



Rome, Italy  
4-7 February 2013

# **Technical Panel for the Glossary February, 2013**

***REPORT***



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

REPORT REVISED 25 APRIL 2013 (SECTION 5.3 WAS REVISED)

## CONTENTS

1.	Opening of the meeting .....	4
1.1	Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat .....	4
1.2	Selection of the Chair and Rapporteur .....	4
1.3	Review and adoption of the agenda .....	4
1.4	Current specification: TP5 (TPG) (2012) (for information).....	4
2.	Administrative Matters .....	4
3.	Reports.....	4
3.1	Previous meeting of the TPG (October 2012).....	4
3.2	Extracts from other meeting reports of relevance to the TPG (SC Nov 2012) .....	4
3.3	Current work plan .....	6
4.	Review relating to draft ISPMs sent for member consultation in 2012 (1 July-20 October) .....	7
4.1	Determination of host status of fruits and vegetables to fruit fly (Tephritidae) infestation (2006-031).....	7
4.2	Appendix 1 to ISPM 12:2011. Electronic certification (2006-003) & 4.3 Annex to ISPM 26:2006. Establishment of fruit fly quarantine areas within a pest free area in the event of an outbreak (2009-007) .....	7
5.	Consideration of new or revised terms/definitions .....	7
5.1	Draft amendments to the glossary as developed at the Oct 2012 meeting.....	7
5.2	Subjects on the TPG work programme .....	8
5.2.1	<i>Pest list</i> (2012-014).....	8
5.2.2	<i>Pest freedom</i> (2010-003) and related terms (consequential changes following October 2012 meeting).....	9
5.2.3	<i>Cut flowers and branches</i> (2012-007).....	9
5.2.4	Definitions containing “occurrence”/”occur” (2010-026), and use of presence (2010-025).....	9
5.2.5	Contaminating pest (2012-001).....	9
5.2.6	Additional declaration (2010-006).....	10
5.3	Advice on new or revised terms in other recent draft standards i.e. those presented to the SC in May 2013 for consideration for member consultation .....	10
5.3.1	Draft annex to ISPM 20:2004 – Phytosanitary pre-clearance (2005-003).....	10
5.3.2	Phytosanitary Procedures for Fruit Fly (Tephritidae) Management (2005-010).....	10
5.3.3	Management of phytosanitary risks in the international movement of wood (2006-029) .....	11
5.3.4	Movement of growing media in association with plants for planting in international trade (2005-004).....	13
6.	Review of ISPMs for consistency of terms and style .....	13
6.1	General recommendations on consistency (as modified following the TPG Oct 2012 meeting. To be reviewed and completed as needed).....	13
6.2	Proposal regarding consistency across standards.....	13
6.2.1	Proposal and options .....	13
6.2.2	Example of phytosanitary status .....	14
6.2.3	Two proposals pending from TPG October 2012 .....	14
6.3	One question from the SC regarding a change proposed for ISPM 23 .....	14

7.	Annotated glossary: 2011 and 2012 amendments .....	14
8.	Explanation of glossary terms .....	15
9.	Review of durations of record keeping in ISPMs.....	16
10.	Taxonomic classification of organisms and IPPC coverage of plants, including an agreed interpretation of the term “plants” .....	16
11.	TPG work plan and medium term plan.....	17
11.1	TPG work plan for 2013-2014 .....	17
11.2	Medium term plan .....	18
12.	Membership of the TPG .....	18
13.	Other issues.....	19
13.1	ISO standard 704 (2009) “Terminology work – principles and methods”.....	19
14.	Date and venue of the next meeting .....	19
15.	Close .....	19

## **ANNEXES**

Annex 1: Agenda.....	20
Annex 2: Documents list .....	22
Annex 3: Participants list .....	24
Annex 4: Language versions of terms and definitions in fruit fly host standard.....	26
Annex 5: Amendments to the Glossary .....	28
Annex 6: General recommendations on consistency.....	39
Annex 7: Consistency across standards.....	42
Annex 8: Review of durations of record keeping in ISPMs.....	55
Annex 9: TPG work plan 2013-2014 .....	57
Annex 10: TPG medium term plan .....	65

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

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

The Secretariat welcomed the members of the Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG) to Rome. Mr Mohammad Katbeh-Bader (Jordan) was unable to attend the meeting, his last meeting as a member. The Secretariat noted that it was also the last meeting of Mr Ian Smith as a member (see agenda item 12).

