definition.	For clarity	Nigeria	See above comment 31	
[32]	14	Substantive	<del>exclusion</del>	Application of phytosanitary measures to	A definiton of exclusion is not needed. Why apply a term to a concept that would tend to be used as a full statement ? The	Australia	See above comment 31

Comment no.	Paragraph no.	Comment type	Comment	Explanation	Country	TPG Responses
			prevent the introduction of a pest	term is too limited.		
			<a href="#">Delete term and definition</a>			
[33]	14	Substantive	exclusion Application of phytosanitary measures to prevent the introduction of a pest		Malaysia	See above comment 31
			<a href="#">General comment:</a> (The word exclusion is currently being used in several ISPMs. To consider whether the new proposed definition will fit in into those ISPMs (i.e: ISPM 9, 10, 22). If not in line, the definition should be revised to be more general.			
[34]	14	Substantive	exclusion Application of phytosanitary measures to prevent the introduction of a pest	The word exclusion is currently being used in several ISPMs. To consider whether the new proposed definition will fit in into those ISPMs (i.e: ISPM 9, 10, 22). If not in line, the definition should be revised to be more general.	Philippines ,Thailand ,Korea, Republic of ,Lao People's Democratic Republic,India	See above comment 31
[35]	14	Substantive	exclusion Application of phytosanitary measures <a href="#">in and around an area</a> to prevent the introduction of a pest	The phrase "in and around" is desirable in order to account for any buffer zones which may be justified or to account for political borders that allow for regulatory action to be administered. The suggested definition refers to "an area", as opposed to an "endangered area", since exclusion activities may involve a buffer zone or necessitate consideration of a political boundary. The modification described above is consistent with the definition of containment, which includes the terms "in and around".	United States of America	See above comment 31
			A			
[36]	14	Substantive	exclusion Application of phytosanitary measures to prevent the introduction of a pest	The word exclusion is currently being used in several ISPMs. To consider whether the new proposed definition will fit in into those ISPMs (i.e: ISPM 9, 10, 22). If not in line, the definition should be revised to be more general or more specific, for example "phytosanitary exclusion"/ "introduction exclusion"	Viet Nam	See above comment 31
[37]	14	Substantive	exclusion Application of phytosanitary measures to prevent the introduction of a pest	The word exclusion is currently being used in several ISPMs. To consider whether the new proposed definition will fit into those ISPM (i.e : ISPM 9,10, 22). If not in line, the definition should be revised to be more general.	Japan	See above comment 31
[38]	14	Substantive	exclusion Application of phytosanitary measures to	SA does not accept proposed addition of the term as the definition has already been covered by the definition of	South Africa	See above comment 31

Comment no.	Paragraph no.	Comment type	Comment	Explanation	Country	TPG Responses
			prevent the introduction of a pest	phytosanitary actions and phytosanitary measures. The term is not specific with IPPC meaning or context.		
[39]	14	Technical	exclusion Application of phytosanitary measures to prevent the introduction of a pest	Proposed addition of the word "exclusion" with proposed meaning agreed	Solomon Islands	-
			<b>ABSORBED DOSE</b>	The TPG considered member comments and proposes that the definition be retained in the glossary but modified. As suggested by several members, reference to the unit was deleted from the definition. Further justification was added in the amendments document		
[40]	23	Editorial	absorbed dose Quantity of radiating energy absorbed per unit of mass of a specified target <del>(in gray)</del>	Other units can be applied.	Philippines ,Lao People's Democratic Republic,Thailand ,Korea, Republic of ,Japan ,India	incorporated
[41]	23	Editorial	absorbed dose Quantity of radiating energy absorbed per unit of mass of a specified target <del>(measured in gray)</del>	For clarification	United States of America	Considered
[42]	23	Substantive	absorbed dose Quantity of radiating energy absorbed per unit of mass of a specified target (in gray)  <a href="#">To propose deletion of this terminology from the glossary</a>	- These terms and definitions do not have a specific meaning in the IPPC context, and are not needed in the Glossary. - The terms are well-known words of physics and has been used worldwide	Malaysia	It is suggested that this definition is useful
[43]	23	Substantive	absorbed dose Quantity of radiating energy absorbed per unit of mass of a specified target (in gray)	SA accepts proposed revision because the placement of "in gray" emphasises that the results should be specified in these units "Gray".	South Africa	See above 40
[44]	23	Technical	absorbed dose Quantity of radiating energy absorbed per unit of mass of a specified target <del>(in gray)</del>	Assigning the measurement unit is unnecessary and inconsistent. Furthermore, it may again be misinterpreted as if gray related to the mass instead of to the dose.	EPPO,European Union ,Russian Federation ,Ukraine ,Morocco ,Uzbekistan	incorporated
[45]	23	Technical	absorbed dose Quantity of radiating energy absorbed per unit of mass of a specified target (in gray)	Proposed revision of "absorbed dose" was agreed to by the workshop participants	Solomon Islands	-
			<b>CONSIGNMENT IN TRANSIT</b>	In view of the comments received, the TPG suggests that consignment in transit needs further consideration , and should be reconsidered in parallel with <i>re-export (of a consignment)</i> (already on		

Comment no.	Paragraph no.	Comment type	Comment	Explanation	Country	TPG Responses
				(the work programme)		
[46]	28	Substantive	consignment in transit  A consignment which passes through a country without being imported, and that may be subject to phytosanitary measures [FAO, 1990; revised CEPM, 1996; CEPM 1999; ICPM, 2002; ISPM No. 25, 2006; formerly country of transit]	EPPO proposes the TPG re-consider the definition once more, including whether or not the current reference to possible phytosanitary measures should be retained or not in the definition, or whether the term could be deleted altogether. The TPG could also consider whether, as an alternative, the words export, import, re-export and transit could be defined.	EPPO, Russian Federation, Ukraine, Morocco, Uzbekistan	The TPG proposes that definitions for import and export are not necessary
[47]	28	Substantive	consignment in transit  A consignment which passes through country without being imported, and that may be subject to phytosanitary measures [FAO, 1990; revised CEPM, 1996; CEPM 1999; ICPM, 2002; ISFM No. 25, 2006; formerly country of transit]	Suggest to retain the old definition in order to make necessary phytosanitary measures clear.	China	See above comment 46
[48]	29	Substantive	<u>Proposed revision</u>	Do not change original definition The reasoning that definitions cannot have requirements has not been applied to other definitions in the glossary. Also, this particular definition does not have a requirement, it states that it "may be subject to phytosanitary measures" not that they will be. Also by removing the last part, it no longer reflects what is in ISPM 25.	United States of America	See above comment 46
[49]	29	Substantive	<u>Proposed revision</u> <u>A consignment that passes through a country without being imported, and that may be subject to phytosanitary measures</u>	Suggest to retain the old definition in order to make necessary phytosanitary measures clear.	China	See above comment 46
[50]	30	Substantive	consignment in transit  A consignment that passes through a country without being imported.  <u>To maintain the current definition of 'consignment in transit' whereby the word "and that may be subject to phytosanitary measures" to be retained.</u>	Current definition is considered sufficient to explain the word 'consignment in transit'.	Malaysia	See above comment 46
[51]	30	Substantive	consignment in transit  A consignment that passes through a country without being imported.	This original definition should be retained because the implementation should be subject to phytosanitary measures.	Thailand	See above comment 46
[52]	30	Substantive	consignment in transit  A consignment that passes	SA does not accept the proposed revision and would like to keep the original definition because the original	South Africa	See above comment 46

Comment no.	Paragraph no.	Comment type	Comment	Explanation	Country	TPG Responses	
				definition places emphasis on the application or use of phytosanitary measures whereas the current definition does not.			
[53]	30	Technical	consignment in transit	A consignment that passes through a country without being imported.	Solomon Islands	See above comment 46	
			<b>PHYTOSANITARY CERTIFICATE</b>	TPG proposes to use <i>consistentwith</i> (used in ISPM 12) instead of <i>patterned</i> , to solve the issue raised in comment 57. It also believes that the end of the definition, proposed for modification or deletion by several countries should be maintained as it is useful to explain the purpose of a PC (see dash point in amendments)			
[54]	37	Editorial	phytosanitary certificate	An official paper document or its official electronic equivalent, patterned after the model certificates of the IPPC, attesting that a consignment meets phytosanitary import requirements  <u>To replace 'attesting' with other simpler word (e.g. 'certifying' or 'declaring' or 'proving' or 'verifying')</u>	Improved clarification, the word 'attesting' is not easily understood by non-native English speakers.	Malaysia	ISPM 12 uses attesting
[55]	37	Editorial	Phytosanitary Certificate	An official paper document or its official electronic equivalent, patterned after the model certificates of the IPPC, attesting that a consignment meets phytosanitary import requirements	For Consistency	Nigeria	Upper case not required
[56]	37	Substantive	phytosanitary certificate	An official paper document or its official electronic equivalent, patterned after the model certificates of the IPPC, attesting that a consignment meets phytosanitary import requirements	Agree. This is a more accurate definition of a Phytosanitary Certificate.	Philippines	See above comment 54
[57]	37	Substantive	phytosanitary certificate	<del>An official paper document or its official electronic equivalent, patterned after the model certificates of the IPPC, attesting that a consignment meets phytosanitary import requirements</del>	EPPO note that 'patterned after the model certificates of the IPPC' should only apply to the paper document, whereas the electronic equivalent only needs equivalent content and wording. Thus, the sequence of those sentence parts should be shifted. EPPO proposes the TPG to re-consider whether to include the part 'attesting that a consignment meets phytosanitary import requirements', or to change it to 'which attests to the phytosanitary status of a consignment', or to delete that	EPPO, Russian Federation, Ukraine, Morocco, Uzbekistan	See above comment 54

Comment no.	Paragraph no.	Comment type	Comment	Explanation	Country	TPG Responses
				part altogether.		
[58]	37	Substantive	phytosanitary certificate An official paper document or its official electronic equivalent, patterned after the model certificates of the IPPC, attesting that a consignment meets phytosanitary import requirements	EU note that 'patterned after the model certificates of the IPPC' should only apply to the paper document, whereas the electronic equivalent only needs equivalent content and wording. Thus, the sequence of those sentence parts should be shifted. EU proposes the TPG to re-consider whether to include the part 'attesting that a consignment meets phytosanitary import requirements', or to change it to 'which attests to the phytosanitary status of a consignment', or to delete that part altogether.	European Union	See above comment 54
[59]	37	Substantive	phytosanitary certificate An official paper document or its official electronic equivalent, patterned after the model certificates of the IPPC, attesting that a consignment meets phytosanitary import requirements	SA accepts the proposed revision because it emphasises that the phytosanitary certificates must be official, whether in paper or electronic version.	South Africa	-
[60]	37	Technical	phytosanitary certificate An official paper document or its official electronic equivalent, patterned after the model certificates of the IPPC, attesting that a consignment meets phytosanitary import requirements	Workshop participants accepted the proposed revision for phytosanitary certificate	Solomon Islands	-
[61]	37	Translation	phytosanitary certificate An official paper document or its official electronic equivalent, patterned after the model certificates of the IPPC, attesting that a consignment meets phytosanitary import requirements	In the Spanish version "attesting" should be translated as "avala" and not "atestigua" for consistency with ISPM 12:2011.	Costa Rica Nicaragua	It was noted that <i>atestigua</i> is considered too weak and ISPM 12 already uses <i>avala</i>
[62]	37	Translation	phytosanitary certificate An official paper document or its official electronic equivalent, patterned after the model certificates of the IPPC, attesting that a consignment meets phytosanitary import requirements	In the Spanish version "attesting" should be translated into Spanish as "avala" and not as "atestigua" for consistency with ISPM 12:2011	Uruguay	See comment 61
[63]	37	Translation	phytosanitary certificate An official paper document or its official electronic equivalent, patterned after the model certificates of the IPPC, attesting that a consignment meets phytosanitary import requirements	In spanish version "Attesting" should be translated into spanish as "avala" and not "atestigua"	Paraguay, Argentina	See comment 61

Comment no.	Paragraph no.	Comment type	Comment	Explanation	Country	TPG Responses
[64]	37	Translation	phytosanitary certificate An official paper document or its official electronic equivalent, patterned after the model certificates of the IPPC, attesting <a href="#">avala</a> that a consignment meets phytosanitary import requirements <a href="#">certificado fitosanitario: Documento oficial en papel o su equivalente electrónico oficial, diseñado según los modelos de certificados de la CIPF, el cual avala que un envío cumple con los requisitos fitosanitarios de importación</a>	In the Spanish version the word "attesting" should be translated as "avala" as is established in ISPM 12, cleared wording in the Spanish version	Mexico	See comment 61
[65]	37	Translation	phytosanitary certificate An official paper document or its official electronic equivalent, patterned after the model certificates of the IPPC, attesting that a consignment meets phytosanitary import requirements	In Spanish version "Attesting" should be translated into Spanish as "avala" and not "atestigua" for consistency with ISPM 12:2011.	COSAVE, Chile, Brazil	See comment 61
			<b>QUARANTINE STATION</b>	<b>The TPG considered the comments and did not propose modifications to the definition sent for member consultation. The explanation given in the amendments document were modified</b>		
[66]	44	Editorial	quarantine station Official <del>station</del> <a href="#">facility</a> for holding <a href="#">in quarantine</a> plants, plants products or other regulated articles, including beneficial organisms <del>in quarantine</del>	"station" is the term being defined. It is therefore circular to use that word again in the definition. Or use 'official place' Move the words "in quarantine" so that the key idea of the purpose "holding in quarantine" is not split by the examples of what is held (additional examples can be added if required without changing the structure of the definition)	Australia	Regarding facility, it was considered appropriate to repeat station in the definition, and this corresponds to practice. Moving "in quarantine" to the place proposed was considered confusing
[67]	44	Editorial	quarantine station Official <a href="#">facility</a> <del>station</del> for holding plants, plant products or other regulated articles, including beneficial organisms, in quarantine	For clarity and consistency	Ghana	See comment 66
[68]	44	Editorial	quarantine station Official <del>station</del> <a href="#">facility</a> for holding plants, plant products or other regulated articles, including beneficial organisms, in quarantine	For clarity and consistency	Gabon ,Cameroon	See comment 66
[69]	44	Substantive	quarantine station Official station for holding plants, plant products or other regulated articles, including	Exotic pest species should be included since this is also a concern for plant quarantine.	Philippines	considered

Comment no.	Paragraph no.	Comment type	Comment	Explanation	Country	TPG Responses
			beneficial organisms <u>and exotic pest species</u> , in quarantine			
[70]	44	Substantive	quarantine station  <u>Official station for holding plants, plants products or other regulated articles, including beneficial organisms, in quarantine</u>	Plants and plant products are included in regulated articles.	Yemen	It was suggested to keep all elements mentioned to be explicit in what is covered. In addition, beneficial organisms were also kept as their inclusion was one of the major intentions of the revision
[71]	44	Substantive	quarantine station  Official station for holding plants, plants products <u>and or other regulated articles, including beneficial organisms, in quarantine</u>	Change is proposed considering that the definition of regulated includes storage places, packaging conveyances, containers, soil and any other organisms, object or material capable of harboring pest, and not all regulated articles are confined in quarantine station. The definition of this term is justified because it is used in ISPM 3 and 34, which refers to quarantine stations for holding organisms and plants in quarantine respectively.	Costa Rica Nicaragua	See comment 70 Also, it was proposed to keep the definition broad with respect to "regulated articles"
[72]	44	Substantive	quarantine station  Official station for holding plants, plants products or other <u>regulated articles, including beneficial organisms, in quarantine</u>	Change is proposed considering that the definition of regulated articles includes storage places, packaging, conveyances, containers, soil and any other organisms, object or material capable of harboring pests. Not all regulated articles are confined in a quarantine station. The definition of this term is justified because it is used in ISPM 3 and 34, which refer to quarantine stations for holding organisms and plants in quarantine, respectively.	Uruguay	See comment 70 and 71
[73]	44	Substantive	quarantine station  Official station for holding <u>plants, plants products or other regulated articles, including beneficial organisms, in quarantine</u>	Plants and plant products are included in regulated articles	Oman	See comment 70
[74]	44	Substantive	quarantine station  Official station for holding plants, plants products or other <u>regulated articles, including beneficial organisms, in quarantine</u>	Change is proposed considering that the definition of regulated articles includes storage places, packaging, conveyances, containers soil and any other organisms, object or material capable of harboring pests, and not all regulated articles are confined in a quarantine station. The definition of this term is justified because it is used in ISPM 3 and 34, which refer to quarantine station for	Paraguay	See comments 70 and 71

Comment no.	Paragraph no.	Comment type	Comment	Explanation	Country	TPG Responses
				holding organisms and plants in quarantine, respectively.		
[75]	44	Substantive	quarantine station Official station for holding plants, plants products or other <del>regulated articles, including beneficial</del> organisms, in quarantine	Change is proposed considering that the definition of regulated articles includes storage places, packaging, conveyances, containers soil and any other organisms, object or material capable of harboring pests, and not all regulated articles are confined in a quarantine station. The definition of this term is justified because it is used in ISPM 3 and 34, which refer to quarantine station for holding organisms and plants in quarantine, respectively.	COSAVE, Chile, Brazil	See comments 70 and 71
[76]	44	Substantive	quarantine station Official station for holding plants, plants products <del>and or other regulated articles, including beneficial</del> organisms, in quarantine	To be consistent with ISPM No. 34 and ISPM No. 3. Broader scope	Mexico	See comment 70
[77]	44	Substantive	quarantine station Official station for holding plants, plants products or other <del>regulated articles, including beneficial</del> organisms, in quarantine	Change is proposed considering that the definition of regulated articles includes storage places, packaging, conveyances, containers soil and any other organisms, object or material capable of harboring pests, and not all regulated articles are confined in a quarantine station. The definition of this term is justified because it is used in ISPM 3 and 34, which refer to quarantine station for holding organisms and plants in quarantine, respectively.	Argentina	See comments 70 and 71
[78]	44	Substantive	quarantine station Official station for holding plants, plants products or other regulated articles, including beneficial organisms, in quarantine	SA accepts proposed revision because not only plants for planting are placed under quarantine but also beneficial organisms.	South Africa	-
[79]	44	Substantive	quarantine station Official station for holding plants, plants products or other regulated articles, including <del>beneficial</del> <u>certain</u> organisms, in quarantine	The definition of this term is justified because it is used in ISPM 3 and 34, which refer to quarantine station for holding organisms and plants in quarantine, respectively. It is recognized that quarantine stations can be useful for holding (maintenance of) certain articles (not allways plant products) suspected of being infected by quarantine pests. For reasons of coherence in the ISPMs in Spanish, is important to note that in ISPM No. 34, it was used the term "post-entry quarantine stations" which was translated into Spanish as "estaciones de cuarentena posentrada". The Spanish translation of the term "quarantine station" is "estación cuarentenaria".	OIRSA	See comment 70
[80]	44	Technical	quarantine station Official station for holding <del>plants, plants products or other</del> regulated articles, including	'Regulated articles' is sufficient wording and does not need further detail, as this includes plants, plant products and (relevant) beneficial organisms. The definition should	EPPO, European Union, Ukraine, Morocco	See comment 70

Comment no.	Paragraph no.	Comment type	Comment	Explanation	Country	TPG Responses
			<del>beneficial organisms</del> , in quarantine	remain simple and similar to that of 'quarantine'.	Uzbekistan	
[81]	44	Technical	quarantine station Official station for holding plants, plants products or other regulated articles, including <del>beneficial organisms</del> , in quarantine	Proposed revision for "quarantine station" accepted by workshop participants	Solomon Islands	-
[82]	44	Technical	quarantine station Official station for holding plants, plants products or other regulated articles, including <del>beneficial</del> <u>certain</u> organisms, in quarantine	The definition of this term is justified because it is used in ISPM 3 and 34, which refer to quarantine station for holding organisms and plants in quarantine, respectively. It is recognized that quarantine stations can be useful for holding (maintenance of) certain articles (not always plant products) suspected of being infected by quarantine pests. For reasons of coherence in the ISPMs in Spanish, it is important to note that in ISPM No. 34, it was used the term "post-entry quarantine stations" which was translated into Spanish as "estaciones de cuarentena posentrada". The Spanish translation of the term "quarantine station" is "estación cuarentenaria".	El Salvador	See comment 70
			CERTIFICATE			
[83]	48	Technical	The current definition of <i>certificate</i> limits it to the IPPC context, but <i>certificate</i> and <i>certification</i> on their own have other meanings that need to be used in ISPMs (e.g. <i>CITES certificate</i> in ISPM 12:2011; <i>treatment documents/certificates</i> , <i>certificate of origin</i> in ISPM 23:2005; <i>certification of facilities</i> in ISPM 18:2003). Deletion of the term and definition is therefore proposed so as to not limit the use of the term.  The proposed revision of the definition of <i>phytosanitary certificate</i> (see 2.3) ensures that the term of specific IPPC relevance is defined. <del>Deletion of the term and definition of certificate is therefore proposed so as to not limit the use of the term.</del> Certificate and certification on their own have other meanings that need to be used in ISPMs (e.g. CITES certificate in ISPM 12:2011; treatment documents/certificates, certificate of origin in ISPM 23:2005; certification of facilities in ISPM 18:2003). -	We propose to change the order of the explanation to make it clearer.	Russian Federation	ok
[84]	50	Substantive	certificate An official document which attests to the phytosanitary status of any consignment affected by phytosanitary regulations [FAO, 1990]	SA accepts proposal for deletion because definition is covered by phytosanitary certificate.	South Africa	-
[85]	50	Technical	certificate An official document which attests to the	Proposed deletion for "certificate" accepted	Solomon Islands	-