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

Mr Hedley (New Zealand) was selected as Chairperson and Mr Nordbo (Denmark) as rapporteur.

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

The TPG adopted the agenda (Annex 1).

### **1.4 Current specification: TP5 (TPG) (2012) (for information)**

The steward presented the current specifications for the TPG (Specification TP5)<sup>1</sup>, as amended at the last meeting and approved by the SC in November 2012.

## **2. Administrative Matters**

The documents list (Annex 2), participants list (Annex 3) and local information were presented.

## **3. Reports**

### **3.1 Previous meeting of the TPG (October 2012)**

The draft report, currently under review within the Secretariat prior to being finalized, was distributed. Pending issues will be discussed under various agenda items.

### **3.2 Extracts from other meeting reports of relevance to the TPG (SC Nov 2012)**

The Secretariat highlighted points of interest from the report of the SC in November 2012. Several points would be discussed under other agenda items. The following items were mentioned that may impact the operation of the TPG in the future:

- A steward module is being developed within the online commenting system (OCS) for stewards to prepare responses to member comments.
- The SC has started to assign assistant stewards to certain expert drafting groups. Mr. Ebbe Nordbo was designated as assistant steward to the TPG. Guidance is under development on the role of assistant stewards. In the meantime, the Secretariat encouraged the steward to call upon the assistant steward as necessary.
- Regarding the outcome of recent calls for new TPG members, the SC had not reached an agreement on the selection of the new member for the English language, and a new call would be made at a future date. The 3<sup>rd</sup> call for a new member for the French language was still open.
- The ink amendments to various ISPMs proposed by the TPG at its October 2012 meeting had been reviewed and modified by the SC in November 2012, and will be presented to CPM-8 (2013) for noting. The Secretariat noted that the set of ink amendments presented to CPM-8 (2012) terminates the review of ISPMs for consistency as defined in Specification 32 (2006, *Review of ISPMs*). This specification will consequently be withdrawn once the CPM has noted this set of ink amendments. Review of individual ISPMs (draft and adopted) for consistency remains a task of the TPG, as described in specification TP 5 (TPG specification).

---

<sup>1</sup>[https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=1110798&frompage=24119&tx\\_publication\\_pi1\[showUid\]=128051&type=publication&L=0](https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=1110798&frompage=24119&tx_publication_pi1[showUid]=128051&type=publication&L=0)

The Secretariat asked for views on one aspect of the revised standard setting process as adopted at CPM-7 (2012) in relation to the *Amendments to the glossary*<sup>2</sup>. In the previous process, the 100-day member consultation period ended at the end of September, the *Amendments to the glossary* were revised by the TPG at its meeting in October, finalized by the SC at its meeting in November, and presented to the CPM for adoption in March-April of the following year. In the revised standard setting process, if the *Amendments to the glossary* follow the same process as “regular” ISPMs, the steps will be (e.g. for 2013): the 150-day member consultation period will end at the end of November 2013, the *Amendments to the glossary* will be revised by the TPG at its meeting in March 2014, reviewed by the SC-7 in May 2014, sent for the (new) Substantial Concerns Commenting Period (SCCP) until the end of September 2014, finalized by the SC in November 2014, and presented to CPM for adoption in 2015. The revised process adds a consultation period (the SCCP) and the Secretariat asked for opinions on this.