Comment no.	Paragraph no.	Comment type	Comment	Explanation	Country	TPG Responses
			phytosanitary status of any consignment affected by phytosanitary regulations [FAO, 1990]			
			GRAY	The TPG considered member comments. In answer to the proposal to retain the term in the glossary, the TPG noted that other ISPMs use such technical terms, which are not defined, as in the diagnostic protocols (the explanations were adjusted in the amendments document). Reference to a source, as suggested in other comments, would require maintenance of an up-to-date link/reference		
[86]	54	Technical	<u>Proposed for deletion</u>	Agree to deletion, but if the IPPC does not define the specific scientific terms it should reference a source that gives an accepted definition in ISPM 18.	United States of America	See above comment 86
[87]	55	Substantive	gray (Gy) Unit of absorbed dose where 1 Gy is equivalent to the absorption of 1 joule per kilogram (1 Gy = 1 J.kg-1) [ISPM No. 18, 2003]	Object to deletion of gray from ISPM 5. Needs to be maintained because i) We are confirming the proposed placement in the definition of absorbed dose in this draft. ii) This is an unfamiliar unit for a normal reader to understand and therefore needs to be recalled for ease reference	Gabon ,Cameroon	See above comment 86
[88]	55	Substantive	gray (Gy) Unit of absorbed dose where 1 Gy is equivalent to the absorption of 1 joule per kilogram (1 J.kg-1) [ISPM No. 18, 2003]	SA accepts proposal for deletion because "gray" is an SI (International System of Units) accepted unit hence it is not necessary to have it listed in the definitions.	South Africa	See above comment 86
[89]	55	Technical	quarantine station Official <u>facility station</u> for holding plants, plant products or other regulated articles, including beneficial organisms, in quarantine  Object to deletion of gray from ISPM 5	Needs to be maintained because i) We are confirming the proposed placement in the definition of absorbed dose in this draft. ii) This is an unfamiliar unit for a normal reader to understand and therefore needs to be recalled for ease reference	Ghana	See above comment 86
[90]	55	Technical	gray (Gy) Unit of absorbed dose where 1 Gy is equivalent to the absorption of 1 joule per kilogram (1 Gy = 1 J.kg-1) [ISPM No. 18, 2003]	Proposed deletion for "gray (Gy)" accepted	Solomon Islands	-
			HITCH-HIKER PEST	The TPG considered the comment received and still suggested that hitch-hiker be deleted but that the definition of "contaminating pest" should be revised to more fully reflect this pathway for the movement of pests.		
[91]	56	Technical	3.3 Hitch-hiker pest <u>it was noted that such a pest may not be a pest of the product that carries it. The term also has the implication that the pest is moved from one place to another. Therefore it was felt that the definition should not be the sa</u>		Solomon Islands	See above comment 91

Comment no.	Paragraph no.	Comment type	Comment	Explanation	Country	TPG Responses
			<a href="#">me as that for contaminating pest.</a>			
[92]	59	Substantive	<a href="#">Proposed for deletion</a> <a href="#">llllmay</a>	It is suggested that the TPG review this decision. The concept of "Hitchhiker" - moved to another area, on a non-host, which may not be a usual pathway - is not dealt with elsewhere. And regarding translation, surely hitchhikers are not only a phenomenon of the English speaking world.	New Zealand	See above comment 91
[93]	59	Substantive	<a href="#">Proposed for deletion</a> <a href="#">Proposed to retain the term.</a>	The term "hitch hiker pest" is referring to a different category of contaminating pest as the pathway is unusual and no host is involved.	Singapore	See above comment 91
[94]	60	Substantive	hitch-hiker pest      See contaminating pest	SA accepts proposal for deletion of "hitch-hiker" because it is not an IPPC term and covered by definition of "contaminating pest".	South Africa	-
[95]	60	Technical	hitch-hiker pest      See contaminating pest	Should be retained; useful concept in quarantine which needs definition which describes the concept fully.	Philippines ,Lao People's Democratic Republic,Thailand ,Korea, Republic of ,India	See above comment 91
[96]	60	Technical	hitch-hiker pest      See contaminating pest	Should be retained; useful concept in quarantine which needs definition which describes the concept fully.	Viet Nam	See above comment 91
[97]	60	Technical	hitch-hiker pest      See contaminating pest	Should be retained; useful concept in quarantine which needs definition which describes the concept fully.	Japan	See above comment 91
			<b>LEGISLATION</b>	The TPG considered the comments made on legislation and a number of general comments. Deletion of legislation was accepted by TPG members. In answer to comments 2-8, the TPG suggests that the definition of phytosanitary legislation and phytosanitary regulation appropriately covers the concepts previously covered by the definition of "legislation"		
[98]	65	Substantive	legislation      Any act, law, regulation, guideline or other administrative order promulgated by a government [ISPM No. 3, 1996]	SA accepts deletion because it is a general term and not a specific IPPC term.	South Africa	-
[99]	65	Technical	legislation      Any act, law, regulation, guideline or other administrative order promulgated by a government [ISPM No. 3, 1996]	Proposed deletion for "legislation" accepted	Solomon Islands	-
			<b>PLANT PEST</b>	The TPG considered the comments received. It suggested that the term be deleted. However, given comment 101 on the fact that plant pest is used in the IPPC, it proposed that the definition of <i>pest</i> should be amended to note that plant pest is used in the IPPC. An amendment of the definition of		

Comment no.	Paragraph no.	Comment type	Comment	Explanation	Country	TPG Responses	
				pest was therefore proposed in the amendments document			
[100]	70	Substantive	plant pest	See pest	SA accepts proposed deletion of this term as “plant pest” is deemed to be identical to the term “pest”.	South Africa	-
[101]	70	Technical	plant pest	See pest	Retain term ‘Plant pest’ and current definition. Retain the definition as a synonym to help the casual reader as long as it appears in the IPPC proper. (However agree that in ISPMs only ‘pest’ should be used)	EPPO, European Union, Russian Federation, Ukraine, Morocco, Uzbekistan	See above comment 100
[102]	70	Technical	plant pest	See pest	proposed deletion accepted	Solomon Islands	-
			ANTAGONIST	The TPG suggested to maintain the proposal for deletion as this is a common biological term that does not have a specific phytosanitary meaning			
[103]	77	Substantive	antagonist	An organism (usually pathogen) which does no significant damage to the host but its colonization of the host protects the host from significant subsequent damage by a pest [ISPM No. 3, 1996]	It is a common terminology used in IPM. Also mentioned in ISPM No. 3 and 21.	Malaysia	See above comment 103
				To maintain this word in the glossary			
[104]	77	Substantive	antagonist	An organism (usually pathogen) which does no significant damage to the host but its colonization of the host protects the host from significant subsequent damage by a pest [ISPM No. 3, 1996]	SA accepts proposed deletion because this definition is covered by the definitions of beneficial and biological control agent.	South Africa	-
[105]	77	Technical	antagonist	An organism (usually pathogen) which does no significant damage to the host but its colonization of the host protects the host from significant subsequent damage by a pest [ISPM No. 3, 1996]	proposed deletion accepted	Solomon Islands	-
[106]	82	Substantive	competitor	An organism which competes with pests for essential elements (e.g. food, shelter) in the environment [ISPM No. 3, 1996]	SA accepts the proposed deletion of the term because it is a general term and not IPPC specific.	South Africa	-
[107]	82	Technical	competitor	An organism which competes with pests for essential elements (e.g. food, shelter) in the	proposed deletion accepted	Solomon Islands	-

Comment no.	Paragraph no.	Comment type	Comment	Explanation	Country	TPG Responses
			environment [ISPM No. 3, 1996]			
			<b>CONTROL POINT</b>	The TPG considered the comments received. It suggested that there is sufficient information in ISPM 14 and therefore deletion of control point.		
[108]	87	Substantive	control point  A step in a system where specific procedures can be applied to achieve a defined effect and can be measured, monitored, controlled and corrected [ISPM No. 14, 2002]	In the Appendix of ISPM No. 14, the word 'control point' has a special reference related to specific independent procedures under critical control point system in the implementation of Systems Approach.	Malaysia	See above comment 108
			<a href="#">To maintain this word in the glossary.</a>			
[109]	87	Substantive	control point  A step in a system where specific procedures can be applied to achieve a defined effect and can be measured, monitored, controlled and corrected [ISPM No. 14, 2002]	We suggest not to delete this definition. It is an important concept for NPPOs. ISPM 14 explains a critical control point system's procedures but does not provide a definition for it.	United States of America	See above comment 103
[110]	87	Substantive	control point  A step in a system where specific procedures can be applied to achieve a defined effect and can be measured, monitored, controlled and corrected [ISPM No. 14, 2002]	SA accepts the proposed deletion because "control point" is not a specific point where a measure should be applied and can differ with pest type and the commodity.	South Africa	-
[111]	87	Technical	control point  A step in a system where specific procedures can be applied to achieve a defined effect and can be measured, monitored, controlled and corrected [ISPM No. 14, 2002]		Solomon Islands	-
			<a href="#">One participant preferred to maintain "control point" in the glossary</a>			
			<b>DOSIMETER AND DOSIMETRY</b>	The TPG considered the comments and suggested deletion of the term		
[112]	88	Technical	3.9 Dosimeter and dosimetry	Agree to deletion, but if the IPPC does not define the specific scientific terms it should reference a source that gives an accepted definition in ISPM 18.	United States of America	See above comment 86
[113]	92	Editorial	dosimeter  A device that, when irradiated, exhibits a quantifiable change in some property of the device which can be related to absorbed dose a given material using appropriate analytical	In the English version doesn't appear the reference for the definition of dosimetry	Mexico	corrected

Comment no.	Paragraph no.	Comment type	Comment	Explanation	Country	TPG Responses	
			instrumentation and techniques [ISPM No. 18, 2003]				
			dosimetry	A system used for determining absorbed dose, consisting of dosimeters, measurement instruments and their associated reference standards, and procedures for the system [ISPM No. 18, 2003]			
[114]	92	Substantive	dosimeter	A device that, when irradiated, exhibits a quantifiable change in some property of the device which can be related to absorbed dose in a given material using appropriate analytical instrumentation and techniques [ISPM No. 18, 2003]	SA accepts the proposed deletion of the terms because they are common physics terms and have no specific meaning in IPPC context.	South Africa	-
			dosimetry	A system used for determining absorbed dose, consisting of dosimeters, measurement instruments and their associated reference standards, and procedures for the system			
[115]	92	Technical	dosimeter	A device that, when irradiated, exhibits a quantifiable change in some property of the device which can be related to absorbed dose in a given material using appropriate analytical instrumentation and techniques [ISPM No. 18, 2003]	proposed deletion accepted	Solomon Islands	-
			dosimetry	A system used for determining absorbed dose, consisting of dosimeters, measurement instruments and their associated reference standards, and procedures for the system			
			<b>IONIZING RADIATION</b>	<b>The TPG considered the comments and suggested deletion of the term</b>			
[116]	96	Technical	<u>Proposed for deletion:</u>	Agree to deletion, but if the IPPC does not define this specific scientific term it should reference a source that gives an accepted definition in ISPM 18.	United States of America	See above comment 86	
[117]	97	Substantive	ionizing radiation	Charged particles and electromagnetic waves that as a result of physical interaction create ions by either primary or secondary processes [ISPM No. 18, 2003]	SA accepts the proposed deletion of the term because it is a common physics term and have no specific meaning in IPPC context.	South Africa	-

Comment no.	Paragraph no.	Comment type	Comment	Explanation	Country	TPG Responses
			18, 2003]			
[118]	97	Technical	ionizing radiation Charged particles and electromagnetic waves that as a result of physical interaction create ions by either primary or secondary processes [ISPM No. 18, 2003]	proposed deletion accepted	Solomon Islands	-

## ANNEX 5. AMENDMENTS TO ISPM 5

[1] **Note to the SC:** The TPG meeting (4-5 November) reviewed member comments and accordingly modified the amendments to ISPM 5 as presented below. In view of the comments received, the TPG suggests that the terms *exclusion* (addition of a definition) and *consignment in transit* (revision of the definition) need further consideration. These have been removed from the amendments below. It is suggested that *exclusion* does not go forward on its own and is reconsidered in association with *containment*, *suppression*, *eradication*, *control* (already on the work programme for review), and that *consignment in transit* is reconsidered in association with *re-export (of a consignment)* (already on the work programme for review).

### [2] DRAFT AMENDMENTS TO ISPM 5: GLOSSARY OF PHYTOSANITARY TERMS

Date of this document	2011-11-05
Document category	Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms)
Current document stage	2011-05 SC approved draft for member consultation 2011 2011-11 TPG reviewed member comments
Origin	1994 CEPM added topic: 1994-001, Amendments to ISPM 5 <i>Glossary of phytosanitary terms</i>
Major stages	Specification TP5. Draft for member consultation, SC May 2011
Notes	12 February 2011: developed by the IPPC TPG at its October 2010 meeting. 27 February 2011: edited. Formatted for SC May 2011 on 1 March 2011. Copy edited after SC May 2011 on 6 May 2011. With TPG proposed changes

Members are asked to consider the following proposals for additions, revisions and deletions in ISPM 5. Brief explanations are given for each proposal.

#### [4] 1. ADDITIONS

##### [5] 1.1 Confinement

[6] **Background.** The term *confinement* was added to the work programme by the Standards Committee (SC) in April 2010 based on the proposal of the Technical panel on the Glossary (TPG) to develop a definition for *confinement* in relation to ISPM 3:2005 (*Guidelines for the export, shipment, import and release of biological control agents and other beneficial organisms*) and ISPM 34:2010 (*Design and operation of post-entry quarantine stations for plants*). A draft definition was proposed by the TPG in October 2010 and reviewed by the SC in May 2011. The following points may be considered:

- [7] - *Confinement* is now the term used in ISPM 34:2010. When the draft of that ISPM had been sent for member consultation, some member comments had suggested using *containment*. However, it was recommended that there was a need for the two terms as used in the IPPC context with their current meaning, i.e. *containment* in relation to areas and *confinement* in relation to regulated articles in a facility.
- As in the definition of *containment*, it is the process of *confinement* that is described, not the result.

- *Confinement* of a regulated article is used to retain any pest in a quarantine facility, while *containment* aims at keeping a pest within an area.
- It is recommended to not mention *regulated pests* or *quarantine* as confinement might have a broader use.

[8] Proposed addition

- [9] **confinement** Application of **phytosanitary** measures to a **regulated article** to (of a **regulated article** prevent the escape of **pests article**)

[10] **2. REVISIONS**

- [11] For revised terms and definitions, explanations of the changes made to the last approved definition are also given. It is suggested that any member comments should relate only to the changes proposed.

[12] **2.1 Absorbed dose**

- [13] Background. The October 2010 TPG identified this revision when reviewing ISPM 5 for the consistency in the use of terms. This change is not considered a consistency change as described in the report of CPM-4 (2009) so it is proposed as an amendment to the Glossary. The following points may be considered:

- [14] - *Absorbed dose* is a physical term with no specific IPPC meaning, which normally would not be part of ISPM 5. It is however recommended to retain it, as it is not easily understood and is of great importance in relation to ISPM 18:2003 (*Guidelines for the use of irradiation as a phytosanitary measure*) and to treatments in ISPM 28:2007 (*Phytosanitary treatments for regulated pests*).
- The modification corrects a technical error. Gray is the quantity of radiating energy absorbed per unit of mass, i.e. the unit applies to the entire definition and not to “radiating energy” as in the old definition (the unit of radiating energy is joule) and as such reference to gray was put at the end of the sentence. However, further consideration resulted in the recommendation to delete the unit gray in the definition as it is not necessary. A definition is given in ISPM 18.

[15] Original definition

- [16] **absorbed dose** Quantity of radiating energy (in **gray**) absorbed per unit of mass of a specified target [ISPM No. 18, 2003]

[17] Proposed revision

- [18] **absorbed dose** Quantity of radiating energy absorbed per unit of mass of a specified target.

[19] **2.2 Phytosanitary certificate**

- [20] Background. The term was added to the work programme by the SC in April 2010 based on TPG proposal. A revised definition was proposed by the TPG in October 2010 and reviewed by the SC in May 2011. The following points may be considered:

- [21] - The current terms *certificate* and *phytosanitary certificate* are interrelated in the

Glossary, *certificate* being used in the definition of *phytosanitary certificate*.

- *Phytosanitary certificate* is the term of specific IPPC relevance and its definition currently lacks its specific IPPC meaning (currently expressed in the definition for *certificate*), i.e. that it attests that a consignment meets phytosanitary import requirements. But the last part of the definition of *certificate* does explain the purpose of phytosanitary certificates. It was therefore proposed to merge the information from *certificate* into *phytosanitary certificate* and then delete *certificate* (as proposed under 3.2).
- The proposed revision covers phytosanitary certificates in paper form and in electronic form and uses wording consistent with ISPM 12:2011 (*Phytosanitary certificates*). The original wording had to be adjusted as *document* (in the original definition of *certificate*) does not cover electronic phytosanitary certificates. The word *official* is used in both cases to indicate NPPO control.
- To solve the issue with “pattern” applying to paper and not the electronic version, the TPG proposes to use “consistent with” as in ISPM 12 (section 1.4).
- Rewording of the last part reflects that the consignment is subject to phytosanitary import requirements and uses wording in line with ISPM 12:2011.

[22] Original definition

<b>Phytosanitary Certificate</b>	<b>Certificate</b> patterned after the model <b>certificates</b> of the <b>IPPC</b> [FAO, 1990]
----------------------------------	---

[24] Proposed revision

<b>phytosanitary certificate</b>	An <b>official</b> paper document or its <b>official</b> electronic equivalent, consistent with the model certificates of the <b>IPPC</b> , attesting that a <b>consignment</b> meets <b>phytosanitary import requirements</b>
----------------------------------	--

[26] **2.3 Quarantine station**

[27] Background: Revision was proposed by the TPG (June 2009) and by the SC (November 2009). The term was added to the work programme by the SC in April 2010. A revised definition was proposed by the TPG in October 2010 and reviewed by the SC in May 2011. The following points may be considered:

- [28] - The current definition is too restrictive as quarantine stations might be used to hold in quarantine not only plants or plant products, but also other regulated articles including beneficial organisms. Mention of other regulated articles and of beneficial organisms was added.
- It is recommended to specifically mention beneficial organisms, as it is important in relation to ISPM 3:2005 (*Guidelines for the export, shipment, import and release of biological control agents and other beneficial organisms*). It should be noted that ISPM 3:2005 currently uses the words quarantine facilities to refer to the concept of quarantine stations. For consistency in the use of terms, once the revised definition is adopted, ISPM 3:2005 could be adjusted for consistency to use quarantine station.
- It is considered useful to cover the different types of elements that can be kept in a quarantine station

[29] Original definition

[30] **quarantine station** Official station for holding **plants** or **plant products** in **quarantine** [FAO, 1990; revised FAO, 1995; formerly **quarantine station or facility**]

[31] Proposed revision

[32] **quarantine station** Official station for holding **plants, plants products** or other **regulated articles**, including beneficial organisms, in **quarantine**

### [33] 3. DELETIONS

#### [34] 3.1 Certificate

[35] Background. The term was added to the work programme by the SC in April 2010 based on a TPG proposal. Deletion was proposed by the TPG in October 2010 and reviewed by the SC in May 2011.

[36] The current definition of *certificate* limits it to the IPPC context, but *certificate* and *certification* on their own have other meanings that need to be used in ISPMs (e.g. *CITES certificate* in ISPM 12:2011; *treatment documents/certificates, certificate of origin* in ISPM 23:2005; *certification of facilities* in ISPM 18:2003). Deletion of the term and definition is therefore proposed so as to not limit the use of the term. The proposed revision of the definition of *phytosanitary certificate* (see 2.3) ensures that the term of specific IPPC relevance is defined.

[37] Proposed for deletion

[38] **certificate** An **official** document which attests to the phytosanitary status of any **consignment** affected by **phytosanitary regulations** [FAO, 1990]

#### [39] 3.2 Gray (Gy)

[40] Background: The term was added to the work programme by the SC in April 2010 based on a TPG proposal. Deletion was proposed by the TPG in October 2010 and reviewed by the SC in May 2011.

[41] The term “gray (Gy)” appears in the (incorrect) Glossary definition of absorbed dose (see 2.X), in ISPM 18:2003 and in ISPM 28:2007 (all annexes). Gray as the unit of absorbed dose is defined in the International System of Units (i.e. an SI-unit) and therefore need not be defined in the Glossary.

[42] It is noted that other ISPMs use such technical terms, which are not defined, as in the diagnostic protocols.

[43] Proposed for deletion

[44] **gray (Gy)** Unit of **absorbed dose** where 1 Gy is equivalent to the absorption of 1 joule per kilogram (1 Gy = 1 J.kg<sup>-1</sup>) [ISPM No. 18, 2003]

#### [45] 3.3 Hitch-hiker pest

[46] Background: The term was added to the work programme by the SC in April 2010 based on a TPG proposal. Deletion was proposed by the TPG in October 2010 and reviewed by the SC in

May 2011.

[47] The current definition (“See contaminating pest”) simply states that hitch-hiker pest should be understood as identical to contaminating pest. The term hitch-hiker pest does not appear in the IPPC or ISPMs. The term is not easily understood by non-native English speakers and difficult to translate in a meaningful way. It need not be defined in the Glossary. However, based on member comments, it was recommended that the definition of “contaminating pest” would be reconsidered to more fully reflect this pathway for the movement of pests.

[48] Proposed for deletion

[49] <b>hitch-hiker pest</b>	See <b>contaminating pest</b>
------------------------------	-------------------------------

### [50] 3.4 Legislation

[51] Background: The term was added to the work programme by the SC in April 2010 based on a TPG proposal. Deletion was proposed by the TPG in October 2010 and reviewed by the SC in May 2011.

[52] The term *legislation* appears in the Convention Article II.1 in the definition of *phytosanitary measures*, in the definition of *phytosanitary legislation*, and in ISPMs 3:2005, 5, 12:2011, 18:2003, 19:2003, 20:2004 and 25:2006. Whereas the Glossary terms *phytosanitary legislation*, *phytosanitary measures* and *phytosanitary regulation* are defined with a particular meaning pertaining to the IPPC domain, the term *legislation* is a broadly used and understood term without any specific usage in the ISPMs. It need not be defined in the Glossary.