The TPG agreed that the *Amendments to the glossary* follow the same process as the regular ISPMs. However, it suggested that some flexibility be retained, in particular to reduce the number of steps. For example, individual proposals in the *Amendments to the glossary* that do not attract member comments during the 150-member consultation period may not need to become subject to the SCCP. When reviewing the *Amendments to the glossary*, the SC-7 could therefore consider separating the proposals in two sets, one going for SCCP (terms and definitions for which member comments were made), one going directly to the SC in November (terms and definitions for which no member comments were made), and a complete proposal could then be reassembled at the SC November to be presented to the CPM. If this system was followed, the SC-7 would have to make recommendations to the SC on which terms do not need to be subject to the SCCP.

The SC sought advice from the TPs on how to better engage experts at all levels of the standard setting process. This issue had originally be raised by the Secretariat, which had expressed general concerns about a low or declining engagement of CPM members, especially in relation to poor answer to calls for experts and to commenting. The Secretariat noted that, at the level of the TPG, the past few calls had highlighted difficulties in finding candidates for the group: recent nominations for a new TPG members for the English language had not led to a selection; the call for a new member for the French language had recently been done for a third time, and attracted few nominations; the latest call for a new member for the Arabic language had to be made twice before a member was selected. The TPG was invited to contribute ideas on how to attract strong candidates to the TPG, and on any other issue linked to engaging experts. The following points were raised:

- Regarding skills, TPG members need a mix of skills that are not so easy to find. Firstly they should have experience of phytosanitary systems and be involved in phytosanitary matters, and be either working with definitions or have a great experience of the whole standard development. This points towards experts who are already involved in IPPC standard setting activities, but as these experts already have a heavy workload, they may not be able to join TPG. Secondly, while TPG members need to have phytosanitary expertise to make sure that the terms are used correctly, they also need to have a specific interest in working with terminology and language. They also need to ensure that the terms will be correct once translated, and this requires good language skills. However, experts with the double skills and interests in phytosanitary matters and in terminology and language are not so frequent. Finally a large part of the work needs to be carried out in English, and this adds another constraint to finding suitable candidates.
- Suggestion was made that people involved in phytosanitary matters and showing interest for terminology and languages should be identified at any type of meetings, including EWG and CPM, by the Secretariat or others involved in standard setting activities.
- Nominees should understand the work to be done, engage into it and be reactive. They should be willing to follow the group in the long term.

---

<sup>2</sup> It is recalled that other elements were discussed at the October 2012 meeting and can be found in the report of that meeting

- Regarding the Secretariat's question on whether TPG members had sufficient time to dedicate to this task and the support of their hierarchy, several members noted it was important that their superior understood the importance of the task in order to have the available time to allocate to the work. When an expert was nominated with the support of a superior, and that person was replaced, the time spent on the tasks may be put in question by the new superior. The Secretariat noted that it could provide a letter, or contact relevant persons, in order to support the work done by TP members.
- Governments may not be aware of the benefits of having members in specific groups, and may focus rather on the cost of having an expert participating in a group. The benefits should be explained.
- The need for continuity was raised. As the skills needed for the TPG are specialized, and some continuity should be maintained in the group, it may be necessary that a member continues beyond her/his first 5-year term. However, NPPOs after 5 years may conclude that they have provided sufficient support by providing their experts for 5 years, and may withdraw them. When continuation of a TP member is necessary, the Secretariat could assist by providing a letter to present to the member's hierarchy, explaining the importance of the work being done and the need for continuity (possibly beyond the 5-year term).

One member noted that some RPPOs have been greatly involved in the development of the glossary since this activity started, and still provided heavy support (for example two TPG members are currently directly funded by an RPPO). It was noted that where the situation arises that an RPPO can propose and fund a nominee who is then selected as a member, this could be encouraged and supported.

The Secretariat requested the assistance of TPG members for each language in checking the *Amendments to the glossary* before they are presented to the CPM for adoption, in order to verify that no elements are missing and that there are no mistakes in translation of glossary terms. Suggestions will then be transmitted to CPM. It was noted that the *Amendments to the glossary* to be reviewed by the SC in May 2013 will normally be sent for member consultation in 2013, and they will therefore be ready for adoption, at the earliest, at CPM-10 (2015).