[53] It is noted that the definitions of *phytosanitary legislation* and *phytosanitary regulation* appropriately cover the concepts previously covered in the definition of *legislation*.

[54] Proposed for deletion:

[55] <b>legislation</b>	Any act, law, regulation, guideline or other administrative order promulgated by a government [ISPM No. 3, 1996]
-------------------------	--

### [56] 3.5 Plant pest

[57] Background: The term was added to the work programme by the SC in April 2010 based on a TPG proposal. Deletion was proposed by the TPG in October 2010 and reviewed by the SC in May 2011.

[58] The current definition (“See pest”) states that plant pest should be understood as identical to the term pest, which is defined in the Convention itself. The term plant pest appears in the Convention Articles I.4, VII.5 and VIII.1(a). It also appears in ISPMs 2:2007, 3:2005, 5, 6:1997, 11:2004, 15:2009 and 17:2002. In all cases, the term is correctly used as synonymous to pest. Plant pest could be substituted by pest during revisions of ISPMs for consistency or revision. The use of two synonymous terms should be avoided, and only the term defined in the IPPC used.

[59] However, because *plant pest* is the term used in the IPPC, the TPG suggest that the definition of pest be also modified as indicated below.

[60] Proposed for deletion

[61] <b>plant pest</b>	See <b>pest</b>
------------------------	-----------------

[62] Consequential revision of the definition of “pest”

[63] Original definition

[64] <b>pest</b>	Any species, strain or biotype of plant, animal or pathogenic agent injurious to <b>plants</b> or <b>plant products</b> .
------------------	---

[65] Proposed revision

[66] <b>pest</b>	Any species, strain or biotype of plant, animal or pathogenic agent injurious to <b>plants</b> or <b>plant products</b> . Note: In the IPPC, <b>plant pest</b> is sometimes used for the term <b>pest</b> .
------------------	---

### Note on other deletions

[67] Deletions proposed in 3.6 to 3.11 below were identified when reviewing ISPM 5 for the consistency in the use of terms. These deletions are not considered consistency changes as described in the report of CPM-4 (2009) so they are proposed as amendments to the Glossary.

### [68] **3.6 Antagonist**

[69] Background: The October 2010 TPG identified these deletions when reviewing ISPM 5 for the consistency in the use of terms. The following may be considered:

[70] - This term and definition do not have a specific meaning in the IPPC context, and are not needed in the Glossary.

[71] Proposed for deletion

[72] <b>antagonist</b>	An <b>organism</b> (usually <b>pathogen</b> ) which does no significant damage to the host but its colonization of the host protects the host from significant subsequent damage by a <b>pest</b> [ISPM No. 3, 1996]
------------------------	--

### [73] **3.7 Competitor**

[74] Background. The October 2010 TPG identified this deletion when reviewing ISPM 5 for the consistency in the use of terms. The following may be considered:

[75] - This term and definition do not have a specific meaning in the IPPC context, and are not needed in the Glossary.

- In addition the term is used in ISPM 3:2005 and ISPM 11:2004 with a different meaning.

[76] Proposed for deletion

[77] <b>competit</b> <b>or</b>	An organism which competes with pests for essential elements (e.g. food, shelter) in the environment [ISPM No. 3, 1996]
-----------------------------------	---

### [78] **3.8 Control point**

[79] Background. The October 2010 TPG identified these deletions when reviewing ISPM 5 for the consistency in the use of terms. The following may be considered:

- [80] - This term and definition do not have a specific meaning in the IPPC context, and are not needed in the Glossary.
- In addition control points are explained in ISPM 14:2002 (*The use of integrated measures in a systems approach for pest risk management*).

[81] Proposed for deletion:

- |      |                      |  |
|------|----------------------|--|
| [82] | <b>control point</b> | A step in a system where specific procedures can be applied to achieve a defined effect and can be measured, monitored, controlled and corrected [ISPM No. 14, 2002] |
|------|----------------------|--|

[83] **3.9 Dosimeter and dosimetry**

[84] Background. The October 2010 TPG identified these deletions when reviewing ISPM 5 for the consistency in the use of terms. The following may be considered:

- [85] - These terms and definitions do not have a specific meaning in the IPPC context, and are not needed in the Glossary.
- The terms are well-known words of physics and not used in any particular or different way in ISPM 18:2003 and ISPM 28:2007.

[86] Proposed for deletion:

- |      |                  |   |
|------|------------------|---|
| [87] | <b>dosimeter</b> | A device that, when irradiated, exhibits a quantifiable change in some property of the device which can be related to absorbed dose in a given material using appropriate analytical instrumentation and techniques [ISPM No. 18, 2003] |
|      | <b>dosimetry</b> | A system used for determining absorbed dose, consisting of dosimeters, measurement instruments and their associated reference standards, and procedures for the system [ISPM No. 18, 2003]  |

[88] **3.10 Ionizing radiation**

[89] Background. The October 2010 TPG identified this deletion when reviewing ISPM 5 for the consistency in the use of terms. The following points may be considered:

- [90] - This is a definition from physics that has no specific meaning for the IPPC, and is not needed in the Glossary.

[91] Proposed for deletion:

- |      |                           |   |
|------|---------------------------|---|
| [92] | <b>ionizing radiation</b> | Charged particles and electromagnetic waves that as a result of physical interaction create ions by either primary or secondary processes [ISPM No. 18, 2003] |
|------|---------------------------|---|

**ANNEX 6 - Compiled comments and TPG responses: Revised Supplement 1 to ISPM 5**

Comment no.	Paragraph no.	Comment type	Comment	Explanation	Country	Steward and TPG Response
[1]	G	Editorial		Editorials should be revised for consistency because for example not in all paragraphs the term "guideline" is replaced with "supplement". The same happens with the term "national" which was deleted in paragraph 39 but not in paragraph 37.	Costa Rica, Mexico, Nicaragua	Text has been modified where permitted. The term "guideline" appears in the gray area of paragraph 21 where comments were not allowed during country consultation.  See response for comment no. 25.
[2]	G	Editorial	<u>Editorials should be revised for consistency because for example not in all paragraphs the term "guideline" is replaced with "supplement". The same happens with the term "national", which was deleted in paragraph 39 but not in paragraph 37.</u>		Uruguay	See comment 1
[3]	G	Editorial	<u>We found it very difficult to partially review the ISPMs, because it is confusing having strikethrough text together with text not subjected to comments in the same paragraph. Editorials should be revised for consistency because for example not in all paragraphs the term "guideline" is replaced with "supplement". The same happens with the term national, which was deleted in paragraph 39 but not in paragraph</u>		OIRSA	See comment 1
[4]	G	Substantive	<u>There seems to be a confusion in the text between the process of determining whether a pest is not widely distributed, the use of PRA and the status of a pest being not widely distributed. Concrete proposals are provided, focusing the text on describing the status.</u>		EPPO, Norway, Russian, Federation, Ukraine, Morocco, Uzbekistan	Considered
[5]	G	Substantive	<u>Paragraph 28 of this draft states "An endangered area need not be continuous but may consist of several distinct parts of any size". That leads to the question, how does a country consider the protection of the endangered area that is not contiguous to the infested area? This is a requirement of official control but because this is not eradication or containment, the protection of the non-continuous endangered area is not included in the definition for OC. How is this action, the protection of a non-continuous endangered area, a requirement for OC, considered? As of this date, it has not been recognized as an OC activity, yet clearly,</u>		United States of America	For TPG's consideration at a later date

Comment no.	Paragraph no.	Comment type	Comment	Explanation	Country	Steward and TPG Response
			<p><a href="#">as per new language describing NWD, it is part of OC.</a></p> <p><a href="#">To help close the gap, the US has suggested additional wording for the definition of the new term exclusion to include "in and around an endangered area".</a></p> <p><a href="#">Furthermore, we suggest the TPG considers revising the term Official Control to include the phrase "exclusion in the endangered areas".</a></p>			
[6]	G	Substantive		<p>The phrase "not widely distributed" is not correctly translated in the Spanish definition of the term "quarantine pest" (plaga cuarentenaria). This phrase should be translated into Spanish as "no ampliamente distribuida". The current Spanish definition of quarantine pest refers to "plagas que no están extendidas" and not to "plagas no ampliamente distribuidas". Thus translation into Spanish of the term "quarantine pest" should be revised to include the phrase "no ampliamente distribuida" to which this supplement is intended to provide guidelines in its application and interpretation. The title of the draft is not correctly translated into Spanish, the translation does not reflect the English version and expresses that the concept of official control only applies to regulated pests that are not widely distributed. We found it very difficult to partially review the ISPM because it is confusing having strikethrough text together with text not subjected to comments in the same paragraph.</p>	Costa Rica , Mexico , Nicaragua	Translation issue
[7]	G	Substantive	<p><a href="#">The phrase "not widely distributed" is not correctly translated in the Spanish definition of the term "quarantine pest" (plaga cuarentenaria). This phrase should be translated into spanish as "no ampliamente distribuida". The current spanish definition of quarantine pest refers to "plagas que no estan extendidas" and not to "plagas no ampliamente distribuidas". Thus translation into spanish of the term "quarantine pest" should be revised to include the phrase "no ampliamente distribuida" to which this supplement is intended to provide guidelines in its application and interpretation.</a></p>		Uruguay	Translation issue
[8]	G	Substantive		<p>The phrase "not widely distributed" is not correctly translated in the spanish definition</p>	COSAVE, Chile, Brazil	Translation issue

Comment no.	Paragraph no.	Comment type	Comment	Explanation	Country	Steward and TPG Response
				of the term “quarantine pest” (plaga cuarentenaria). This phrase should be translated into spanish as “no ampliamente distribuida”. The current spanish definition of quarantine pest refers to “plagas que no estan extendidas” and not to “plagas no ampliamente distribuidas”. Thus translation into spanish of the term “quarantine pest” should be revised to include the phrase “no ampliamente distribuida” to which this supplement is intended to provide guidelines on its application and interpretation. The title of the draft is not correctly translated into spanish, the translation does not reflect the english version and express that the concept of official control only applies to regulated pests that are not widely distributed.		
[9]	G	Substantive	<u>There seems to be a confusion in the text between the process of determining whether a pest is not widely distributed, the use of PRA and the status of a pest being not widely distributed. Concrete proposals are provided, focusing the text on describing the status.</u>		European Union	Considered
[10]	G	Substantive		The phrase “not widely distributed” is not correctly translated in the Spanish definition of the term “quarantine pest” (plaga cuarentenaria). This phrase should be translated into spanish as “no ampliamente distribuida”. The current spanish definition of quarantine pest refers to “plagas que no estan extendidas” and not to “plagas no ampliamente distribuidas”. Thus translation into spanish of the term “quarantine pest” should be revised to include the phrase “no ampliamente distribuida” to which this supplement is intended to provide guidelines on its application and interpretation. The title of the draft is not correctly translated into spanish, the translation does not reflect the English version and express that the concept of official control only applies to regulated pests that are not widely distributed	Argentina	Translation issue

Comment no.	Paragraph no.	Comment type	Comment	Explanation	Country	Steward and TPG Response
[11]	G	Translation		The Spanish version has a lot of problems with translation. We detected for example in paragraph 55 inconsistencies with the English version which leads to a wrong interpretation of the contents.	Costa Rica , Mexico , Nicaragua	Translation issue
[12]	G	Translation	<u>The title of the draft is not correctly translated into spanish, the translation does not reflect the english version and express that the concept of official control only applies to regulated pests that are not widely distributed.</u>		Uruguay	Translation issue
[13]	G	Translation	<u>The phrase "not widely distributed" is not correctly translated in the spanish definition of the term "quarantine pest" (plaga cuarentenaria). This phrase should be translated into spanish as "no ampliamente distribuida". The current spanish definition of quarantine pest refers to "plagas que no estan extendidas" and not to "plagas no ampliamente Distribuidas". Thus translation into spanish of the term "quarantine pest" should be revised to include the phrase "no ampliamente distribuida" to wich this supplement is intended to provide guidelines on its application and interpretation.</u> <u>The title of the draft is not correctly translated into spanish, the translation does not reflect the english version and express that the concept of official control only applies to regulated pests that are not widely distributed.</u>		Paraguay	Translation issue
[14]	G	Translation	<u>The phrase "not widely distributed" is not correctly translated in the Spanish definition of the term "quarantine pest" (plaga cuarentenaria). This phrase should be translated into spanish as "no ampliamente distribuida". The current spanish definition of quarantine pest refers to "plagas que no estan extendidas" and not to "plagas no ampliamente distribuidas". Thus translation into spanish of the term "quarantine pest" should be revised to include the phrase "no ampliamente distribuida" to which this supplement is intended to provide guidelines in its application and interpretation.</u> <u>The title of the draft is not correctly translated into spanish, the translation does not reflect the english version and expresses that the concept of official control only applies to regulated pests that are not widely distributed.</u> <u>The Spanish version has a lot of problems with translation. We detected for example in paragraph 55 inconsistencies with the English version which leads to a wrong interpretation of the contents.</u>		OIRSA	Translation issue
[15]	1	Editorial	2. DRAFT REVISION TO ISPM 5 (GLOSSARY OF PHYTOSANITARY TERMS) - SUPPLEMENT NO. 1: GUIDELINES ON THE INTERPRETATION AND APPLICATION OF THE CONCEPTS OF "OFFICIAL CONTROL" <del>FOR IN RELATION TO REGULATED PESTS</del> AND "NOT WIDELY DISTRIBUTED" <del>IN RELATION TO QUARANTINE PESTS THAT ARE PRESENT IN AN AREA</del>	Simplification of title (by removing both 'in relation to ...etc') Add inserted commas to "official control" and "not widely distributed" for clarity	EPPO, Russian Federation , Ukraine , Morocco , Uzbekistan	Modified. The TPG suggests that inverted commas are needed.
[16]	1	Editorial	2. DRAFT REVISION TO ISPM 5 (GLOSSARY OF PHYTOSANITARY TERMS) - SUPPLEMENT NO. 1: GUIDELINES ON THE	Simplified wording	Uruguay	See comment 15

Comment no.	Paragraph no.	Comment type	Comment	Explanation	Country	Steward and TPG Response
			INTERPRETATION AND APPLICATION OF THE CONCEPTS OF "OFFICIAL CONTROL" <del>FOR IN RELATION TO</del> FOR REGULATED PESTS AND "NOT WIDELY DISTRIBUTED" <del>FOR IN RELATION TO</del> FOR QUARANTINE PESTS THAT ARE PRESENT <del>IN AN AREA</del>			
[17]	1	Editorial	2. DRAFT REVISION TO ISPM 5 (GLOSSARY OF PHYTOSANITARY TERMS) - SUPPLEMENT NO. 1: GUIDELINES ON THE INTERPRETATION AND APPLICATION OF THE CONCEPTS OF OFFICIAL CONTROL <del>FOR IN RELATION TO</del> REGULATED PESTS AND NOT WIDELY DISTRIBUTED <del>FOR IN RELATION TO</del> QUARANTINE PESTS THAT ARE PRESENT <del>IN AN AREA</del>	Simplified wording	COSAVE, Chile, Brazil	See comment 15
[18]	1	Editorial	2. DRAFT REVISION TO ISPM 5 (GLOSSARY OF PHYTOSANITARY TERMS) - SUPPLEMENT NO. 1: GUIDELINES ON THE INTERPRETATION AND APPLICATION OF THE CONCEPTS OF OFFICIAL CONTROL <del>FOR IN RELATION TO</del> REGULATED PESTS AND NOT WIDELY DISTRIBUTED <del>FOR IN RELATION TO</del> QUARANTINE PESTS THAT ARE PRESENT <del>IN AN AREA</del>	Simplified wording	Paraguay	See comment 15
[19]	1	Editorial	2. DRAFT REVISION TO ISPM 5 (GLOSSARY OF PHYTOSANITARY TERMS) - SUPPLEMENT NO. 1: GUIDELINES ON THE INTERPRETATION AND APPLICATION OF THE CONCEPTS OF "OFFICIAL CONTROL" <del>FOR IN RELATION TO</del> REGULATED PESTS AND "NOT WIDELY DISTRIBUTED" <del>IN RELATION TO</del> QUARANTINE PESTS THAT ARE PRESENT <del>IN AN AREA</del>	Simplification of title (by removing both 'in relation to ...etc') Add inserted commas to "official control" and "not widely distributed" for clarity	European Union	See comment 15
[20]	1	Editorial	2. DRAFT REVISION TO ISPM 5 (GLOSSARY OF PHYTOSANITARY TERMS) - SUPPLEMENT NO. 1: GUIDELINES ON THE INTERPRETATION AND APPLICATION OF THE CONCEPTS OF OFFICIAL CONTROL <del>FOR FOR IN RELATION TO</del> REGULATED PESTS AND NOT WIDELY DISTRIBUTED <del>FOR IN RELATION TO</del> QUARANTINE PESTS THAT ARE PRESENT <del>IN AN AREA</del>	Simplified wording	Argentina	See comment 15
[21]	1	Editorial	2. DRAFT REVISION TO ISPM 5 (GLOSSARY OF PHYTOSANITARY TERMS) - SUPPLEMENT NO. 1: GUIDELINES ON THE INTERPRETATION AND APPLICATION OF THE CONCEPTS OF OFFICIAL CONTROL <del>FOR IN RELATION TO</del> REGULATED PESTS AND NOT WIDELY DISTRIBUTED <del>IN RELATION TO</del> QUARANTINE PESTS THAT ARE PRESENT <del>IN AN AREA</del>	Title of the supplement No. 1 to ISPM no. 5 (Glossary of Phytosanitary Terms) is too long and convoluted to be helpful. Suggested changes to the title of supplement no. 1 make it easier to understand for the reader. These changes are also supported by the description of the scope as it is written in paragraph [7]	Canada	See comment 15
[22]	1	Editorial	2. DRAFT REVISION TO ISPM 5 (GLOSSARY OF PHYTOSANITARY TERMS) - SUPPLEMENT NO. 1: GUIDELINES ON THE INTERPRETATION AND APPLICATION OF THE CONCEPTS OF	Simplified wording	OIRSA	See comment 15

Comment no.	Paragraph no.	Comment type	Comment	Explanation	Country	Steward and TPG Response
			OFFICIAL CONTROL <del>FOR IN RELATION TO</del> FOR "REGULATED PESTS" AND "NOT WIDELY DISTRIBUTED" <del>IN RELATION TO</del> FOR QUARANTINE PESTS THAT ARE PRESENT <del>IN AN AREA</del>			
[23]	1	Technical	2. DRAFT REVISION TO ISPM 5 (GLOSSARY OF PHYTOSANITARY TERMS) - SUPPLEMENT NO. 1: GUIDELINES ON THE INTERPRETATION AND APPLICATION OF THE CONCEPTS OF "OFFICIAL CONTROL" <del>FOR FOR IN RELATION TO</del> REGULATED PESTS AND "NOT WIDELY DISTRIBUTED" <del>IN RELATION TO</del> FOR QUARANTINE PESTS THAT ARE PRESENT <del>IN AN AREA</del>	Simplified wording.	Costa Rica , Mexico , Nicaragua	See comment 15
[24]	1	Translation	2. DRAFT REVISION TO ISPM 5 (GLOSSARY OF PHYTOSANITARY TERMS) - SUPPLEMENT NO. 1: GUIDELINES ON THE INTERPRETATION AND APPLICATION OF THE CONCEPTS OF OFFICIAL CONTROL <del>FOR IN RELATION TO</del> REGULATED PESTS AND NOT WIDELY DISTRIBUTED IN RELATION TO QUARANTINE PESTS THAT ARE PRESENT IN AN AREA	The text proposed in Spanish is: "2. PROYECTO DE REVISIÓN DE LA NIMF 5 (GLOSARIO DE TÉRMINOS FITOSANITARIOS) - SUPLEMENTO NO. 1: DIRECTRICES SOBRE LA INTERPRETACIÓN Y APLICACIÓN DE LOS CONCEPTOS DE "CONTROL OFICIAL" PARA PLAGAS REGLAMENTADAS Y "NO AMPLIAMENTE DISTRIBUIDAS" PARA LAS CUARENTENARIAS QUE ESTÁN PRESENTES" Explanation: the translation does not reflect the English version and expresses that the concept of official control only applies to regulated pests that are not widely distributed.	OIRSA	Translation issue
[25]	7	Editorial	This guideline <del>supplement</del> refers only to <u>guideline provides guidance on the official control of regulated pests and, for the decision on whether a pest qualifies as a quarantine pest, determination of when a pest is considered to be present but not widely distributed.</u> For the purposes of this <del>guideline supplement guideline</del> , the relevant regulated pests are both quarantine pests that are present in an importing country but not widely distributed and regulated non-quarantine pests. <u>General comment:</u> Maintain 'guidelines' when referring to the content of the whole document. The word supplement refers to association of the document with ISPM No. 5.	Using the word 'guideline' when referring to this supplement is more appropriate.	Malaysia	Modified. Propose to use the term supplement, to be consistent with general current practice in ISPMs Sentence has been modified so as to present the content of the supplement in two bullet points
[26]	7	Editorial	This guideline <del>supplement</del> refers only to <u>provides guidance on the official control of regulated pests, and, for the provides decision criteria on whether a pest qualifies as a quarantine pest and, determination of when a pest is considered to be present but not widely distributed.</u> For the purposes of this		Philippines	Modified. "Provides" is not necessary since it follows the same thought at the beginning