The TPG:

- (1) *invited* the SC to consider the TPG suggestion that the *Amendments to the glossary* follow the same process as the regular ISPMs, but that the SC-7, when considering the *Amendments to the Glossary* after the 150-day member consultation, could consider separating them in two sets: one going for SCCP (terms and definitions for which member comments were made), one going directly to the SC in November (terms and definitions for which no member comments were made).
- (2) *noted* that its input regarding engaging experts will be presented to the SC, together with suggestions from other TPs.
- (3) *noted* that the Secretariat will send a reminder requesting TPG members to review the *Amendments to the glossary* in relevant languages in January prior to the CPM at which they will be presented for adoption (for the next set of amendments, this will normally be CPM-10 in 2015).

### 3.3 Current work plan

The Secretariat presented the 2012-2013 work plan<sup>3</sup>. The 2013-2014 work plan was discussed under agenda item 12.1.

---

<sup>3</sup> TPG\_2012\_Oct\_34

#### **4. Review relating to draft ISPMs sent for member consultation in 2012 (1 July-20 October)**

The TPG reviewed member comments on terms and on consistency, extracted by the Secretariat from the compiled comments, and also reviewed the drafts for consistency in the use of terms. Recommendations will be compiled by the Secretariat and steward after the meeting, transmitted to stewards, and posted as a meeting document for the SC-7 meeting in May 2013. Owing to the size of the tables of recommendation, these are not attached to this report but will be posted on the TPG work area. The TPG recommendations regarding requests in member comments that new definitions be developed are repeated in this report.

##### **4.1 Determination of host status of fruits and vegetables to fruit fly (Tephritidae) infestation (2006-031)**

The TPG recommendations on this draft will be transmitted to the steward (and posted as a meeting document for the SC-7 meeting in May 2013). The TPG discussed in particular two proposals suggesting that *host* and *semi-natural* be defined. In both cases, the TPG recommended that these terms do not need to be defined (see details in the recommendations to the steward and presented to the SC-7).

The draft ISPM contains a number of draft definitions, and the TPG reviewed their translations. As agreed at the October 2012 meeting, the members for Chinese, Arabic and Russian languages had provided a version of the definitions in these languages, as guidance when the drafts are next processed for translation. Proposals related to language versions of the translation are in Annex 4, and will be transmitted to translators when the drafts are sent for translation or adjustment of translations.

The TPG:

- (4) *invited* the SC to note that, regarding the proposals in member comments that *host* and *semi-natural* be defined, the TPG recommends that these definitions are not needed (see details in the recommendations as presented to the SC-7).
- (5) *invited* the SC to note that the Secretariat will forward proposals regarding the language versions of draft definitions in this standard to the translators (when this draft is next sent for translation).

##### **4.2 Appendix 1 to ISPM 12:2011. Electronic certification (2006-003)**

##### **4.3 Annex to ISPM 26:2006. Establishment of fruit fly quarantine areas within a pest free area in the event of an outbreak (2009-007)**

The TPG recommendations on these two drafts will be transmitted to the stewards (and posted as a meeting document for the SC-7 meeting in May 2013). There was no member comment proposing that specific terms be defined.

#### **5. Consideration of new or revised terms/definitions**

##### **5.1 Draft amendments to the glossary as developed at the Oct 2012 meeting**

The TPG reviewed and further modified the draft *Amendments to the glossary* as compiled after its October 2012 meeting. Several proposals were added following discussions on agenda items 5.2.3, 5.2.4 and 5.2.5 (see below). The *Amendments to the Glossary* are attached as Annex 5 and will be presented to the SC for consideration for member consultation.