Comment no.	Paragraph no.	Comment type	Comment	Explanation	Country	Steward and TPG Response
			<del>guideline</del> supplement, the relevant regulated pests are both quarantine pests that are present in an importing country but not widely distributed and regulated non-quarantine pests.			of the sentence. Suggested rewording to avoid the word criteria as the supplement does not give guidance on the decision on whether a pest qualifies as a quarantine pest.
[27]	7	Editorial	This <del>guideline</del> supplement <del>guideline</del> refers only to <u>provides guidance on</u> the official control of regulated pests <u>and, for the decision on whether a pest qualifies as a quarantine pest, determination of when a pest is considered to be present but not widely distributed.</u> For the purposes of this <del>guideline</del> supplement- <del>guideline</del> , the relevant regulated pests are both quarantine pests that are present in an importing country but not widely distributed and regulated non-quarantine pests.		Thailand , Korea, Republic of , Viet Nam , Lao People's Democratic Republic, India	See comment 25
[28]	7	Editorial	This <del>guideline</del> supplement <del>guideline</del> refers only to <u>provides guidance on</u> the official control of regulated pests <u>and, for the decision on whether a pest qualifies as a quarantine pest, determination of when a pest is considered to be present but not widely distributed.</u> For the purposes of this <del>guideline</del> supplement, the relevant regulated pests are both quarantine pests that are present in an importing country but not widely distributed and regulated non-quarantine pests.	Deleted text is repetition from the definition of a quarantine pest	Ghana	Considered. The whole point of this supplement is to provide guidance when a pest is considered to be present but NWD.
[29]	7	Editorial	This <del>guideline</del> guideline <del>supplement</del> refers only to <u>provides guidance on</u> the official control of regulated pests <u>and, for the decision on whether a pest qualifies as a quarantine pest, determination of when a pest is considered to be present but not widely distributed.</u> For the purposes of this <del>guideline</del> <del>guideline</del> <del>supplement</del> , the relevant regulated pests are both quarantine pests that are present in an importing country but not widely distributed and regulated non-quarantine pests.		Japan	See comment 25
[30]	7	Editorial	This <del>guideline</del> supplement <del>guideline</del> refers only to <u>provides guidance on</u> the official control of regulated pests <u>and, for the decision on whether a pest qualifies as a quarantine pest, determination of when a pest is considered to be present but not widely distributed.</u> For the purposes of this <del>guideline</del> supplement- <del>guideline</del> , the relevant regulated pests are both quarantine pests that are present in an importing country but not widely distributed and regulated non-quarantine pests.		Russian Federation	See comment 25
[31]	7	Editorial	This <del>guideline</del> supplement <del>guideline</del> refers only to <u>provides guidance on</u> the official control of regulated pests <u>and, for the decision on whether a pest qualifies as a quarantine pest and the- determination of when a pest is considered to be present but not widely distributed.</u> For the purposes of this <del>guideline</del> supplement, the relevant regulated pests are both quarantine pests	These changes are proposed to provide clarity.	Canada	Modified

Comment no.	Paragraph no.	Comment type	Comment	Explanation	Country	Steward and TPG Response
			that are present in an importing country but not widely distributed and regulated non-quarantine pests.			
[32]	7	Editorial	This <del>guideline supplement refers only to</del> <u>provides guidance on</u> the official control of regulated pests <u>and, for the decision on whether a pest qualifies as a quarantine pest, determination of when a pest is considered to be present but not widely distributed.</u> For the purposes of this <del>guideline supplement</del> , the relevant regulated pests are both quarantine pests that are present in an importing country but not widely distributed and regulated non-quarantine pests.	Deleted text is repetition from the definition of a quarantine pest	Gabon , Cameroon	See comment 28
[33]	7	Editorial	This <del>guideline supplement refers only to</del> <u>provides guidance on</u> the official control of regulated pests <u>and, for the decision on whether a pest qualifies as a quarantine pest, determination of when a pest is considered to be present but not widely distributed.</u> For the purposes of this <del>guideline supplement</del> , the relevant regulated pests are both quarantine pests that are present in an importing country but not widely distributed and regulated non-quarantine pests.	To avoid redundancy	El Salvador	Considered. Retained for clarity. In addition, the TPG noted that the last sentence of the paragraph has become unnecessary and confusing, and deletion was proposed. <b>For SC consideration</b> (grey text) (note: SC accepted).
[34]	7	Editorial	This <del>guideline supplement guideline</del> <u>refers only to provides guidance on</u> the official control of regulated pests <u>and, for the decision on whether a pest qualifies as a quarantine pest, determination of when a pest is considered to be present but not widely distributed.</u> For the purposes of this <del>guideline supplement- guideline</del> , the relevant regulated pests are both quarantine pests that are present in an importing country but not widely distributed and regulated non-quarantine pests.	Scope should clearly specify the content of the revision of this supplement which is to provide guidelines on the concept of not widely distributed in relation to present quarantine pest.	Brazil	See comment 25
[35]	7	Substantive	This <del>guideline supplement</del> <u>refers only to provides guidance on</u> the official control of regulated pests <u>and on not widely distributed for the decision on whether a pest qualifies as a quarantine pest, determination of when a pest is considered to be present but not widely distributed.</u> For the purposes of this <del>guideline supplement</del> , the relevant regulated pests are both quarantine pests that are present in an importing country but not widely distributed and regulated non-quarantine pests.	Scope should clearly specify the content of the revision of this supplement which is to provide guidelines on the concept of not widely distributed in relation to quarantine pests that are present.	Costa Rica , Mexico , Nicaragua	Considered. The modified text presented to the SC provides more clarity.
[36]	7	Substantive	This <del>guideline supplement</del> <u>refers only to provides guidance on</u> the official control of regulated pests <u>and, for the decision on whether a pest qualifies as a quarantine pest, on the determination of when a quarantine pest is considered to be present but not widely distributed.</u> For the purposes of this <del>guideline supplement</del> , the relevant regulated pests are both quarantine pests that are present in an importing country but not widely distributed and regulated non-quarantine pests.	Scope should clearly specify the content of the revision of this supplement which is to provide guidelines on the concept of not widely distributed in relation to quarantine pests that are present.	Uruguay	Considered. First, we must determine if a pest is present but NWD. If these conditions exist along with a pest being of economic importance and under OC, then we can call it a quarantine pest. But if these conditions have not been determined yet, we cannot call

Comment no.	Paragraph no.	Comment type	Comment	Explanation	Country	Steward and TPG Response
						it a quarantine pest yet.
[37]	7	Substantive	This <del>guideline supplement refers only to</del> <u>provides guidance on</u> the official control of regulated pests <u>and, for the decision on whether a pest qualifies as a quarantine pest, on the determination of when a quarantine pest is considered to be present but not widely distributed.</u> For the purposes of this <del>guideline supplement</del> , the relevant regulated pests are both quarantine pests that are present in an importing country but not widely distributed and regulated non-quarantine pests.	Scope should clearly specify the content of the revision of this supplement which is to provide guidelines on the concept of not widely distributed in relation to present quarantine pest.	COSAVE, Chile, Brazil	See comment 36
[38]	7	Substantive	This <del>guideline supplement refers only to</del> <u>provides guidance on</u> the official control of regulated pests <u>and, for the decision on whether a pest qualifies as a quarantine pest, ON THE determination of when a QUARANTINE pest is considered to be present but not widely distributed.</u> For the purposes of this <del>guideline supplement</del> , the relevant regulated pests are both quarantine pests that are present in an importing country but not widely distributed and regulated non-quarantine pests.	Scope should clearly specify the content of the revision of this supplement which is to provide guidelines on the concept of not widely distributed in relation to present quarantine pest.	Argentina	See comment 36
[39]	7	Substantive	This <del>guideline supplement refers only to</del> <u>provides guidance on</u> the official control of regulated pests <u>and, for the decision on whether a pest qualifies as a quarantine pest, determination of when a pest is considered to be present but on not widely distributed for quarantine pests that are present.</u> For the purposes of this <del>guideline supplement</del> , the relevant regulated pests are both quarantine pests that are present in an importing country but not widely distributed and regulated non-quarantine pests.	Scope should clearly specify the content of the revision of this supplement which is to provide guidelines on the concept of not widely distributed in relation to quarantine pests that are present.	OIRSA	Considered. See explanation for comment 36.
[40]	7	Substantive	This <del>guideline supplement refers only to</del> <u>provides guidance on</u> the official control of regulated pests <u>and, for the decision on whether a pest qualifies as a quarantine pest, on the determination of when a quarantine pest is considered to be present but not widely distributed.</u> For the purposes of this <del>guideline supplement</del> , the relevant regulated pests are both quarantine pests that are present in an importing country but not widely distributed and regulated non-quarantine pests.	Scope should clearly specify the content of the revision of this supplement which is to provide guidelines on the concept of not widely distributed in relation to present quarantine pest.	Paraguay	See comment 36
[41]	7	Technical	This <del>guideline supplement refers only to</del> <u>provides guidance on</u> the official control of regulated pests <u>and, for the decision on whether a pest qualifies as a quarantine pest, determination of when a pest is considered to be present but not widely distributed.</u> For the purposes of this <del>guideline supplement</del> , the relevant regulated pests are both quarantine pests that are present in an importing country but not widely distributed and regulated non-quarantine pests.	The last sentence, even with amendments, is still confusing and has become unnecessary with the amendments to the first sentence. The second sentence therefore should be deleted altogether.	EPPO, Norway, Russian Federation, Ukraine, Morocco, Uzbekistan	The steward and the TPG agree with the comment, and the text has been deleted, but this is <b>for consideration by the SC.</b> (note: SC accepted).
[42]	7	Technical	This <del>guideline supplement refers only to</del> <u>provides guidance on</u> the official control of regulated pests <u>and, for the decision on whether a pest qualifies as a quarantine pest, determination of when a pest is considered to be present</u>	The last sentence, even with amendments, is still confusing and has become unnecessary with the amendments to the	European Union	See comment 41

Comment no.	Paragraph no.	Comment type	Comment	Explanation	Country	Steward and TPG Response
			<del>but not widely distributed.</del> For the purposes of this guideline supplement, the relevant regulated pests are both quarantine pests that are present in an importing country but not widely distributed and regulated non-quarantine pests.	first sentence. The second sentence therefore should be deleted altogether.		
[43]	7	Technical	This guideline supplement refers only to provides guidance on the official control of regulated pests <u>and, for the decision on whether a pest qualifies as a quarantine pest, determination of when a pest is considered to be present but not widely distributed.</u> For the purposes of this guideline supplement, the relevant regulated pests are both quarantine pests that are present in an importing country but not widely distributed and regulated non-quarantine pests.	Deleted text is repetition from the definition of a quarantine pest	Nigeria	See comment 28
[44]	7	Translation	This guideline supplement refers only to provides guidance on the official control of regulated pests <u>and, for the decision on whether a pest qualifies as a quarantine pest, determination of when a pest is considered to be present but not widely distributed.</u> For the purposes of this guideline supplement, the relevant regulated pests are both quarantine pests that are present in an importing country but not widely distributed and regulated non-quarantine pests.	The proposal of the Spanish translation for the first sentence of the paragraph 7 it is that follow: "El presente suplemento brinda orientación sobre el control oficial de las plagas reglamentadas y para decidir si una plaga califica como plaga cuarentenaria, determinando cuando se considera que está presente pero no distribuida ampliamente". Explanation: For better understanding	El Salvador	Translation issue
[45]	9	Editorial	ISPM 1. 2006. <i>Phytosanitary principles for the protection of plants and the application of phytosanitary measures in international trade.</i> Rome, IPPC, FAO. Rome.	To be consistent with the format used in other ISPMs.	Malaysia	Considered. Recent IPPC change.
[46]	9	Editorial	ISPM 1. 2006. <i>Phytosanitary principles for the protection of plants and the application of phytosanitary measures in international trade.</i> Rome, IPPC, FAO. Rome.		Philippines , Thailand , Korea, Republic of , Viet Nam , Lao People's Democratic Republic, India	See comment 45
[47]	9	Editorial	ISPM 1. 2006. <i>Phytosanitary principles for the protection of plants and the application of phytosanitary measures in international trade.</i> Rome, IPPC, FAO. Rome.		Mexico , Russian Federation , Gabon	See comment 45
[48]	10	Editorial	ISPM 2. 2007. <i>Framework for pest risk analysis.</i> Rome, IPPC, FAO. Rome.	To be consistent with the format used in other ISPMs.	Malaysia	See comment 45
[49]	10	Editorial	ISPM 2. 2007. <i>Framework for pest risk analysis.</i> Rome, IPPC, FAO. Rome.		Thailand	See comment 45

Comment no.	Paragraph no.	Comment type	Comment	Explanation	Country	Steward and TPG Response
[50]	11	Editorial	ISPM 6. 1997. <i>Guidelines for surveillance</i> . <del>Rome</del> , IPPC, <del>FAO</del> , <del>Rome</del> .	To be consistent with the format used in other ISPMs.	Malaysia	See comment 45
[51]	11	Editorial	ISPM 6. 1997. <i>Guidelines for surveillance</i> . <del>Rome</del> , IPPC, <del>FAO</del> , <del>Rome</del> .		Thailand	See comment 45
[52]	12	Editorial	ISPM 8. 1998. <i>Determination of pest status in an area</i> . <del>Rome</del> , IPPC, <del>FAO</del> , <del>Rome</del> .	To be consistent with the format used in other ISPMs.	Malaysia	See comment 45
[53]	12	Editorial	ISPM 8. 1998. <i>Determination of pest status in an area</i> . <del>Rome</del> , IPPC, <del>FAO</del> , <del>Rome</del> .		Thailand	See comment 45
[54]	13	Editorial	ISPM 11. 2004. <i>Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests including analysis of environmental risks and living modified organisms</i> . <del>Rome</del> , IPPC, <del>FAO</del> , <del>Rome</del> .		Thailand	See comment 45
[55]	14	Editorial	<i>Report of the ICPM open-ended working group on official control, 22–24 March 2000, Bordeaux, France</i> , IPPC Secretariat, <del>FAO</del> , <del>Rome</del> , <del>IPPC</del> , <del>FAO</del> , <del>Rome</del> .		Thailand	The TPG suggested to delete reference to the report, which is not mentioned in the supplement. <b>For SC (grey text)</b> (note. SC accepted). See comment 45
[56]	19	Editorial	The words “ <u>present but not widely distributed and being officially controlled</u> ” express an essential concept in the definition of a quarantine pest. <u>According to that definition, a quarantine pest must always be of potential economic importance to an endangered area. In addition, it must either meet the criterion of not being present in that area or it must meet the combined criteria of being not widely distributed and subject to official control.</u>	An indefinite article is missing.	EPPO, Russian Federation, Ukraine, Morocco, Uzbekistan	Considered. This definition refers to the term “quarantine pest”, not to a quarantine pest.
[57]	19	Editorial	The words “ <u>present but not widely distributed and being officially controlled</u> ” express an essential concept in the definition of a quarantine pest. <u>According to that definition, a quarantine pest must always be of potential economic importance to an endangered area. In addition, it must either meet the criterion of not being present in that area or it must meet the combined criteria of being present but not widely distributed and subject to official control.</u>	To clarify	Costa Rica, Mexico, Nicaragua	Incorporated
[58]	19	Editorial	The words “ <u>present but not widely distributed and being officially controlled</u> ” express an essential concept in the definition of a quarantine pest. <u>According to that definition, a quarantine pest must always be of potential economic importance to an endangered area. In addition, it must either meet the criterion of not being present in that area or it must meet the combined criteria of being present but not widely distributed and subject to</u>	To clarify	Uruguay	See comment 57

Comment no.	Paragraph no.	Comment type	Comment	Explanation	Country	Steward and TPG Response
			<u>official control.</u>			
[59]	19	Editorial	The words <u>"present but not widely distributed and being officially controlled"</u> express <del>an</del> essential concepts in the definition of <del>a</del> a quarantine pest. <u>According to that definition, a quarantine pest must always be of potential economic importance to an endangered area. In addition, it must either meet the criterion of not being present in that area or it must meet the combined criteria of being present but not widely distributed and subject to official control.</u>	To clarify	COSAVE, Chile, Brazil	See comment 57
[60]	19	Editorial	The words <u>"present but not widely distributed and being officially controlled"</u> express <del>an</del> essential concepts in the definition of <del>a</del> a quarantine pest. <u>According to that definition, a quarantine pest must always be of potential economic importance to an endangered area. In addition, it must either meet the criterion of not being present in that area or it must meet the combined criteria of being not widely distributed and subject to official control.</u>	An indefinite article is missing.	European Union	See comment 56
[61]	19	Editorial	The words <u>"present but not widely distributed and being officially controlled"</u> express <del>an</del> essential concepts in the definition of <del>a</del> a quarantine pest. <u>According to that definition, a quarantine pest must always be of potential economic importance to an endangered area. In addition, it must either meet the criterion of not being present in that area or it must meet the combined criteria of being PRESENT BUT not widely distributed and subject to official control.</u>	To clarify	Argentina	See comment 57
[62]	19	Editorial	The words <u>"present but not widely distributed and being officially controlled"</u> express <del>an</del> <u>an</u> essential concepts in the definition of <del>a</del> a quarantine pest. <u>According to that definition, a quarantine pest must always be of potential economic importance to an endangered area. In addition, it must either meet the criterion of not being present in that area or it must meet the combined criteria of being not widely distributed and subject to official control.</u>	The string of words in quotes is expressing a single concept, not a collection of concepts. As stated in the final sentence of this paragraph, the "not widely distributed" and "subject to official control" are combined. Since these two elements are inseparable in the definition of a quarantine pest, it would be preferable to refer to them as a single entity.	Canada	Considered. The steward believes the definition of a quarantine pest includes several important concepts, e.g. the terms official control and potential economic importance have been clarified as separate concepts in two different supplements.
[63]	19	Editorial	The words <u>"present but not widely distributed and being officially controlled"</u> express <del>an</del> essential concepts in the definition of <del>a</del> a quarantine pest. <u>According to that definition, a quarantine pest must always be of potential economic importance to an endangered area. In addition, it must either meet the criterion of not being present in that area or it must meet the combined criteria of being present but not widely distributed and subject to official control.</u>	To clarify	OIRSA	See comment 57

Comment no.	Paragraph no.	Comment type	Comment	Explanation	Country	Steward and TPG Response
[64]	19	Editorial	The words <u>“present but not widely distributed and being officially controlled”</u> express an essential concept in the definition of a quarantine pest. <u>According to that definition, a quarantine pest must always be of potential economic importance to an endangered area. In addition, it must either meet the criterion of not being present in that area or it must meet the combined criteria of being present but not widely distributed and subject to official control.</u>	To clarify	Paraguay	See comment 57
[65]	20	Editorial	The <i>Glossary of phytosanitary terms</i> defines official as “established, authorized or performed by an NPPO” and control as “suppression, containment or eradication of a pest population”. However, for phytosanitary purposes, the concept of <i>official control</i> is not adequately expressed by the combination of these two definitions.	A space is missing between "terms" and "defines" in the first line and between "control" and "is" in the third line. This will facilitate reading of the text.	Canada	Considered.
[66]	21	Editorial	The purpose of this <u>guideline supplement</u> is to describe more precisely the interpretation of:	Obvious error.	EPPO, European Union , Russian Federation , Ukraine , Morocco , Uzbekistan	See comment 25 For consistency
[67]	21	Editorial	The purpose of this <u>supplement guideline</u> is to describe more precisely the interpretation of:	To be consistent with previous corrections.	OIRSA	See comment 25
[68]	22	Editorial	the concept of official control and its application in practice <u>for quarantine pests that are present in an area as well as for regulated non-quarantine pests, and</u> <u>The concept of “present but not widely distributed” in relation to official control for quarantine pests.</u>	To clarify	Costa Rica , Mexico , Nicaragua	Modified. Quotes removed to be consistent with official control in the previous indent.
[69]	22	Editorial	the concept of official control and its application in practice <u>for quarantine pests that are present in an area as well as for regulated non-quarantine pests, and</u> <u>the concept of “present but not widely distributed” in relation to official control for quarantine pests.</u>	To clarify and consistency with first bullet	Uruguay	See comment 68
[70]	22	Editorial	the concept of official control and its application in practice <u>for quarantine pests that are present in an area as well as for regulated non-quarantine pests, and</u> <u>• The concept of “present but not widely distributed” in relation to official control for quarantine pests.</u>	To clarify	COSAVE, Chile, Brazil	See comment 68

Comment no.	Paragraph no.	Comment type	Comment	Explanation	Country	Steward and TPG Response
[71]	22	Editorial	the concept of official control and its application in practice <u>for quarantine pests that are present in an area as well as for regulated non-quarantine pests, and</u> <u>The concept of “present but not widely distributed” in relation to official control for quarantine pests.</u>	To clarify	Paraguay	See comment 68
[72]	22	Editorial	the concept of official control and its application in practice <u>for quarantine pests that are present in an area as well as for regulated non-quarantine pests, and</u> <u>THE CONCEPT OF “present but not widely distributed” in relation to official control for quarantine pests.</u>	To clarify	Argentina	See comment 68
[73]	22	Editorial	the concept of official control and its application in practice <u>for quarantine pests that are present in an area as well as for regulated non-quarantine pests, and</u> <u>the concept of “present but not widely distributed” in relation to official control for quarantine pests.</u>	To clarify	OIRSA	See comment 68
[74]	22	Substantive	the concept of official control and its application in practice <u>for quarantine pests that are present in an area as well as for regulated non-quarantine pests, and</u> <u>“present but not widely distributed” in relation to <del>official control</del> for quarantine pests.</u>	The concepts included in the second bullet of paragraph 22 should only be in relation to quarantine pests.	Canada	Modified. The concepts of NWD and OC cannot be separated when discussing quarantine pests. This is the reason the SC wanted both concepts in the same supplement, instead of two separate supplements. The text was adjusted
[75]	23	Editorial	<u>A national plant protection organization (NPPO) may choose whether or not to officially control a pest that is of potential economic importance and that is present but is not widely distributed, taking into account other relevant factors from pest risk analysis (PRA), for example the costs and benefits of regulating the specific pest.</u>	"other" seems confusing	EPPO, Russian Federation, Ukraine, Morocco, Uzbekistan	Incorporated (and sentence moved, see comment 80) The TPG suggested to add a sentence to clarify the outcome of the pest not being subject to official control, i.e. If the pest is not subjected to official control, it does not then qualify as a quarantine pest.
[76]	23	Editorial	<u>A National Plant Protection Organization (NPPO) may choose whether or not to officially control a pest that is of potential economic importance and that is present but is not widely distributed, taking into account other relevant factors from Pest Risk Analysis (PRA), for example the costs and benefits of regulating the specific pest.</u>	For consistency	Ghana	Considered (current practice)

Comment no.	Paragraph no.	Comment type	Comment	Explanation	Country	Steward and TPG Response
[77]	23	Editorial	<u>A national plant protection organization (NPPO) may choose whether or not to officially control a pest that is of potential economic importance and that is present but is not widely distributed, taking into account other relevant factors from pest risk analysis (PRA), for example the costs and benefits of regulating the specific pest.</u>	"other" seems confusing	European Union	See comment 75
[78]	23	Editorial	<u>A National Plant Protection Organization (NPPO) may choose whether or not to officially control a pest that is of potential economic importance and that is present but is not widely distributed, taking into account other relevant factors from pest risk analysis (PRA), for example the costs and benefits of regulating the specific pest.</u>	For consistency	Nigeria	See comment 76
[79]	23	Editorial	<u>A National Plant Protection Organization (NPPO) may choose whether or not to officially control a pest that is of potential economic importance and that is present but is not widely distributed, taking into account other relevant factors from pest risk analysis (PRA), for example the costs and benefits of regulating the specific pest.</u>	For consistency	Gabon , Cameroon	See comment 76
[80]	23	Substantive	<u>A national plant protection organization (NPPO) may choose whether or not to officially control a pest that is of potential economic importance and that is present but is not widely distributed, taking into account other relevant factors from pest risk analysis (PRA), for example the costs and benefits of regulating the specific pest, as well as the technical and logistical ability to contain or control the pest within the defined area.</u>	If the pest can't be managed, it can't be under official control	Australia	Modified. The EWG provided just one example but there are more, such as the cost to manage the pest risk.  TPG suggests to modify to not include contain. Containment is a form of control. Text modified to ..."and the technical and logistical ability to control the pest within the defined area".  This is not background and had been moved to 1.3 as a new subsection that applies to both official control and not widely distributed
[81]	26	Substantive	Official control is subject to ISPM 1:2006, in particular the principles of non-discrimination, transparency, equivalence of phytosanitary measures and pest risk analysis.	This paragraph should be moved after paragraph 30 as this would include discussion on "official control" all under one place.	Canada	Modified. Paragraph moved after paragraph 29.
[82]	27	Editorial	<u>"Not widely distributed" is a concept referring to a pest's geographic occurrence within an area. Any pest may be categorized as widely distributed in an area, or not widely distributed, or absent. Transient occurrences of pests in an area are not expected to lead to establishment and therefore are not relevant.</u>	It is important to emphasize that the concept of NWD is used in the PRA.	EPPO, Russian Federation , Ukraine , Morocco ,	See comment 90. If "or" deleted, the sentence would make not much sense anymore.

Comment no.	Paragraph no.	Comment type	Comment	Explanation	Country	Steward and TPG Response
					Uzbekistan	
[83]	27	Editorial	<u>"Not widely distributed" is a concept referring to a pest's geographic occurrence within an area. Any pest may be categorized as widely distributed in an area, or not widely distributed, or absent. Transient occurrences of pests in an area are not expected to lead to establishment and therefore are not relevant.</u>	'geographic' unnecessary as its within an area	Australia	Considered. It is proposed that not widely distributed refers to "...a pest's occurrence and distribution within an area".
[84]	27	Editorial	<u>"Not widely distributed" is a concept referring to a pest's geographic occurrence within an area. Any pest may be categorized as widely distributed in an area, or not widely distributed, or absent<del>not present</del>. Transient occurrences of pests in an area are not expected to lead to establishment and therefore are not relevant.</u>	For consistency with the rest of the text.	United States of America	Considered. ISPM 8 uses the term "absent" to describe pest status in an area.
[85]	27	Editorial	<u>"Not widely distributed" is a concept referring to a pest's geographic occurrence within an area. Any pest may be categorized as widely distributed in an area, or not widely distributed, or absent. Transient occurrences of pests in an area are not expected to lead to establishment and therefore are not relevant.</u>	Move paragraph 27 to after paragraph 33. To organize the text separating those related to the concepts of "not widely distributed" from those related to "official control".	Costa Rica	Considered. It was proposed that this section be rearranged to have first all paragraphs on official control, and then those on not widely distribute (as in some previous sections). Subtitles were added for clarity
[86]	27	Editorial	<del><u>"Not widely distributed" is a concept referring to a pest's geographic occurrence within an area. Any pest may be categorized as widely distributed in an area, or not widely distributed, or absent. Transient occurrences of pests in an area are not expected to lead to establishment and therefore are not relevant.</u></del>	Move para 27 to after 33. To organize the text separating those related to the concepts of "not widely distributed" from those related to "official control"	Uruguay	See comment 85
[87]	27	Editorial	<del><u>"Not widely distributed" is a concept referring to a pest's geographic occurrence within an area. Any pest may be categorized as widely distributed in an area, or not widely distributed, or absent. Transient occurrences of pests in an area are not expected to lead to establishment and therefore are not relevant.</u></del>	Move para 27 to after 33	Paraguay	See comment 85
[88]	27	Editorial	<u>"Not widely distributed" is a concept referring to a pest's geographic occurrence within an area. Any pest may be categorized as widely distributed in an area, or not widely distributed, or absent. Transient occurrences of pests in an area are not expected to lead to establishment and therefore are not relevant.</u>	It is important to emphasize that the concept of NWD is used in the PRA.	European Union	See comment 82
[89]	27	Editorial	<u>"Not widely distributed"</u> <u>This a concept referring to a pest's geographic occurrence within an area. Any pest may be categorized as widely distributed in an area, or not widely distributed, or absent. Transient occurrences of pests in an area are not expected to lead to establishment and therefore are not relevant.</u>	Move all paragraph 27 to after 33 and a title was added to group text related to not widely distributed all together in the same section.	Argentina , COSAVE, Chile	See comment 85. The guidance provided from the SC was to incorporate the concept of NWD into the OC text. Changes made for clarity.
[90]	27	Editorial	<u>"Not widely distributed" is a concept referring to a pest's geographic</u>	Move paragraph 27 to after 33 To organize	Nicaragua	See comment 85.

Comment no.	Paragraph no.	Comment type	Comment	Explanation	Country	Steward and TPG Response
			<u>occurrence within an area. Any pest may be categorized as present, widely distributed in an area, or not widely distributed, or absent. Transient occurrences of pests in an area are not expected to lead to establishment and therefore are not relevant.</u>	the text separating those related to the concepts of “not widely distributed” from those related to “official control” Present was added to clarify the text		Modified.
[91]	27	Editorial	<del>“Not widely distributed” is a concept referring to a pest’s geographic occurrence within an area. Any pest may be categorized as widely distributed in an area, or not widely distributed, or absent. Transient occurrences of pests in an area are not expected to lead to establishment and therefore are not relevant.</del>	Move paragraph 27 to after 33 To organize the text separating those related to the concepts of “not widely distributed” from those related to “official control”	OIRSA	See comment 85 and 90.
[92]	27	Editorial	“Not widely distributed” <del>This a concept referring to a pest’s geographic occurrence within an area. Any pest may be categorized as widely distributed in an area, or not widely distributed, or absent. Transient occurrences of pests in an area are not expected to lead to establishment and therefore are not relevant.</del>	Move all paragraph 27 to after 33 and a title was added to group text related to not widely distributed all together in the same section.	Brazil	See comment 85 and 89.
[93]	27	Substantive	“Not widely distributed” is a concept referring to a pest’s geographic occurrence within an area. Any pest may be categorized as <u>present, widely distributed in an area, or not widely distributed, or absent. Transient occurrences of pests in an area are not expected to lead to establishment and therefore are not relevant.</u>	Present was added to clarify the text. There are three categories outlined for pest status in the ISPM No. 8: presence, absence and transience.	OIRSA	See comment 90.
[94]	27	Technical	“Not widely distributed” is a concept referring to a pest’s geographic occurrence within an area. Any pest may be categorized as <u>widely distributed in an area, or not widely distributed, or absent. In PRA, the determination whether a pest is not widely distributed is carried out in the pest categorization step. Transience means that a occurrences of pests is in an area are not expected to lead to establishment and therefore are is not relevant in connection with the concept of ‘not widely distributed’.</u>	Explaining where in the PRA that evaluation would take place. ‘Transience’ and ‘occurrence’ are glossary terms of opposite meaning, and their connected use (as ‘transient occurrence’ is self-contradictory. Furthermore, it seems useful to spell out that transience is irrelevant in connection with NWD only.	EPPO, Norway , Russian Federation , Ukraine , Morocco , Uzbekistan	Incorporated
[95]	27	Technical	“Not widely distributed” is a concept referring to a pest’s geographic occurrence within an area. Any pest may be categorized as <u>present, widely distributed in an area, or not widely distributed, or absent. Transient occurrences of pests in an area are not expected to lead to establishment and therefore are not relevant.</u>	To clarify the text.	Costa Rica	See comment 90.
[96]	27	Technical	“Not widely distributed” is a concept referring to a pest’s geographic occurrence within an area. Any pest may be categorized as <u>widely distributed in an area, or not widely distributed, or absent. In PRA, the determination whether a pest is not widely distributed is carried out in the pest categorization step. Transience means that a occurrences of pests is in an area are not expected to lead to establishment and therefore are is not relevant in connection with the concept of ‘not widely distributed’.</u>	Explaining where in the PRA that evaluation would take place. ‘Transience’ and ‘occurrence’ are glossary terms of opposite meaning, and their connected use (as ‘transient occurrence’ is self-contradictory. Furthermore, it seems useful to spell out that transience is irrelevant in connection	European Union	See comment 94.

Comment no.	Paragraph no.	Comment type	Comment	Explanation	Country	Steward and TPG Response
				with NWD only.		
[97]	27	Technical	<p><u>"Not widely distributed" is a concept referring to a pest's geographic occurrence within an area. Any pest may be categorized as widely distributed in an area, or not widely distributed, or absent. Transient occurrences of pests in an area are not expected to lead to establishment and therefore are not relevant.</u></p> <p><a href="#">there were some discussions on the issues involved here - with NWD linked to "limited" distribution</a></p>		Solomon Islands	Considered
[98]	28	Editorial	<p><u>In the case of a quarantine pest that is present but not widely distributed, and where appropriate in the case of certain regulated non-quarantine pests, the importing country should define the infested area(s), endangered area(s) and protected area(s). <b>When a pest is considered not widely distributed this means that the pest is limited to parts of the endangered area, i.e. it has reached only a limited part of its potential distribution within the endangered area or has been eradicated from parts of that area. Thus, when a pest is not widely distributed in an area, there are unaffected parts of the area at risk from further introduction or spread. An endangered area need not be continuous but may consist of several distinct parts of any size. In order to justify the statement of a pest being not widely distributed, a description and quantification of the parts of the endangered area at risk should be made available if requested. There is a degree of uncertainty attached to any categorization of distribution. The categorization may also change over time.</b></u></p>	Simpler and more precise.	EPPO, Russian Federation, Ukraine, Morocco, Uzbekistan	Considered. Even though the comment may be grammatically correct, the use of "it" in this case, may be somewhat ambiguous. The reader may question whether we are referring to the "pest" or the concept of 'NWD'. In this instance, the steward would prefer to retain "the pest" for clarity.
[99]	28	Editorial	<p><u>In the case of a quarantine pest that is present but not widely distributed, and where appropriate in the case of certain regulated non-quarantine pests, the importing country should define the infested area(s), endangered area(s) and protected area(s). <b>When a pest is considered not widely distributed this means that the pest is limited to parts of the endangered area, i.e. it has reached only a limited part of its potential distribution within the endangered area or has been eradicated from parts of that area. Thus, when a pest is not widely distributed in an area, there are unaffected parts of the area at risk from further introduction or spread. An endangered area need not be continuous but may consist of several distinct parts of any size. In order to justify the statement of a pest being not widely distributed, a description and quantification of the parts of the endangered area at risk should be made available if requested. There is a degree of uncertainty attached to any categorization of distribution. The categorization may also change over time.</b></u></p>	Move paragraph 28 after the new location of paragraph 27. To organize the text separating those related to the concepts of "not widely distributed" from those related to "official control".	Costa Rica	Considered.
[100]	28	Editorial	<p><del><u>In the case of a quarantine pest that is present but not widely distributed, and where appropriate in the case of certain regulated non-quarantine pests, the importing country</u></del></p>	Move paragraph 28 after the new location of paragraph 27. To organize the text	Uruguay	See comment 99.

Comment no.	Paragraph no.	Comment type	Comment	Explanation	Country	Steward and TPG Response
			<del>should define the infested area(s), endangered area(s) and protected area(s). When a pest is considered not widely distributed this means that the pest is limited to parts of the endangered area, i.e. it has reached only a limited part of its potential distribution within the endangered area or has been eradicated from parts of that area. Thus, when a pest is not widely distributed in an area, there are unaffected parts of the area at risk from further introduction or spread. An endangered area need not be continuous but may consist of several distinct parts of any size. In order to justify the statement of a pest being not widely distributed, a description and quantification of the parts of the endangered area at risk should be made available if requested. There is a degree of uncertainty attached to any categorization of distribution. The categorization may also change over time.</del>	separating those related to the concepts of "not widely distributed" from those related to "official control".		
[101]	28	Editorial	In the case of a quarantine pest that is present but not widely distributed, and where appropriate in the case of certain regulated non-quarantine pests, the importing country should define the infested area(s), endangered area(s) and protected area(s). <u>When a pest is considered not widely distributed this means that the pest is limited to parts of the endangered area, i.e. it has reached only a limited part of its potential distribution within the endangered area or has been eradicated from parts of that area. Thus, when a pest is not widely distributed in an area, there are unaffected parts of the area at risk from further introduction or spread. An endangered area need not be continuous but may consist of several distinct parts of any size. In order to justify the statement of a pest being not widely distributed, a description and quantification of the parts of the endangered area at risk should be made available if requested. There is a degree of uncertainty attached to any categorization of distribution. The categorization may also change over time.</u>	Move all paragraph 28 to after new position of paragraph 27. Text in this para is not changed, is only moved. Moved to group text related to not widely distributed all together in the same section	COSAVE, Chile, Brazil	See comment 99.
[102]	28	Editorial	In the case of a quarantine pest that is present but not widely distributed, and where appropriate in the case of certain regulated non-quarantine pests, the importing country should define the infested area(s), endangered area(s) and protected <u>area (s) area(s)</u> . <del>When a pest is considered not widely distributed this means that the pest is limited to parts of the endangered area, i.e. it has reached only a limited part of its potential distribution within the endangered area or has been eradicated from parts of that area. Thus, when a pest is not widely distributed in an area, there are unaffected parts of the area at risk from further introduction or spread. An endangered area need not be continuous but may consist of several distinct parts of any size. In order to justify the statement of a pest being not widely distributed, a description and quantification of the parts of the endangered area at risk should be made available if requested. There is a degree of uncertainty attached to any categorization of distribution. The categorization may also change over time.</del>	Move all para 28 to after 33a Text in this para is not changed, is only moved.	Paraguay	See comment 99.
[103]	28	Editorial	In the case of a quarantine pest that is present but not widely distributed, and where appropriate in the case of certain regulated non-quarantine pests, the importing country should define the infested area(s),	Simpler and more precise.	European Union	See comment 98.

Comment no.	Paragraph no.	Comment type	Comment	Explanation	Country	Steward and TPG Response
			endangered area(s) and protected area(s). <u>When a pest is considered not widely distributed this means that <del>the pest</del> it is limited to parts of the endangered area. i.e. it has reached only a limited part of its potential distribution within the endangered area or has been eradicated from parts of that area. Thus, when a pest is not widely distributed in an area, there are unaffected parts of the area at risk from further introduction or spread. An endangered area need not be continuous but may consist of several distinct parts of any size. In order to justify the statement of a pest being not widely distributed, a description and quantification of the parts of the endangered area at risk should be made available if requested. There is a degree of uncertainty attached to any categorization of distribution. The categorization may also change over time.</u>			
[104]	28	Editorial	In the case of a quarantine pest that is present but not widely distributed, and where appropriate in the case of certain regulated non-quarantine pests, the importing country should define the infested area(s), endangered area(s) and protected area(s). <u>When a pest is considered not widely distributed this means that the pest is limited to parts of the endangered area. i.e. it has reached only a limited part of its potential distribution within the endangered area or has been eradicated from parts of that area. Thus, when a pest is not widely distributed in an area, there are unaffected parts of the area at risk from further introduction or spread. An endangered area need not be continuous but may consist of several distinct parts of any size. In order to justify the statement of a pest being not widely distributed, a description and quantification of the parts of the endangered area at risk should be made available if requested. There is a degree of uncertainty attached to any categorization of distribution. The categorization may also change over time.</u>	Move all paragraph 28 to after new position of paragraph 27. Text in this para is not changed, is only moved. Moved to group text related to not widely distributed all together in the same section	Argentina	See comment 99.
[105]	28	Editorial	In the case of a quarantine pest that is present but not widely distributed, and where appropriate in the case of certain regulated non-quarantine pests, the importing country should define the infested area(s), endangered area(s) and protected area(s). <u>When a pest is considered not widely distributed this means that the pest is limited to parts of the endangered area. i.e. it has reached only a limited part of its potential distribution within the endangered area or has been eradicated from parts of that area. Thus, when a pest is not widely distributed in an area, there are unaffected parts of that area that are at risk from further introduction or spread. An endangered area need not be contiguous<del>ous</del> but may consist of several distinct parts of any size. In order to justify the statement of a pest being not widely distributed, a description and quantification of the parts of the endangered area at risk should be made available if requested. There is a degree of uncertainty attached to any categorization of distribution. The categorization may also change over time.</u>	To provide clarity and is gramatically more correct.	Canada	Modified. See comment 109

Comment no.	Paragraph no.	Comment type	Comment	Explanation	Country	Steward and TPG Response
[106]	28	Editorial	In the case of a quarantine pest that is present but not widely distributed, and where appropriate in the case of certain regulated non-quarantine pests, the importing country should define the infested area(s), endangered area(s) and protected area(s). <u>When a pest is considered not widely distributed this means that the pest is limited to parts of the endangered area, i.e. it has reached only a limited part of its potential distribution within the endangered area or has been eradicated from parts of that area. Thus, when a pest is not widely distributed in an area, there are unaffected parts of the area at risk from further introduction or spread. An endangered area need not be continuous but may consist of several distinct parts of any size. In order to justify the statement of a pest being not widely distributed, a description and quantification of the parts of the endangered area at risk should be made available if requested. There is a degree of uncertainty attached to any categorization of distribution. The categorization may also change over time.</u>	Move all paragraph 28 to after 33a Text in this paragraph is not changed, is only moved. To organize the text separating those related to the concepts of "not widely distributed" from those related to "official control"	Nicaragua	See comment 99
[107]	28	Editorial	In the case of a quarantine pest that is present but not widely distributed, and where appropriate in the case of certain regulated non-quarantine pests, the importing country should define the infested area(s), endangered area(s) and protected area(s). <u>When a pest is considered not widely distributed this means that the pest is limited to parts of the endangered area, i.e. it has reached only a limited part of its potential distribution within the endangered area or has been eradicated from parts of that area. Thus, when a pest is not widely distributed in an area, there are unaffected parts of the area at risk from further introduction or spread. An endangered area need not be continuous but may consist of several distinct parts of any size. In order to justify the statement of a pest being not widely distributed, a description and quantification of the parts of the endangered area at risk should be made available if requested. There is a degree of uncertainty attached to any categorization of distribution. The categorization may also change over time.</u>	Move all paragraph 28 to after 33a Text in this paragraph is not changed, is only moved. To organize the text separating those related to the concepts of "not widely distributed" from those related to "official control"	OIRSA	See comment 99
[108]	28	Substantive	In the case of a quarantine pest that is present but not widely distributed, and where appropriate in the case of certain regulated non-quarantine pests, the importing country should define the infested area(s), endangered area(s) and protected area(s). <u>When a pest is considered not widely distributed this means that the pest is limited to parts of the endangered area, i.e. it has reached only a limited part of its potential distribution within the endangered area or has been eradicated from parts of that area. Thus, when a pest is not widely distributed in an area, there are unaffected parts of the area at risk from further introduction or spread. An endangered area need not be continuous but may consist of several distinct parts of any size. In order to justify the statement of a pest being not widely distributed, a description and quantification delimitation of the parts of the endangered area at risk considered free from the pest should be made available if requested. There is a degree of uncertainty attached to any categorization of distribution. The categorization may also change over time.</u>	There is a lower limit to the possible size of parts of an endangered area: Although not explicitly expressed (e.g. in the Glossary or other ISPMs) there is a supposition that the size of an area (or part of an area) is larger than e.g. a place of production. Thus, 'of any size' seems incorrect and in any case superfluous. 'Delimitation' seems more correct and understandable than 'quantification' of an area. An endangered area is 'at risk' per definition, -the issue at stake is that it is considered pest free.	EPPO, Norway, Russian Federation, Ukraine, Morocco, Uzbekistan	Incorporated
[109]	28	Substantive	In the case of a quarantine pest that is present but not widely distributed,	This will make the term used consistent with	United States	Modified.