Two proposals developed at the October 2012 meeting were re-discussed and modified:

- it had been proposed that *re-exported consignment* be proposed for deletion and, if this was not acceptable, that the SC consider defining *phytosanitary certificate for re-export* to replace *re-exported consignment* (see Annex 5 in October 2012 TPG report). There was still agreement on the proposal that *re-exported consignment* be proposed for deletion, but there was no agreement

on the proposal that *PC for re-export* be defined instead. Some members believed that there was no need to define *PC for re-export* as ISPM 12:2011 (*Phytosanitary certificates*) gives sufficient guidance on PCs for re-export, and the definition of *phytosanitary certificate* refers to the models in the IPPC (i.e. also the PC for re-export). Other members felt that a PC for re-export would deserve a definition. The TPG finally decided to only propose deletion of *re-exported consignment*.

- *kiln-drying* had been proposed for deletion at the last meeting (see Annex 5 in October 2012 TPG report). However, the TPG concluded that this definition should better be maintained as it is used in ISPM 15:2009 (*Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade*), but its revision should be considered (as per the discussion detailed in the October 2012 report).

The TPG:

- (6) *invited* the SC to review the *Amendments to the Glossary*, for consideration for member consultation.
- (7) *invited* the SC to add the term *kiln-drying* as a subject to the List of Topics for IPPC Standards, for revision.

## 5.2 Subjects on the TPG work programme

### 5.2.1 Pest list (2012-014)

A SC member had raised concerns related to the use of *pest list* in ISPMs and confusion that may arise with the use of this term in practice. At its meeting in November 2012, the SC had added the term *pest list* to the List of Topics for IPPC Standards as a subject and requested the TPG to discuss how to proceed (e.g. definition, explanation, revision of ISPM 19:2003 (*Guidelines on lists of regulated pests*)). The TPG reviewed the SC document<sup>4</sup> and discussed how to work on this issue. The following points were mentioned, that could be considered further when this issue is analysed in detail:

- The TPG agreed that there is confusion in the use of the term in practice; while *pest list* relates to lists of regulated pests in many instances in ISPMs, the term NPPOs may currently use it for other types of lists (e.g. lists of pests present in a country).
- There are different types of lists of pests, such as associated with a commodity (*commodity pest list* is already defined in ISPM 5), associated with a plant (*host pest list* is already defined in ISPM 5), regulated pests, quarantine pests, pests present in a country. The solution proposed, and in particular whether one or several definitions are needed, should acknowledge that the term *pest list* needs to be used in various contexts. In particular, there may be little advantage in defining *pest list* to apply only to regulated pests; if a term and definition was needed in relation to regulated pests, it may rather be *list of regulated pests*.
- Although the term *pest list* is used on its own in ISPM 19:2003, this does not seem to create confusion as it always clearly relates to regulated pests. However the use of *pest list* is confusing in some other ISPMs, because it is sometimes clearly used in relation to regulated pests, but not in all cases.

The TPG concluded that an analysis would be made of the various uses of *pest list* or *lists of pests* in ISPMs. Recommendations could then be made on how to proceed, in particular whether some terms should be defined, whether ink amendments are needed to adopted ISPMs to clarify this issue (e.g. across standards), or whether some type of explanation should be developed.

The TPG:

- (8) *invited* the SC to note that the TPG will analyse the use of *pest list* (or *list of pests*) in ISPMs at its next meeting and develop recommendations on how to proceed.

---

<sup>4</sup> TPG\_2013\_Feb\_09

### **5.2.2 *Pest freedom* (2010-003) and related terms (consequential changes following October 2012 meeting)**

At its October 2012 meeting, the TPG concluded that *pest freedom* did not need to be defined, but envisaged that the definitions of *pest free production site*, *pest free area* and *pest free place of production* may need to be amended (see detailed discussions in the October 2012 TPG report). The TPG re-discussed this issue and concluded that these revisions were not necessary. Consideration of *pest freedom* was therefore concluded, without a need to add new definitions or modify existing ones, and the SC would be asked to remove this term from the List of Topics for IPPC Standards.

The TPG:

- (9) *invited* the SC to note that no amendment to ISPM 5 is proposed as a consequence of the consideration of *pest freedom* (2010-003), and to remove this subject from the List of Topics for IPPC Standards.

### **5.2.3 *Cut flowers and branches* (2012-007)**

Following discussion of the proposal<sup>5</sup>, a revised definition for *cut flowers and branches* is proposed (see draft *Amendments to the Glossary* in Annex 5 for details). Explanations are given in Annex 5 and there was no other point of discussion.

The TPG:

- (10) *proposed* the revision of *cut flowers and branches* in the *Amendments to the Glossary* to be presented to the SC May 2013.

### **5.2.4 Definitions containing “occurrence”/”occur” (2010-026), and use of presence (2010-025)**

At its last meeting, the TPG recommended that term *occurrence* and its definition be deleted from the Glossary and that, in ISPMs, “present” (or relevant derived forms) be used instead of “occur” (and relevant derived forms). However, there was no need to define *presence* (see *Amendments to the glossary* in Annex 5 and report of the October 2012 meeting). As a consequence of these proposals, definitions that currently use “occur” (and derived forms) were analysed and modifications proposed (i.e. *area of low pest prevalence*, *commodity pest list*, *habitat*, *pest free area*, *pest free place of production*, *pest free production site*, *surveillance*, *survey*)<sup>6</sup>. The TPG finalized these proposals and decided to include them to the *Amendments to the glossary* as consequential changes to the deletion of *occurrence*.

The TPG:

- (11) *proposed* the revision of *area of low pest prevalence*, *commodity pest list*, *habitat*, *pest free area*, *pest free place of production*, *pest free production site*, *surveillance*, *survey* in the *Amendments to the Glossary* to be presented to the SC May 2013.
- (12) *invited* the SC to remove the term *presence* (2010-005) from the List of Topics for IPPC Standards.

### **5.2.5 *Contaminating pest* (2012-001)**

Following discussion of the proposal<sup>7</sup>, the definition of *contaminating pest* was proposed for deletion (see draft *Amendments to the Glossary* in Annex 5 for details). Explanations are given in Annex 5 and there was no other point of discussion.

---

<sup>5</sup> TPG\_2013\_Feb\_14

<sup>6</sup> TPG\_2013\_Feb\_19

<sup>7</sup> TPG\_2013\_Feb\_27

The TPG:

- (13) *proposed* the deletion of *contaminating pest* in the *Amendments to the Glossary* to be presented to the SC May 2013.

### **5.2.6 Additional declaration (2010-006)**

The SC had added this term to the List of Topics for IPPC Standards in order to consider the revision of the definition, as there was an inconsistency between the definition in ISPM 5 and ISPM 12:2011. The definition in ISPM 5 only mentions regulated pests whilst ISPM 12:2011 provides that soil may also be the subject of additional declarations. The TPG discussed a proposal<sup>8</sup> that included information provided from several countries regarding the use of additional declarations. It was noted that freedom from soil is a frequent requirement for additional declarations. In addition, other items may be subject to additional declarations, such as growing media or the packaging in which the commodity is held. Amending the definition to mention only regulated pests and soil was therefore thought to be restrictive, and the proposal was to mention regulated articles in order to cover possible needs for additional declarations, i.e.: “A statement that is required by an importing country to be entered on a **phytosanitary certificate** and which provides specific additional information on a **consignment** in relation to **regulated pests or regulated articles**”.

One member did not agree to mentioning regulated articles in general, as the reason to mention soil was still related directly to the presence of pests, and *regulated articles* would be too broad. Other members believed that *soil* was too limited as additional declarations may be used for other types of regulated articles. In conclusion, there was no agreement on how the definition should be revised: adding *soil* to the definition was considered too restrictive by some, and adding *regulated articles* too broad by others.

The TPG:

- (14) *invited* the SC to consider the discussion on *additional declaration* (2010-006) and decide how to proceed.