Comment no.	Paragraph no.	Comment type	Comment	Explanation	Country	Steward and TPG Response
			<p>and where appropriate in the case of certain regulated non-quarantine pests, the importing country should define the infested area(s), endangered area(s) and protected area(s). <u>When a pest is considered not widely distributed this means that the pest is limited to parts of the endangered area, i.e. it has reached only a limited part of its potential distribution within the endangered area or has been eradicated from parts of that area. Thus, when a pest is not widely distributed in an area, there are unaffected parts of the area still free from the pest that are at risk from further introduction or spread. An endangered area need not be continuous but may consist of several distinct parts of any size. In order to justify the statement of a pest being not widely distributed, a description and quantification of the parts of the endangered area still free from the pest at risk should be made available if requested. There is a degree of uncertainty attached to any categorization of distribution. The categorization may also change over time.</u></p>	the remainder of the document. Revised for clarity	of America	See comment 108.
[110]	28	Substantive	<p>In the case of a quarantine pest that is present but not widely distributed, and where appropriate in the case of certain regulated non-quarantine pests, the importing country should define the infested area(s), endangered area(s) and protected area(s). <u>When a pest is considered not widely distributed this means that the pest is limited to parts of the endangered area, i.e. it has reached only a limited part of its potential distribution within the endangered area or has been eradicated from parts of that area. Thus, when a pest is not widely distributed in an area, there are unaffected parts of the area at risk from further introduction or spread. An endangered area need not be continuous but may consist of several distinct parts of any size. In order to justify the statement of a pest being not widely distributed, a description and quantification of the parts of the endangered area at risk should be made available if requested. There is a degree of uncertainty attached to any categorization of distribution. The categorization may also change over time.</u></p>	4th sentence: This makes the statement either/or. The original text is confusing. Here we are talking about the endangered area, not where the pest is.	Yemen	<p>If an exporting country requires justification for a quarantine pest on “not widely distributed” status, the importing country should provide evidence that there are endangered areas still at risk from pest introduction. Therefore, it is important to delimit the infested, endangered and protected areas in the importing country.</p> <p>The TPG proposed further modifications to paragraph 28. Using endangered area in the first part of the paragraph is confusing. There is now contradiction between the definition of endangered area (the pest is not present) and the current text and definition of qp where a not widely distributed pest may be present in an endangered area.</p> <p>It also suggests to remove reference to “protected areas” in this paragraph, for the same reason. (For SC, grey text) (SC</p>

Comment no.	Paragraph no.	Comment type	Comment	Explanation	Country	Steward and TPG Response
						accepted) It is also suggested that the mention of regulated non-quarantine pests in the original text be deleted (for SC grey text). (SC accepted) The TPG will propose to the SC in May 2012 that <i>endangered area</i> and <i>protected area</i> be added to the work programme in light of the issues mentioned above.
[111]	28	Substantive	In the case of a quarantine pest that is present but not widely distributed, and where appropriate in the case of certain regulated non-quarantine pests, the importing country should define the infested area(s), endangered area(s) and protected area(s). <u>When a pest is considered not widely distributed this means that the pest is limited to parts of the endangered area, i.e. it has reached only a limited part of its potential distribution within the endangered area or has been eradicated from parts of that area. Thus, when a pest is not widely distributed in an area, there are unaffected parts of the area at risk from further introduction or spread. An endangered area does not necessarily need to be continuous but may consist of several distinct parts of any size. In order to justify the statement of a pest being not widely distributed, a description and quantification of the parts of the endangered area at risk should be made available if requested. There is a degree of uncertainty attached to any categorization of distribution. The categorization may also change over time.</u>	4th sentence: This makes the statement either/or. The original text is confusing. Here we are talking about the endangered area, not where the pest is.	Oman	See comment 110. Modified.
[112]	28	Substantive	In the case of a quarantine pest that is present but not widely distributed, and where appropriate in the case of certain regulated non-quarantine pests, the importing country should define the infested area(s), endangered area(s) and protected area(s). <u>When a pest is considered not widely distributed this means that the pest it is limited to parts of the endangered area, i.e. it has reached only a limited part of its potential distribution within the endangered area or has been eradicated from parts of that area. Thus, when a pest is not widely distributed in an area, there are unaffected parts of the area at risk from further introduction or spread. An endangered area need not be continuous but may consist of several distinct parts of any size. In order to justify the statement of a pest being not widely distributed, a description and quantification delimitation of the parts of the endangered area at risk considered free from the pest should be made available if requested. There is a degree of uncertainty attached to any categorization of distribution. The categorization may also change over</u>	There is a lower limit to the possible size of parts of an endangered area: Although not explicitly expressed (e.g. in the Glossary or other ISPMs) there is a supposition that the size of an area (or part of an area) is larger than e.g. a place of production. Thus, 'of any size' seems incorrect and in any case superfluous. 'Delimitation' seems more correct and understandable than 'quantification' of an area. An endangered area is 'at risk' per definition, -the issue at stake is that it is considered pest free.	European Union	See comments 98 and 108

Comment no.	Paragraph no.	Comment type	Comment	Explanation	Country	Steward and TPG Response
			<u>time.</u>			
[113]	28	Technical	<u>In the case of a quarantine pest that is present but not widely distributed, and where appropriate in the case of certain regulated non-quarantine pests, the importing country should define the infested area(s), endangered area(s) and protected area(s). When a pest is considered not widely distributed this means that the pest is limited to parts of the endangered area, i.e. it has reached only a limited part of its potential distribution within the endangered area or has been eradicated from parts of that area. Thus, when a pest is not widely distributed in an area, there are unaffected parts of the area at risk from further introduction or spread. An endangered area need not be contiguous but may consist of several distinct parts of any size. In order to justify the statement of a pest being not widely distributed, a description and quantification of the parts of the endangered area at risk should be made available if requested. There is a degree of uncertainty attached to any categorization of distribution. The categorization may also change over time.</u>	If the part of the potential distribution which is not affected is the most important production area in the country, then it does not matter how limited or not that area is. There is still some area of production that you wish to protect and which is at risk. Other suggested changes are there to clarify the meaning.	Canada	Modified
[114]	28	Translation	<u>In the case of a quarantine pest that is present but not widely distributed, and where appropriate in the case of certain regulated non-quarantine pests, the importing country should define the infested area(s), endangered area(s) and protected area(s). When a pest is considered not widely distributed this means that the pest is limited to parts of the endangered area, i.e. it has reached only a limited part of its potential distribution within the endangered area or has been eradicated from parts of that area. Thus, when a pest is not widely distributed in an area, there are unaffected parts of the area at risk from further introduction or spread. An endangered area need not be continuous but may consist of several distinct parts of any size. In order to justify the statement of a pest being not widely distributed, a description and quantification of the parts of the endangered area at risk should be made available if requested. There is a degree of uncertainty attached to any categorization of distribution. The categorization may also change over time.</u>	Translate "Thus", like "es decir", instead of "a saber". Explanation: most common term in Spanish.	OIRSA	Translation issue
[115]	29	Editorial	<u>The area for which the NPPO is investigating whether or not the pest is widely distributed should be the same as the area for which the economic impact is also being analysed and which is considered for official control. The decision that a pest is a quarantine pest, including consideration of its distribution and placing the endangered area under official control, is typically made by an NPPO with respect to an entire country. However, in some instances it may be more appropriate to decide if a pest is a quarantine pest with respect to parts of a country rather than the whole country. In that case, it is the potential economic importance of the pest for those parts that has to be considered in deciding phytosanitary measures.</u>	Small typo changes and an example to clarify meaning.	New Zealand	Modified so as not to repeat "examples" twice.

Comment no.	Paragraph no.	Comment type	Comment	Explanation	Country	Steward and TPG Response
			<u>Examples of when this may be appropriate are countries whose territories include one or more islands or other cases where there are natural or artificially created barriers to pest distribution and establishment. For example, large countries in which specified crops are restricted by climate to well defined areas.</u>			
[116]	29	Editorial	<p>The area for which the NPPO is investigating whether or not the pest is widely distributed should be the same as the area for which the economic impact is being analysed and which is considered for official control. The decision that a pest is a quarantine pest, including consideration of its distribution and placing the endangered area under official control, is typically made by an NPPO with respect to an entire country.</p> <p><del>However, in some instances it may be more appropriate to decide if a pest is a quarantine pest with respect to parts of a country rather than the whole country. In that case, it is the potential economic importance of the pest for those parts that has to be considered in deciding phytosanitary measures.</del></p> <p><u>Examples of when this may be appropriate are countries whose territories include one or more islands or other cases where there are natural or artificially created barriers to pest distribution and establishment.</u></p>		United States of America	Incorporated
[117]	29	Editorial	<p>The area for which the NPPO is investigating whether or not the pest is widely distributed should be the same as the area for which the economic impact is being analysed and which is considered for official control. The decision that a pest is a quarantine pest, including consideration of its distribution and placing the endangered area under official control, is typically made by an NPPO with respect to an entire country. However, in some instances it may be more appropriate to decide if a pest is a quarantine pest with respect to parts of a country rather than the whole country. In that case, it is the potential economic importance of the pest for those parts that has to be considered in deciding phytosanitary measures.</p> <p><u>Examples of when this may be appropriate are countries whose territories include one or more islands or other cases where there are natural or artificially created barriers to pest distribution and establishment.</u></p>	Move paragraph 29 after the new location of paragraph 28. To organize the text separating those related to the concepts of "not widely distributed" from those related to "official control".	Costa Rica , Mexico	See comment 99
[118]	29	Editorial	<p><del>The area for which the NPPO is investigating whether or not the pest is widely distributed should be the same as the area for which the economic impact is being analysed and which is considered for official control. The decision that a pest is a quarantine pest, including consideration of its distribution and placing the endangered area under official control, is typically made by an NPPO with respect to an entire country. However, in some instances it may be more appropriate to decide if a pest is a quarantine pest with respect to parts of a country rather than the whole country. In that case, it is the potential economic importance of the pest for those parts that has to be considered in deciding phytosanitary measures.</del></p> <p><u>Examples of when this may be appropriate are countries whose territories include one or more islands or other cases where there are natural or artificially created barriers to pest distribution and establishment.</u></p>	Move paragraph 29 after the new location of paragraph 28. To organize the text separating those related to the concepts of "not widely distributed" from those related to "official control".	Uruguay	See comment 99

Comment no.	Paragraph no.	Comment type	Comment	Explanation	Country	Steward and TPG Response
[119]	29	Editorial	<u>The area for which the NPPO is investigating whether or not the pest is widely distributed should be the same as the area for which the economic impact is being analysed and which is considered for official control. The decision that a pest is a quarantine pest, including consideration of its distribution and placing the endangered area under official control, is typically made by an NPPO with respect to an entire country. However, in some instances it may be more appropriate to decide if a pest is a quarantine pest with respect to parts of a country rather than the whole country. In that case, it is the potential economic importance of the pest for those parts that has to be considered in deciding phytosanitary measures. Examples of when this may be appropriate are countries whose territories include one or more islands or other cases where there are natural or artificially created barriers to pest distribution and establishment.</u>	Move paragraph 29 to after new position of paragraph 28 to group text related to not widely distributed all together in the same section.	COSAVE, Chile, Brazil	See comment 99
[120]	29	Editorial	<del>The area for which the NPPO is investigating whether or not the pest is widely distributed should be the same as the area for which the economic impact is being analysed and which is considered for official control. The decision that a pest is a quarantine pest, including consideration of its distribution and placing the endangered area under official control, is typically made by an NPPO with respect to an entire country. However, in some instances it may be more appropriate to decide if a pest is a quarantine pest with respect to parts of a country rather than the whole country. In that case, it is the potential economic importance of the pest for those parts that has to be considered in deciding phytosanitary measures. Examples of when this may be appropriate are countries whose territories include one or more islands or other cases where there are natural or artificially created barriers to pest distribution and establishment.</del>	Move para 28 to after 33b	Paraguay	See comment 99
[121]	29	Editorial	<u>The area for which the NPPO is investigating whether or not the pest is widely distributed should be the same as the area for which the economic impact is being analysed and which is considered for official control. The decision that a pest is a quarantine pest, including consideration of its distribution and placing the endangered area under official control, is typically made by an NPPO with respect to an entire country. However, in some instances it may be more appropriate to decide if a pest is a quarantine pest with respect to parts of a country rather than the whole country. In that case, it is the potential economic importance of the pest for those parts that has to be considered in deciding phytosanitary measures. Examples of when this may be appropriate are countries whose territories include one or more islands or other cases where there are natural or artificially created barriers to pest distribution and establishment.</u>	Move paragraph 29 after the new location of paragraph 28. To organize the text separating those related to the concepts of "not widely distributed" from those related to "official control".	Argentina	See comment 99
[122]	29	Editorial	<u>The area for which the NPPO is investigating whether or not the pest is widely distributed should be the same as the area for which the economic impact is being analysed and which is considered for official control. The decision that a pest is a quarantine pest, including consideration of its</u>	Adding a coma in the second sentence provides clarity as to what is meant here Improves English.	Canada	Incorporated

Comment no.	Paragraph no.	Comment type	Comment	Explanation	Country	Steward and TPG Response
			<u>distribution, and placing the endangered area under official control, is typically made by an NPPO with respect to an entire country. However, in some instances it may be more appropriate to decide if a pest is a quarantine pest with respect to parts of a country rather than the whole country. In that case, it is the potential economic importance of the pest for those parts that has to be considered in determining <del>deciding</del> phytosanitary measures. Examples of when this may be appropriate are countries whose territories include one or more islands or other cases where there are natural or artificially created barriers to pest distribution and establishment.</u>			
[123]	29	Editorial	<u>The area for which the NPPO is investigating whether or not the pest is widely distributed should be the same as the area for which the economic impact is being analysed and which is considered for official control. The decision that a pest is a quarantine pest, including consideration of its distribution and placing the endangered area under official control, is typically made by an NPPO with respect to an entire country. However, in some instances it may be more appropriate to decide if a pest is a quarantine pest with respect to parts of a country rather than the whole country. In that case, it is the potential economic importance of the pest for those parts that has to be considered in deciding phytosanitary measures. Examples of when this may be appropriate are countries whose territories include one or more islands or other cases where there are natural or artificially created barriers to pest distribution and establishment.</u>	Move paragraph 28 to after 33b To organize the text separating those related to the concepts of “not widely distributed” from those related to “official control” The NPPO is always responsible for making this decision.	Nicaragua	See comment 99. Incorporated.
[124]	29	Editorial	<u>The area for which the NPPO is investigating whether or not the pest is widely distributed should be the same as the area for which the economic impact is being analysed and <del>for</del> which is considered <del>for</del> official control. The decision that a pest is a quarantine pest, including consideration of its distribution and placing the endangered area under official control, is typically made by an NPPO with respect to an entire country. However, in some instances it may be more appropriate to decide if a pest is a quarantine pest with respect to parts of a country rather than the whole country. In that case, it is the potential economic importance of the pest for those parts that has to be considered in deciding phytosanitary measures. Examples of when this may be appropriate are countries whose territories include one or more islands or other cases where there are natural or artificially created barriers to pest distribution and establishment.</u>	For better understanding	El Salvador	Considered. The change would not work grammatically.
[125]	29	Editorial	<u>The area for which the NPPO is investigating whether or not the pest is widely distributed should be the same as the area for which the economic impact is being analysed and <del>for</del> which is considered <del>for</del> official control. The decision that a pest is a quarantine pest, including consideration of its distribution and placing the endangered area under official control, is typically made by an NPPO with respect to an entire country. However, in</u>	Move paragraph 28 to after 33b To organize the text separating those related to the concepts of “not widely distributed” from those related to “official control” The text modification is for to clarify.	OIRSA	See comment 124.

Comment no.	Paragraph no.	Comment type	Comment	Explanation	Country	Steward and TPG Response
			some instances it may be more appropriate to decide if a pest is a quarantine pest with respect to parts of a country rather than the whole country. In that case, it is the potential economic importance of the pest for those parts that has to be considered in deciding phytosanitary measures. Examples of when this may be appropriate are countries whose territories include one or more islands or other cases where there are natural or artificially created barriers to pest distribution and establishment.			
[126]	29	Substantive	<u>The area for which the NPPO is investigating whether or not the pest is not widely distributed should be the same as the area for which the economic impact is being analysed applies (i.e. the endangered area) and where the pest is under which is or being considered for official control. The decision that a pest is a quarantine pest, including consideration of its distribution and placing the endangered area under official control, is typically made by an NPPO with respect to an entire country. However, in some instances it may be more appropriate to decide if a pest is a quarantine pest with respect to parts of a country rather than the whole country. In that case, it is the potential economic importance of the pest for those parts that has to be considered in deciding phytosanitary measures. Examples of when this may be appropriate are countries whose territories include one or more islands or other cases where there are natural or artificially created barriers to pest distribution and establishment and spread.</u>	Sentence 1: It is necessary to create an explicit link to the uses of 'endangered area' in many other parts of this text. Also, referral here to the process of investigating whether a pest is not widely distributed seems inappropriate as in paragraph 28 this status have already been defined (cf. EPPO's general comment). Last sentence: This is about the events 'establishment' and 'spread', not about the state 'distribution'.	EPPO, Norway, Russian Federation, Ukraine, Morocco, Uzbekistan	Incorporated However, the TPG suggested that the first sentence be deleted. For SC to consider. (note : SC maintained the sentence).
[127]	29	Substantive	<u>The area for which the NPPO is investigating whether or not the pest is widely distributed should be the same as the area for which the economic impact is being analysed and which is considered for official control. The decision that a pest is a quarantine pest, including consideration of its distribution and placing that pest under official control, is typically made by an NPPO with respect to an entire country. However, in some instances it may be more appropriate to decide if a pest is a quarantine pest with respect to parts of a country rather than the whole country. In that case, it is the potential economic importance of the pest for those parts that has to be considered in deciding phytosanitary measures. Examples of when this may be appropriate are countries whose territories include one or more islands or other cases where there are natural or artificially created barriers to pest distribution and establishment.</u>	more correct--the pest is under official control, not the area.	United States of America	Incorporated
[128]	29	Substantive	<u>The area for which the NPPO is investigating whether or not the pest is widely distributed should be the same as the area for which the economic impact is being analysed and which is considered for official control. The decision that a pest is a quarantine pest, including consideration of its distribution and placing the endangered area under official control, is typically made by an NPPO with respect to an entire country. However, in some instances it may be more appropriate to decide if a pest is a</u>	The NPPO is always responsible for making this decision.	Costa Rica	Considered. The focus of the sentence is on whether decision is made for an entire country, in contrast with the next one dealing with part of a country. The sentence was edited for clarity, and reference to NPPO

Comment no.	Paragraph no.	Comment type	Comment	Explanation	Country	Steward and TPG Response
			<u>quarantine pest with respect to parts of a country rather than the whole country. In that case, it is the potential economic importance of the pest for those parts that has to be considered in deciding phytosanitary measures. Examples of when this may be appropriate are countries whose territories include one or more islands or other cases where there are natural or artificially created barriers to pest distribution and establishment.</u>			deleted as it applies to both cases
[129]	29	Substantive	<u>The area for which the NPPO is investigating whether or not the pest is widely distributed should be the same as the area for which the economic impact is being analysed and which is considered for official control. The decision that a pest is a quarantine pest, including consideration of its distribution and placing the endangered area under official control, is typically made by an NPPO with respect to an entire country. However, in some instances it may be more appropriate to decide if a pest is a quarantine pest with respect to parts of a country rather than the whole country. In that case, it is the potential economic importance of the pest for those parts that has to be considered in deciding phytosanitary measures. Examples of when this may be appropriate are countries whose territories include one or more islands or other cases where there are natural or artificially created barriers to pest distribution and establishment.</u>	The NPPO is always responsible for making this decision.	Uruguay	See comment 128
[130]	29	Substantive	<u>The area for which the NPPO is investigating whether or not the pest is widely distributed should be the same as the area for which the economic impact is being analysed and which is considered for official control. The decision that a pest is a quarantine pest, including consideration of its distribution and placing the endangered area under official control, is typically made by an NPPO with respect to an entire country. However, in some instances it may be more appropriate to decide if a pest is a quarantine pest with respect to parts of a country rather than the whole country. In that case, it is the potential economic importance of the pest for those parts that has to be considered in deciding phytosanitary measures. Examples of when this may be appropriate are countries whose territories include one or more islands or other cases where there are natural or artificially created barriers to pest distribution and establishment.</u>	The NPPO is always responsible for making this decision.	COSAVE, Argentina, Chile, Brazil	See comment 128
[131]	29	Substantive	<u>The area for which <del>the NPPO is investigating whether or not</del> the pest is <del>not</del> widely distributed should be the same as the area for which the economic impact <del>is being analysed applies (i.e. the endangered area) and where the pest is under which is or being considered for official control.</del> The decision that a pest is a quarantine pest, including consideration of its distribution and placing the endangered area under official control, is typically made by an NPPO with respect to an entire country. However, in some instances it may be more appropriate to decide if a pest is a quarantine pest with respect to parts of a country rather than the whole country. In that case, it is the potential</u>	Sentence 1: It is necessary to create an explicit link to the uses of 'endangered area' in many other parts of this text. Also, referral here to the process of investigating whether a pest is not widely distributed seems inappropriate as in paragraph 28 this status have already been defined (cf. EPPO's general comment). Last sentence: This is about the events 'establishment' and	European Union	Slightly modified

Comment no.	Paragraph no.	Comment type	Comment	Explanation	Country	Steward and TPG Response
			<u>economic importance of the pest for those parts that has to be considered in deciding phytosanitary measures. Examples of when this may be appropriate are countries whose territories include one or more islands or other cases where there are natural or artificially created barriers to pest distribution and establishment and spread.</u>	'spread', not about the state 'distribution'.		
[132]	29	Substantive	<u>The area for which the NPPO is investigating whether or not the pest is widely distributed should be the same as the area for which the economic impact is being analysed and which is considered for official control. The decision that a pest is a quarantine pest, including consideration of its distribution and placing the endangered area under official control, is typically made by an NPPO with respect to an entire country. However, in some instances it may be more appropriate to decide if a pest is a quarantine pest with respect to parts of a country rather than the whole country. In that case, it is the potential economic importance of the pest for those parts that has to be considered in deciding phytosanitary measures. Examples of when this may be appropriate are countries whose territories include one or more islands or other cases where there are natural or artificially created barriers to pest distribution and establishment.</u>	The NPPO is always responsible for making this decision.	OIRSA	See comment 128
[133]	33	Editorial	For quarantine pests, eradication and containment may have an element of suppression. For regulated non-quarantine pests, suppression may be used to avoid unacceptable economic impact as it applies to the intended use of plants for planting. <u>(33a) "Not widely distributed"</u> <u>This concept refers to a pest's geographic occurrence within an area. Any pest may be categorized as widely distributed in an area, or not widely distributed, or absent. Transient occurrences of pests in an area are not expected to lead to establishment and therefore are not relevant.</u> <u>(33b) In the case of a quarantine pest that is present but not widely distributed, and where appropriate in the case of certain regulated non-quarantine pests, the importing country should define the infested area(s), endangered area(s) and protected area(s). When a pest is considered not widely distributed this means that the pest is limited to parts of the endangered area, i.e. it has reached only a limited part of its potential distribution within the endangered area or has been eradicated from parts of that area. Thus, when a pest is not widely distributed in an area, there are unaffected parts of the area at risk from further introduction or spread. An endangered area need not be continuous but may consist of several distinct parts of any size. In order to justify the statement of a pest being not widely distributed, a description and quantification of the parts of the endangered area at risk should be made available if requested. There is a degree of uncertainty attached to any categorization of distribution. The categorization may also change over time.</u> <u>(33c) The area for which the NPPO is investigating whether or not the pest is widely distributed should be the same as the area for which the economic impact is being analysed</u>	(33a) Moved from para 27 and title added to group text related to not widely distributed all together in the same section. (33b) Moved from para 28 to group text related to not widely distributed all together in the same section. (33c) Moved from para 29 to group text related to not widely distributed all together in the same section. (*)The NPPO is always responsible for making this decision.	Paraguay	Considered. See comment 99

Comment no.	Paragraph no.	Comment type	Comment	Explanation	Country	Steward and TPG Response
			<u>and which is considered for official control. The decision that a pest is a quarantine pest, including consideration of its distribution and placing the endangered area under official control, is (*)typically (this term is eliminated, please see the template) made by an NPPO with respect to an entire country. However, in some instances it may be more appropriate to decide if a pest is a quarantine pest with respect to parts of a country rather than the whole country. In that case, it is the potential economic importance of the pest for those parts that has to be considered in deciding phytosanitary measures. Examples of when this may be appropriate are countries whose territories include one or more islands or other cases where there area natural or artificially ceated barriers to pest distribution and establishment.</u>			
[134]	39	Technical	<del>If</del> downgrading or reclassifying is permitted within <del>an domestic national</del> official control programme, similar options should be available for imported consignments.	More precisely contrasting the import requirements	EPPO, Norway , Russian Federation , Ukraine , Morocco , Uzbekistan	Slightly modified The TPG noted that the change to domestic is necessary, but it implies some consequential changes to paragraph 37 for consistency. For SC to consider (grey text). (SC accepted)
[135]	39	Technical	<del>If</del> downgrading or reclassifying is permitted within <del>an domestic national</del> official control programme, similar options should be available for imported consignments.	More precisely contrasting the import requirements	European Union	Incorporated
[136]	44	Substantive	<u>2.4 Pest risk analysis</u>	Section 2.4 should be moved ahead of the other sections that are related to official control for a more logical flow of ideas.	Canada	Section 2.4 moved to 2.1 and merged under technical justification
[137]	45	Editorial	<u>Application of the definition of a quarantine pest requires knowledge of potential economic importance, potential distribution and official control applied (ISPM 2:2007). The categorization of a pest as present and widely distributed or present but not widely distributed is determined in relation to its potential distribution. This potential distribution represents the areas where the pest could become established if given the opportunity, i.e. its hosts are present and environmental factors such as climate and soil are favourable. ISPM 11:2004 provides guidance on the factors to be considered in assessing the probability of establishment and spread. In the case of a pest that is present but not widely distributed, the assessment of potential economic importance should relate to the areas where the pest is not established.</u>	Clarity	EPPO, Russian Federation , Ukraine , Morocco , Uzbekistan	Modified
[138]	45	Editorial	<u>Application of the definition of a quarantine pest requires knowledge of potential economic importance, potential distribution and official control applied (ISPM 2:2007). The categorization of a pest as "present and widely distributed" or "present but not widely distributed" is determined in relation to its potential distribution. This potential distribution represents the areas</u>	Clarity	European Union	Modified See comment 139

Comment no.	Paragraph no.	Comment type	Comment	Explanation	Country	Steward and TPG Response
			<u>where the pest could become established if given the opportunity, i.e. its hosts are present and environmental factors such as climate and soil are favourable. ISPM 11:2004 provides guidance on the factors to be considered in assessing the probability of establishment and spread. In the case of a pest that is present but not widely distributed, the assessment of potential economic importance should relate to the areas where the pest is not established.</u>			
[139]	45	Technical	<u>Application of the definition of a quarantine pest requires knowledge of potential economic importance, potential distribution and official control (ISPM 2:2007). The categorization of a pest as present and widely distributed or present but not widely distributed is determined in relation to its potential distribution. This potential distribution represents the areas where the pest could become established if given the opportunity, i.e. its hosts are present and environmental factors such as climate and soil are favourable. ISPM 11:2004 provides guidance on the factors to be considered in assessing the probability of establishment and spread. In the case of a pest that is present but not widely distributed, the assessment of potential economic importance should relate to the areas where the pest is not established.</u>	Soil is probably not an 'environmental factor', and in any case probably not relevant.	EPPO, Russian Federation, Ukraine, Morocco, Uzbekistan	Considered. Environmental factors are all the external elements that affect an organism, biotic and abiotic. Soil would be included on the latter.
[140]	45	Technical	<u>Application of the definition of a quarantine pest requires knowledge of potential economic importance, potential distribution and official control applied (ISPM 2:2007). The categorization of a pest as "present and widely distributed" or "present but not widely distributed" is determined in relation to its potential distribution. This potential distribution represents the areas where the pest could become established if given the opportunity, i.e. its hosts are present and environmental factors such as climate and soil are favourable. ISPM 11:2004 provides guidance on the factors to be considered in assessing the probability of establishment and spread. In the case of a pest that is present but not widely distributed, the assessment of potential economic importance should relate to the areas where the pest is not established.</u>	Soil is probably not an 'environmental factor', and in any case probably not relevant.	European Union	See comments 138 and 139
[141]	45	Translation	<u>Application of the definition of a quarantine pest requires knowledge of potential economic importance, potential distribution and official control (ISPM 2:2007). The categorization of a pest as present and widely distributed or present but not widely distributed is determined in relation to its potential distribution. This potential distribution represents the areas where the pest could become established if given the opportunity, i.e. its hosts are present and environmental factors such as climate and soil are favourable. ISPM 11:2004 provides guidance on the factors to be considered in assessing the probability of establishment and spread. In the case of a pest that is present but not widely distributed, the assessment of</u>	Translate "Thus", like "es decir", instead of "a saber". Explanation: most common term in Spanish.	OIRSA	Translation issue

Comment no.	Paragraph no.	Comment type	Comment	Explanation	Country	Steward and TPG Response
			<u>potential economic importance should relate to the areas where the pest is not established.</u>			
[142]	53	Editorial	<u>Surveillance should be used to determine the distribution of a pest in an area <del>and whether it is not widely distributed.</del></u>	For consistency the deleted is redundant	Ghana	Considered. It is felt necessary to link surveillance to not widely distributed.  In addition, paragraphs 53 & 54 do not relate to the “area of application” as mentioned in the title of the section, but to the distribution of the pest and the determination of whether it is not widely distributed. It is therefore proposed to move them with the paragraphs on pest risk analysis, which are now under the section entitled “technical justification”
[143]	53	Editorial	<u>Surveillance should be used to determine the distribution of a pest in an area <del>and whether it is not widely distributed.</del></u>	For consistency the deleted is redundant	Nigeria	See comment 142
[144]	53	Editorial	<u>Surveillance should be used to determine the distribution of a pest in an area <del>and whether it is not widely distributed.</del></u>	For consistency the deleted is redundant	Cameroon	See comment 142
[145]	53	Substantive	<u>Surveillance should be used to determine the distribution of a pest in an area <del>and whether it is not widely distributed.</del></u>	Surveillance provides data on the geographical distribution of a pest in an area, but the concept of NWD furthermore has to take into account whether that area is actually an endangered area. Thus, surveillance in itself cannot provide the answer whether as pest is NWD	EPPO, Norway, Russian Federation, Ukraine, Morocco, Uzbekistan	See comment 142
[146]	53	Substantive	<u>Surveillance should be used to determine the distribution of a pest in an area <del>and whether it is not widely distributed.</del></u>	Surveillance provides data on the geographical distribution of a pest in an area, but the concept of NWD furthermore has to take into account whether that area is actually an endangered area. Thus, surveillance in itself cannot provide the answer whether a pest is NWD	European Union	See comment 142
[147]	53	Substantive	<u>In addition to other sources of information, <del>s</del>urveillance should be used to determine the distribution of a pest in an area and whether it is not widely distributed.</u>	Provides options other than surveillance for determining if a pest is not widely distributed in an area.	Canada	Considered. The definition of surveillance includes the use of other procedures

Comment no.	Paragraph no.	Comment type	Comment	Explanation	Country	Steward and TPG Response
[148]	54	Editorial	<u>ISPM 6:1997 provides guidance on surveillance describes the components of survey and monitoring systems, and includes provisions on transparency. Biological factors such as pest life cycle, means of dispersal and rate of reproduction may influence the design of surveillance programmes, the interpretation of survey data and the level of confidence in the categorization of a pest as not widely distributed. The distribution of a pest in an area is not a static condition. Changing conditions or new information may necessitate a review reconsideration of whether a pest is not widely distributed.</u>	Sentence 1: Simpler language. No need to include the wording from the scope of ISPM 6. Sentence 4: more precise word.	EPPO, Russian Federation, Ukraine, Morocco, Uzbekistan	Slightly modified See 142
[149]	54	Editorial	<u>ISPM 6:1997 provides guidance on surveillance describes the components of survey and monitoring systems, and includes provisions on transparency. Biological factors such as pest life cycle, means of dispersal and rate of reproduction may influence the design of surveillance programmes, the interpretation of survey data and the level of confidence in the categorization of a pest as not widely distributed. The distribution of a pest in an area is not a static condition. Changing conditions or new information may necessitate a review reconsideration of whether a pest is not widely distributed.</u>	Sentence 1: Simpler language. No need to include the wording from the scope of ISPM 6. Sentence 4: more precise word.	European Union	See comment 148
[150]	55	Editorial	<u>“Not widely distributed” is not a description of pest status listed in ISPM 8:1998. Rather it encompasses may refer to a number of pest situations described therein. Depending on its distribution relative to the endangered area, the status of a pest that is not widely distributed may be described using one or more of the examples provided in ISPM 8:1998.</u>	NWD is not all encompassing. The term could be misleading and should be changed to reflect this.	United States of America	Modified. This does not relate to the “area of application” section, but is background information on not widely distributed. The paragraph was moved to the background, and the last part was deleted as unnecessary
[151]	55	Editorial	<u>“Not widely distributed” is not a term included in the description of pest status listed in ISPM 8:1998. Rather it encompasses a number of pest situations described therein. Depending on its distribution relative to the endangered area, the status of a pest that is not widely distributed may be described using one or more of the examples provided in ISPM 8:1998.</u>	To clarify	El Salvador	Incorporated

**ANNEX 7 – SUPPLEMENT 1 TO ISPM 5****[1] DRAFT REVISION TO ISPM 5 (GLOSSARY OF PHYTOSANITARY TERMS) - SUPPLEMENT NO. 1: GUIDELINES ON THE INTERPRETATION AND APPLICATION OF THE CONCEPTS OF “OFFICIAL CONTROL” ~~FOR~~ AND “NOT WIDELY DISTRIBUTED”**

<b>[2] Date of this document</b>	2011-11-06
<b>Document category</b>	Draft revision of Supplement 1 to ISPM 5
<b>Current document stage</b>	Draft for 2011-11 SC (formatted in OCS) 2011-11 TPG reviewed member comments 2011-05 SC revised draft 2010-03 revised to incorporate consistency ink amendments noted by CPM-5 (2010) 2010-02 edited and formatted in template
<b>Origin</b>	Work programme topic: Not widely distributed (supplement to ISPM No. 5: <i>Glossary of phytosanitary terms</i> 2005-008, ICPM-7 (2005)
<b>Major stages</b>	2011-06 member consultation 2011-05 SC approved for member consultation 2008-05 SC-7 reviewed draft 2006-05 SC approved specification 33
<b>Notes to this document</b>	<p>For the purpose of visibility of the new text on not widely distributed, and in order to not reopen the discussion on the official control text (as requested by the SC), the text is marked as follows.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– original text on official control incorporating the consistency ink amendments noted by CPM-5 in 2010 (as additions or deletions to the original text on official control)      Grey</li> <li>– new text on not widely distributed      <u>black underlined</u></li> <li>– original text on official control deleted for the purpose of integrating both texts      <del>in black and strikethrough.</del></li> </ul> <p>Note that renumbering of sections does not show as changes.</p> <p>Deletions do not intend to change the content of the official control supplement, but some deletion was necessary: for example, essential changes to integrate both texts, updates to current glossary or IPPC terminology (e.g. “phytosanitary import requirements”, “contracting party”), consistency with the structure of recent ISPMs (e.g. sections on adoption, background), updates to ISPM references, editorials.</p> <p>2011-01-31: Formatting for Editor; 2011-02-12 and 2011-03-10: editorial checks; 10 March 2011: Formatting for SC 2011-05. 2011-05-10: editorial checks.</p>

**[3] Adoption**

[4] This supplement was first adopted by the Third Interim Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (2001) as a supplement to ISPM 5:2001, *Supplement No. 1: Guidelines on the interpretation and application of the concept of official control for regulated pests*. The first revision was adopted by the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures in 20-- as the present Supplement 1 to ISPM 5.

**[5] INTRODUCTION****[6] Scope**

[7] This ~~guideline~~ supplement ~~refers only to~~ provides guidance on:

- the official control of regulated pests, and
- determination of when a pest is considered to be present but not widely distributed, for the decision on whether a pest qualifies as a quarantine pest.

~~For the purposes of this guideline, the relevant regulated pests are both quarantine pests that are present in an importing country but not widely distributed and regulated non-quarantine pests.~~

[8] **References**

- [9] **ISPM 1.** 2006. *Phytosanitary principles for the protection of plants and the application of phytosanitary measures in international trade.* Rome, IPPC, FAO.
- [10] **ISPM 2.** 2007. *Framework for pest risk analysis.* Rome, IPPC, FAO.
- [11] **ISPM 6.** 1997. *Guidelines for surveillance.* Rome, IPPC, FAO.
- [12] **ISPM 8.** 1998. *Determination of pest status in an area.* Rome, IPPC, FAO.
- [13] **ISPM 11.** 2004. *Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests including analysis of environmental risks and living modified organisms.* Rome, IPPC, FAO.
- [14] *Report of the ICPM open ended working group on official control, 22-24 March 2000, Bordeaux, France, IPPC Secretariat, FAO, Rome.*

[15] **Definition**

- [16] Official control is defined as:
- [17] The active enforcement of mandatory phytosanitary regulations and the application of mandatory phytosanitary procedures with the objective of eradication or containment of quarantine pests or for the management of regulated non-quarantine pests.

[18] **Purpose-BACKGROUND**

- [19] The words “present but not widely distributed and being officially controlled” express an essential concept in the definition of a quarantine pest. According to that definition, a quarantine pest must always be of potential economic importance to an endangered area. In addition, it must either meet the criterion of not being present in that area or it must meet the combined criteria of being present but not widely distributed and subject to official control.

- [20] The *Glossary of phytosanitary terms* defines official as “established, authorized or performed by an NPPO” and control as “suppression, containment or eradication of a pest population”. However, for phytosanitary purposes, the concept of *official control* is not adequately expressed by the combination of these two definitions.

- [21] The purpose of this ~~supplement guideline~~ is to describe more precisely the interpretation of:

- [22] - the concept of official control and its application in practice for quarantine pests that are present in an area as well as for regulated non-quarantine pests, and
- the concept of “present but not widely distributed and under official control” for quarantine pests.

- [23] “Not widely distributed” is not a term included in the description of pest status listed in ISPM 8:1998.

[24] **REQUIREMENTS**

[25] **1. General Requirements**

- [26] Official control is subject to ISPM 1:2006, in particular the principles of non-discrimination, transparency, equivalence of phytosanitary measures and pest risk analysis.

[27] **1.1 Official control**

- [28] Official control includes:

- [29] - eradication and/or containment in the infested area(s)  
 - surveillance in the endangered area(s)  
 - restrictions related to the movement into and within the protected area(s) including phytosanitary measures applied at import.

[30] All official control programmes have elements that are mandatory. At minimum, programme evaluation and pest surveillance are required in official control programmes to determine the need for and effect of control to justify phytosanitary measures applied at import for the same purpose. Phytosanitary measures applied at import should be consistent with the principle of non-discrimination (see section 2.1 below).

[31] For quarantine pests, eradication and containment may have an element of suppression. For regulated non-quarantine pests, suppression may be used to avoid unacceptable economic impact as it applies to the intended use of plants for planting.

[32] **1.2 Not widely distributed**

[33] “Not widely distributed” is a concept referring to a pest’s occurrence and distribution within an area. A pest may be categorized as present and widely distributed in an area or not widely distributed, or absent. In PRA, the determination whether a pest is not widely distributed is carried out in the pest categorization step. Transience means that a pest is not expected to establish and therefore is not relevant to the concept of “not widely distributed”.

[34] In the case of a quarantine pest that is present but not widely distributed, and where appropriate in the case of certain regulated non-quarantine pests, the importing country should define the infested area(s) and, endangered area(s) and protected area(s). When a quarantine pest is considered not widely distributed, this means that the pest is limited to parts of its potential distribution and there are areas free from the pest that are at risk of economic loss from introduction or spread. These endangered areas do not need to be contiguous but may consist of several distinct parts. In order to justify the statement of a pest being not widely distributed, a description and delimitation of the endangered areas should be made available if requested. There is a degree of uncertainty attached to any categorization of distribution. The categorization may also change over time.

[35] The area in which the pest is not widely distributed should be the same as the area for which the economic impact applies (i.e. the endangered area) and where the pest is under or being considered for official control. The decision that a pest is a quarantine pest, including consideration of its distribution, and placing that pest under official control, is typically made with respect to an entire country. In some instances it may be more appropriate to regulate a pest as a quarantine pest in parts of a country rather than in the whole country. It is the potential economic importance of the pest for those parts that has to be considered in determining phytosanitary measures. Examples of when this may be appropriate are countries whose territories include one or more islands or other cases where there are natural or artificially created barriers to pest establishment and spread, such as large countries in which specified crops are restricted by climate to well defined areas.

[36] **1.3 Decision to apply official control**

[37] A national plant protection organization (NPPO) may choose whether or not to officially control a pest of potential economic importance that is present but not widely distributed, taking into account relevant factors from pest risk analysis (PRA), for example the costs and benefits of regulating the specific pest, and the technical and logistical ability to control the pest within the defined area. If the pest is not subjected to official control, it does not then qualify as a quarantine pest.

[38] **2. Specific Requirements**

[39] The specific requirements to be met relate to pest risk analysis, non-discrimination, transparency, technical justification, enforcement, mandatory nature of official control, area of application, and NPPO authority and involvement in official control.

## [40] 2.1 Technical justification

[41] Domestic requirements and phytosanitary import requirements should be technically justified and result in non-discriminatory phytosanitary measures.

[42] Application of the definition of a quarantine pest requires knowledge of potential economic importance, potential distribution and official control programmes (ISPM 2:2007). The categorization of a pest as present and widely distributed or present but not widely distributed is determined in relation to its potential distribution. This potential distribution represents the areas where the pest could become established if given the opportunity, i.e. its hosts are present and environmental factors such as climate and soil are favourable. ISPM 11:2004 provides guidance on the factors to be considered in assessing the probability of establishment and spread. In the case of a pest that is present but not widely distributed, the assessment of potential economic importance should relate to the areas where the pest is not established.

[43] Surveillance should be used to determine the distribution of a pest in an area as a basis for the further consideration of whether the pest is not widely distributed.

[44] ISPM 6:1997 provides guidance on surveillance, and includes provisions on transparency. Biological factors such as pest life cycle, means of dispersal and rate of reproduction may influence the design of surveillance programmes, the interpretation of survey data and the level of confidence in the categorization of a pest as not widely distributed. The distribution of a pest in an area is not a static condition. Changing conditions or new information may necessitate reconsideration of whether a pest is not widely distributed.

## [45] 2.2 Non-discrimination

[46] The principle of non-discrimination between domestic requirements and phytosanitary import requirements is fundamental. In particular, requirements for imports should not be more stringent than the effect of official control in an importing country. There should therefore be consistency between domestic requirements and phytosanitary import requirements for a defined pest:

- [47] - Import requirements should not be more stringent than domestic requirements.
- Domestic and import requirements should be the same or have an equivalent effect.
- Mandatory elements of domestic and import requirements should be the same.
- The intensity of inspection of imported consignments should be the same as equivalent processes in domestic control programmes.
- In the case of non-compliance, the same or equivalent phytosanitary actions should be taken on imported consignments as are taken domestically.
- If a tolerance level is applied within a ~~national-domestic~~ national-domestic official control programme, the same tolerance level should be applied to equivalent imported material. In particular, if no action is taken in the ~~national-domestic~~ national-domestic official control programme because the pest incidence does not exceed the tolerance level concerned, then no action should be taken for an imported consignment if the pest incidence does not exceed that same tolerance level. Compliance with import tolerance levels is generally determined by inspection or testing at entry, whereas compliance with the tolerance level for domestic consignments should be determined at the last point where official control is applied.

[48] - ~~if~~ if downgrading or reclassifying is permitted within a ~~domestic national~~ domestic national official control programme, similar options should be available for imported consignments.

## [49] 2.3 Transparency

[50] Domestic requirements for official control and the phytosanitary import requirements should be

documented and made available, on request.

**[51] 2.4 Enforcement**

**[52]** The domestic enforcement of official control programmes should be equivalent to the enforcement of phytosanitary import requirements. Enforcement should include:

- [53]**
- a legal basis
  - operational implementation
  - evaluation and review
  - phytosanitary action in the case of non-compliance.

**[54] 2.5 Mandatory nature of official control**

**[55]** Official control is mandatory in the sense that all persons involved are legally bound to perform the actions required. The scope of official control programmes for quarantine pests is completely mandatory (e.g. procedures for eradication campaigns), whereas the scope for regulated non-quarantine pests is mandatory only in certain circumstances (e.g. official certification programmes).

**[56] 2.6 Area of application**

**[57]** An official control programme can be applied at national, subnational or local area level. The area of application of official control measures should be specified. Any phytosanitary import requirements should have the same effect as the domestic requirements for official control.

**[58] 2.7 NPPO authority and involvement in official control**

**[59]** Official control should:

- [60]**
- be established or recognized by the contracting party or the NPPO under appropriate legislative authority
  - be performed, managed, supervised or, at minimum, audited/reviewed by the NPPO
  - have enforcement assured by the contracting party or the NPPO
  - be modified, terminated or lose official recognition by the contracting party or the NPPO.

**[61]** Responsibility and accountability for official control programmes rests with the contracting party. Agencies other than the NPPO may be responsible for aspects of official control programmes, and certain aspects of official control programmes may be the responsibility of subnational authorities or the private sector. The NPPO should be fully aware of all aspects of official control programmes in its country.

## ANNEX 8 - TPG RESPONSES TO SOME MEMBER COMMENTS ON DRAFTS FOR MEMBER CONSULTATION: PRA FOR PLANTS AS QUARANTINE PESTS (CONSISTENCY ONLY)

### TPG. General discussions

1. Regarding the use of the terms habitat and location, and the proposal from member comments that only habitat is used, or that area is used instead of location. One member noted that PRA is conducted for an area, i.e. PRA would define the risk of establishment for an area as a whole and not for individual locations in that area. However, other members (including the steward of the draft) acknowledged that the text attempts to highlight two different pest risks: one being that the plant may be able to establish in other habitats than the habitat where it was intentionally planted; the other being, that the plant may spread to other geographical locations than where it was intentionally planted. Several members (including the steward of the draft) noted that this distinction should be better explained in the text.

2. It is recognized that the wording “plant as pest” has now been agreed to by members, and is appropriate. However, one member warned that in other contexts it may not be correct English to use the words “plant as pest” when referring to an individual plant, and that the wording “pest plant” may be more appropriate in that case. The steward of the draft explained that the original draft used ‘pest plant’, but that the SC had felt that this term could be confusing and possibly not easily understood, and had therefore preferred to avoid its use.

Comment no.	Paragraph no.	Comment type	Comment	Explanation	Country	TPG Response
[5]	G	Substantive	<a href="#">As a general comment in all text replace the word "location" by "habitat" because "habitat" is a term already defined in ISPM No. 5.</a>		Mexico	See general discussion 1 above.
[29]	10	Technical	This annex provides guidance for conducting pest risk analysis (PRA) to determine if a plant is a pest of cultivated plants or wild flora, whether it should be regulated, and to identify <del>appropriate</del> phytosanitary measures. ...	It is not appropriate to qualify phytosanitary measures.	Costa Rica ,Nicaragua ,El Salvador	Not TPG-related
[65]	14	Technical	Thus, the protection of plants as pursued through the IPPC may include considering certain plant species as pests, and taking <a href="#">phytosanitary</a> measures to prevent their introduction and spread. ...	To be consistent with paragraph 10.	Costa Rica ,Nicaragua ,El Salvador ,Brazil	Not TPG-related
[150]	32	Editorial	<del>Plant for</del> Other intended uses may be considered, including human <del>or animal</del> consumption <del>or animal feed</del> , processing or combustion for energy production. For example, spillage of grain <del>whose</del> intended <del>use is for</del> processing may lead to unintended <del>propagation</del> <del>growth</del> of plants as pests.	1) To be consistent with paragraph 30; 2), 3), 4) and 5) For better understanding.	El Salvador	Not TPG-related

Comment no.	Paragraph no.	Comment type	Comment	Explanation	Country	TPG Response
[160]	33	Substantive	<del>Habitats and intended</del> <u>habitats locations</u>	PRA is conducted for a defined area and not for different geographic locations within the PRA area. In addition, location is not a defined term and the ISPM 5 term "habitat" covers the meaning of this paragraph.	Costa Rica ,Mexico ,Nicaragua ,El Salvador	See general suggestion 1
[163]	33	Substantive	<del>Habitats and intended locations</del> <u>Habitats and intended areas</u>	Global change in this section: use "area" instead of "location". It is understandable why the Expert Working Group wanted to avoid the use of the word habitat as any given habitat may include intended and unintended locations. However, the use of the word location is too specific because it implies very narrow areas (e.g., points) that may be too specific for an NPPO to effectively manage. Thus we suggest using the term area instead of location.	United States of America	See general suggestion 1
[217]	45	Substantive	<del>tolerance/resistance/susceptible:</del> response to herbicides, grazing and other actual cultural practices, drought, salinity.		Indonesia	Not TPG-related
[329]	66	Editorial	Irrespective of risk management options, where the import of a plant is allowed, it may be appropriate to develop post- <del>entry import</del> systems such as surveillance in the PRA area, contingency plans and systems to report new occurrences.		Korea, Republic of ,Thailand ,Lao People's Democratic Republic,Japan ,Viet Nam ,India	TPG agrees: Post – entry should be used for consistency with other uses.
[359]	80	Technical	<u>More detailed guidance on PRA for plants as quarantine pests is provided in Annex 4.</u>	To be consistent with the title.	Costa Rica ,Uruguay ,Nicaragua ,El Salvador	The end point is not determined yet, so keep pest
[445]	129	Technical	The coverage of the IPPC definition of <del>plant pests</del> includes <del>weeds plants as pests</del> , and other species that have indirect effects on plants, and the Convention applies to the protection of wild flora.	The definition of "plant pest" directs you to the definition of "pest " in ISPM 5.	Costa Rica ,Nicaragua ,El Salvador	TPG agrees

**ANNEX 9 - DRAFT WORK PLAN 2011-2012****(November 2011 to october 2012 – last update 2012-01-07)**Table 1: regular tasksTable 2: one-off tasksTable 3: terms on the TPG work programme as subjects as of October 2011Table 4: Chronological summary of deadlines**Table 1 - Regular tasks**

Regular tasks	Detailed task		Responsible	Deadline	Comments
<b>1-Report reporting to SC</b>	Prepare executive summary for SC Nov. if needed		Secretariat	07-11-2012	Only urgent issues
	Draft report to Steward and rapporteur		Secretariat	02-12-2011	
	Steward and rapporteur send back draft report		<b>Steward</b>	31-12-2012	
	Secretariat finalizes report and sends to TPG		Secretariat	02-01-2011	
	TPG review report		<b>All</b>	30-01-2012	
	Final report		Secretariat with <b>steward/rapporteur</b>	05-02-2012	
	Prepare executive summary for SC May (updated with developments between TPG 2011 and SC)		Secretariat with <b>steward</b>	15-03-2012	
<b>2- Draft ISPMs in member consultation</b>	<b>2011 MC</b>	Reactions to comments/consistency review integrated in tables, and redrafting of text for SC: Amendments to the glossary and NWD	Secretariat with <b>steward</b>	06-11-2011	
		Consultation of steward NWD on redrafted text and reactions to comments	Secretariat (and others?)	07-11-2011	
		Reactions to comments/consistency review integrated in tables: other drafts, and sent to stewards via Secretariat	Secretariat with <b>steward</b>	30-11-2011	
		Reactions on translation of terms compiled and sent to Secretariat for translators–None in 2011	Secretariat	-	None in 2011

		Reactions to requests for new terms and definitions–None in 2011	Secretariat with <b>steward</b>	-	None in 2011
	<b>2012 MC</b>	check accuracy of translation of definitions in draft ISPMs before country consultation - Members receive draft definitions for their language and send proposals back to Secretariat	All in languages	10-06-2012	TPG 2012
		Review for possible inconsistencies	<b>All</b> prior to meeting (drafts on IPP from June 2012)	14-10-2012	TPG 2012
		Terms and consistency comments extracted	Secretariat	10-10-2012	TPG 2012
		After TPG 2012, other steps will be similar to above for 2011		01-12-2012	
<b>3- Annotated glossary – (to be published every 3 years)</b>	2010 (publication)	Publication of revised annotated Glossary 2010	Secretariat	30-10-2011	
	2012 (intermediate)	Document for TPG taking account of adoptions etc since TPG 2010	Ian Smith	25-06-2012	TPG 2012
<b>4- Review of membership</b>	Annual review of membership to make recommendations to SC on new members needed		All during TPG 2012		TPG 2012
<b>5- Explanation of glossary terms</b>	Members to identify before the meeting some glossary terms/definitions requiring further explanations (and not already explained in other places, such as the annotated glossary).		All to send to Secretariat	25-06-2012	TPG 2012

Table 2 - One-off tasks (for individual terms to be worked on, see table 3)

One-off tasks	Detailed task		Responsible	Deadline	Comments
<b>6- Review of adopted ISPMs for consistency and style</b>	General recommendations on consistency: yearly updates as needed		All during meeting	05-11-2011	TPG 2011 not discussed
			Secretariat to SC	31-01-2012	None
	General recommendations on consistency: yearly updates as needed		All prior to meeting	14-10-2012	TPG 2012
			Secretariat and steward to SC May	31-01-2013	in TPG report
ISPM 5	Table for posting (note: to include the definition for “release (into the environment)”) )	Secretariat		15-04-2012	TPG 2012

	ISPM 9	a- table to Secretariat	Mohammad Bader	Katbeh-	15-04-2012	TPG 2012	
		b-TPG comments	All		10-06-2012	TPG 2012	
		c-MKB to Secretariat (in form ready for posting)	Mohammad Bader	Katbeh-	01-08-2012	TPG 2012	
	ISPM 16	a- table to Secretariat	John Hedley			15-04-2012	TPG 2012
		b-TPG comments	All			10-06-2012	TPG 2012
		c-JH to Secretariat (in form ready for posting)	John Hedley			01-08-2012	TPG 2012
	ISPM 20	a- table to Secretariat	John Hedley			15-04-2012	TPG 2012
		b-TPG comments	All			10-06-2012	TPG 2012
		c-JH to Secretariat (in form ready for posting)	John Hedley			01-08-2012	TPG 2012
	ISPM 23	a- EN to Secretariat (after consideration of editors comments)	Ebbe Nordbo			15-04-2012	TPG 2012
	ISPM 25	a-IMS to Secretariat (in form ready for posting)	Ian Smith			15-04-2012	TPG 2012
		ISPM 17	a- table to Secretariat	Beatriz Melcho			15-04-2012
b-TPG comments			All			10-06-2012	TPG 2012
c- BM to Secretariat (in form ready for posting)			Beatriz Melcho			01-08-2012	TPG 2012
Suppl. 2 to ISPM 5		a- table to Secretariat	Andrei Orlinski			15-04-2012	TPG 2012
		b-TPG comments	All			10-06-2012	TPG 2012
		c- AO to Secretariat (in fom ready for posting)	Andrei Orlinski			01-08-2012	TPG 2012
Ongoing consistency review			All during TPG 2012			15-10-2012	TPG 2012
<b>7- Draft Supplement on not widely distributed/official control</b>	actions to be decided by SC, if any		-				
<b>8- Terminology of Montreal Protocol in relation to the glossary of phytosanitary terms</b>	actions to be decided by SC, if any		Note: SC November 2011 proposed deletion of this topic to CPM-7 (2012)				
<b>9- Brief guidance for</b>	Secretariat to prepare paper for the next meeting		Secretariat			01-06-2012	TPG 2012

style guide on use of the terms "should", "shall" and "must"				
10. Review of duration of record keeping in ISPMs	Paper for the next meeting	Secretariat volunteers	with	01-05-2012 TPG 2012
11- Individual terms	volunteers to be identified	All during TPG 2011		05-11-2011 done
	Volunteer sends draft meeting paper to Secretariat	As allocated in Table 3		25-06-2012 TPG 2012

**Table 3 - Terms ON the TPG work programme as subjects as of OCTOBER 2011**

Deadline for preparation of papers for TPG 2012 is 15 September 2012 for all terms

		Source of the proposal	volunteer for preparation	Comments
	<b>To be prepared for TPG 2012 meeting</b>			
1.	additional declaration (2010-006)	SC November 2010	John Hedley	In relation to soil. SC November 2010 - Deletion of “soil or other” was proposed, as the definition for additional declaration includes the wording “in relation to regulated pests”. On the other hand it was noted that the additional declaration is the only place on the phytosanitary certificate where statements for specific situations, such as soil freedom, can be made. Additional declarations for soil freedom are common practice. Soil is included in Article 1 of the IPPC and is a major pathway. The SC decided to leave soil as an example and request the TPG to consider revision of the definition of <i>additional declaration</i> .
2.	identity (2011-001)	SC May 2011 based on CPM-6 discussion	Ebbe Nordbo	At CPM-6, in relation to the revised ISPM 12: 2010, 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.
3.	organism (2010-021), pest (2010-022), naturally	TPG discussion 2009	Ian Smith	Review the three definitions

		Source of the proposal	volunteer for preparation	Comments
	occurring (2010-023)			
4.	pest freedom (2010-003)	TPG discussion 2010 Added SC November 2010	Andrei Orlinski	To develop a definition. Occurs in ISPMs and would tie loose ends when looking at definitions of find free and free from.
5.	phytosanitary status (2010-004)	TPG discussion 2010 Added SC November 2010	Ebbe Nordbo	To review the use in ISPMs and consider if the term needs to be clarified. Raised in TPG 2010 in relation to the draft ISPM on plants for planting. The term is used in many contexts, in relation to e.g. area, pest. Use in standards should be reviewed and used considered. Term might need to be clarified.
6.	point of entry (2010-005)	From the review of the draft annotated glossary, TPG 2010 Added SC November 2010	Beatriz Melcho	To revise the definition. This definition is now out of date and does not allow for the current practice of having <b>points of entry</b> inside countries.
7.	presence (2010-025), occurrence (2010-026)	TPG discussion 2009	Ebbe Nordbo and Ian Smith	To review the use in English ISPMs and in languages to make sure consistent. TPG 2010 discussed. Outcome detailed in the 2010 report
8.	re-export (of a consignment) (2010-024) consignment in transit (To be proposed to SC May 2012 – previously considered a consistency amendment)	TPG discussion 2009 Back to TPG from SC May 2011	Andrei Orlinski	TPG 2010 revised definition of <i>re-export of a consignment</i> ) and proposed consequential change to the definition of <i>consignment in transit</i> . SC May 2011: “For several members, the proposed definition implied that the consignment had to be re-exported as a whole. The SC discussed whether the splitting up of consignments (one part staying in the importing country and the other part being re-exported) should be mentioned in the definition. One member suggested mentioning that the re-exported consignment can be exported in its entirety or in part. The SC could not solve this issue and requested the TPG to reconsider the definition [of re-export (of a consignment)].”. The May 2011 SC also decided to send <i>consignment in transit</i> for member consultation. Based on member comments, the TPG suggested to reconsider this together with the definition of re-export (of a consignment). Possible deletion of these terms would also be considered. See TPG 2011 report and responses to comments on <i>amendments to the glossary</i> .

		Source of the proposal	volunteer for preparation	Comments
9.	restriction(2010-027)	TPG discussion 2009 and 2010	Ian Smith	Review the use of restriction in ISPMs, as well as the use of restrictive. Used in inconsistent way. Also take account of the discussion in TPG 2010 under explanation of terms
10.	suppression (2011-002), eradication (2011-003) and containment (2011-004), exclusion (2010-008), control (2011-005)	Exclusion: TPF 2009 Others: TPG October 2010	Ebbe Nordbo	<i>Suppression, eradication, containment</i> : proposed for addition to the work programme in order to consider the use of <i>phytosanitary measures</i> in these definitions. <i>Exclusion</i> : Proposed by the TPF in Sept. 2009, but not considered by TPG 2009. TPF 2010 resubmitted a definition to TPG. TPG 2010 modified definition. SC May 2011 decided to send for MC. Based on comments received, TPG 2011 advised that the draft definition should be reconsidered together with <i>suppression, eradication, containment, control</i> . <i>Control</i> : proposed for addition to the work programme in order to consider mentioning exclusion in the definition.
11.	systems approach (2010-002)	TPG discussion 2010 Added SC November 2010	Beatriz Melcho	To consider the pros and cons of redefining/revising. Need to review use in standards and consider whether to revise. Two issues to be considered for possible revision of the definition: “risk management measures” (should it be “pest risk management measures”) meeting “appropriate level of protection” (“should it be “phytosanitary import requirements”) [Note: a third issue may be raised by SC in May 2012 based on a suggestion by the SC-7 in May 2011]
12.	quarantine station(2010-013)	TPG June 2009	Secretariat	To revise. Based on ISPM No. 3, change the definition for quarantine station in the Glossary to refer also to organisms or other regulated articles in quarantine instead of only referring to plants or plant products. TPG 2010 proposed revision. Member consultation in 2011. TPG 2011 modified definition. SC November 2011 sent back to TPG (details in SC report)
13.	endangered area, protected	To be proposed to SC May	Ian Smith	to consider whether the current definitions should be revised to be

		Source of the proposal	volunteer for preparation	Comments
	area	2012		consistent with the current definition of <i>quarantine pest</i> , and to review the use of the term in ISPMs, especially those on PRA (see report of 2011 TPG meeting)
14.	production site	To be proposed to SC May 2012	Ian Smith	To clarify the ambiguity linked to place of production (see report of 2011 TPG meeting)
15.	contaminating pest	To be proposed to SC May 2012	Volunteer needed	Definition to be reviewed to make sure that it covers the concepts normally expressed by a hitch-hiker pest. (see report of 2011 TPG meeting)
<b>Terms related to consistency</b>				
16.	Review of the use of and/or in adopted ISPMs(2010-030)	TPG discussion 2009 Modified SC November 2010	See report. stays on the work programme to be implemented during the consistency review Terms returned by SC Nov. 2010	Consistent with general recommendations on consistency, but require a review of every occurrence. Will be considered during consistency study. (Following definitions returned by SC Nov 2010 and will need to be reconsidered (see SC report): <i>kiln-drying</i> , <i>phytosanitary measure</i> , <i>phytosanitary regulation</i> and <i>plant quarantine</i> as part of consistency study)
17.	country of origin (2006-016)	Past TPG meetings (but pending)	Pending for ISPM 11 - Done for ISPM 7 and 12 - Will be done for ISPM 20 as part of consistency review	In standard setting programme presented to CPM-4: SC decided that this would be taken up under the review of ISPMs 7 and 12 and the review of adopted ISPMs. Addressed in ISPM 7, and needs to be addressed in 11 and 20
<b>Terms in the amendments to the Glossary 2011 and pending further review of member comments, proposal to SC, CPM decision</b>				
18.	absorbed dose (2010-031)	TPG 2010 identified as part of consistency	Amendments to the Glossary	Revision of the definition. MC in 2011. SC November 2011 sent proposal to CPM for adoption

		Source of the proposal	volunteer for preparation	Comments
			2011 going to CPM-7 (2012)	
19.	antagonist (2010-032), competitor (2010-033), control point (2010-034), dosimeter (2010-035), dosimetry (2010-036), ionizing radiation (2010-037)	TPG 2010 identified as part of consistency	Amendments to the Glossary 2011 going to CPM-7 (2012)	Deletion of the definition. MC in 2011. SC November 2011 sent proposal to CPM for adoption
20.	certificate (2010-015), phytosanitary certificate(2010-016)	Member comments 2009	Amendments to the Glossary 2011 going to CPM-7 (2012)	Deletion of certificate or merging phytosanitary certificate and certificate (with consideration of a def applying to electronic certification) (taking into account and in coordination with revision of ISPM 12). TPG 2010 proposes to merge definitions, and revised phytosanitary certificate. MC in 2011. SC November 2011 sent proposal to CPM for adoption
21.	confinement (2010-012)	TPG June 2009, member comments on PEQ draft	Amendments to the Glossary 2011 going to CPM-7 (2012)	Propose a definition, in relation to ISPM 3 and PEQ draft. Discussed at 2010 meeting. MC in 2011. SC November 2011 sent proposal to CPM for adoption
22.	hitch hiker (2010-017), Gray (2010-018), legislation (2010-019), plant pest(2010-020)	TPG discussion 2009	Amendments to the Glossary 2011 going to CPM-7 (2012)	Deletion proposed. To be added to the <i>Amendments to the Glossary</i> proposed by the TPG in October 2010. TPG 2010 agreed to paper

Note: The TPG had finalized proposals for *domestic regulation* and *electronic certification* at its 2010 meeting, but the SC decided in November 2010 to delete these subjects from the work programme.

**TABLE 4: SUMMARY OF MAIN DEADLINES IN CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER FOR TPG MEMBERS (EXCEPT STEWARD AND SECRETARIAT) - FOR DETAILS ON TASKS, SEE TABLES ABOVE**

<b>30-01-2012</b>	All	1. review draft report / send comments to Secretariat
<b>15-04-2012</b>	All	6. to prepare tables of consistency for several ISPMs (9, 16, 17, 20, Suppl. 2 to ISPM 5) Or to deliver final tables to Secretariat (ISPM 5, 23, 25)
<b>10-06-2012</b>	All	2. 2012 MC check accuracy of translation of definitions in draft ISPMs before country consultation
	All	6. comments on consistency tables (for ISPMs 9, 16, 20, 17, Suppl. 2 to ISPM 5)
<b>25-06-2012</b>	All TPG members identified in Table 3	11. individual terms / sends draft meeting paper to Secretariat
	Ian Smith	3. annotated glossary - Document for TPG taking account of adoptions etc. since TPG 2010
	All	5. 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).
<b>01-08-2012</b>	Mohammad Katbeh-Bader, John Hedley, Beatriz Melcho, Andrei Orlinski	6. final versions of consistency tables (ISPMs 9, 16, 20, 17, Suppl. 2 to ISPM 5) to Secretariat prior to 2012 TPG
<b>14-10-2012</b>	All	2. 2012 MC Review for possible inconsistencies
	All	6. General recommendations on consistency: yearly updates as needed