### **5.3 Advice on new or revised terms in other recent draft standards i.e. those presented to the SC in May 2013 for consideration for member consultation<sup>9</sup>**

This agenda item relates to draft terms and definitions proposed by expert drafting groups in draft standards to be presented to the SC in May 2013 for consideration for member consultation, and consistency in the use of terms in these drafts. No draft definitions were proposed in the drafts available, but the TPG made a general review of the drafts for consistency in the use of terms. The TPG suggestions will be transmitted to the stewards of the draft ISPMs and presented to the SC.

#### **5.3.1 Draft Annex (Phytosanitary pre-clearance) to ISPM 20:2004 (*Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system*) (2005-003)**

The TPG did not identify consistency issues in this draft<sup>10</sup>. It was noted that the introductory text to the draft ISPM suggested that revision of the definition of “pre-clearance” in ISPM 5 would be needed, as well as a new definition for the term “phytosanitary oversight”. These issues would presumably come back to the TPG at a later date.

#### **5.3.2 Phytosanitary Procedures for Fruit Fly (*Tephritidae*) Management (2005-010)**

The TPG reviewed the draft<sup>11</sup> and raised one concern related to the nature of this document. This draft does not have the content of a standard, because it does not give guidance on issues that are normally subject to a standard (i.e. issues that need to be harmonized). Although it uses terms related to

---

<sup>8</sup> TPG\_2013\_Feb\_24

<sup>9</sup> This section was revised on 25 April 2013 to correct errors in paragraph numbering.

<sup>10</sup> 2005-003\_Preclearance

<sup>11</sup> 2005-010\_FF\_Procedures

phytosanitary regulations, it is written as guidance of a general nature on pest management. At the same time, it is not a manual either, because it is not detailed enough for this purpose.

The TPG:

- (15) *invited* the SC to consider the TPG review of consistency for the draft *Phytosanitary Procedures for Fruit Fly (Tephritidae) Management* (2005-010).

### 5.3.3 Management of phytosanitary risks in the international movement of wood (2006-029)

The TPG reviewed the draft<sup>12</sup> and raised the following general and specific issues.

#### General issues

- The TPG noted that the draft is an information manual rather than a standard. It does not lay down requirements related to movement of wood in international trade, but gives indications on different processes and operations that may be applied. NPPOs need guidance in that area and would benefit from this information being compiled and distributed under the authority of the IPPC. However, the nature of this document and how it should be developed and approved may be considered. One member wondered if this kind of documents could follow a different approval procedure than standards. One member wondered whether an ISPM for wood could be developed by keeping only what constitutes requirements for the international trade of wood, without all the detailed guidance that does not belong to a standard. It was noted that the adopted commodity standard ISPM 36:2012 (*Integrated measures for plants for planting*) does contain requirements. Finally, several commodity standards are currently on the List of Topics of IPPC Standards (such as seed, grain, cut flowers and branches) and may raise the same issue.
- A number of issues were raised in relation to the use of the terms *wood* and *bark* in this draft (especially in paragraph [7] and their definitions in ISPM 5.
  - . [7] mentions *bark chips* as a commodity class for wood. If this is the case, then the title need to be changed as it currently mentions “wood and bark” (i.e. implying separate commodity classes). However, the TPG believed that bark and wood are generally considered as separate commodity classes.
  - . [7] and the definition of *wood* in ISPM 5 are not consistent. *Wood* is defined in ISPM 5 as “a commodity class for round wood, sawn wood, wood chips or dunnage, with or without bark” while [7] mentions more categories. The TPG felt that the ISPM 5 definition of *wood* seems too restrictive, and should either list all items considered as wood (which may be difficult) or mention only some, but clearly identify them as examples. In addition, one member wondered whether *dunnage* should be in the definition of *wood*, as it is not a commodity class in itself, but accompanies commodities.
  - . *Bark* is currently defined in ISPM 5 not as a commodity class, but as the elements that need to be removed when the wood is debarked. However, there may be a need to define *bark* as a commodity class.

The TPG finally recommended that paragraph [7] may not be needed as the coverage of the standard is considered under paragraph [6], and also as revision of the definition of *wood* would ensure that the items covered are clarified. Even if [7] is maintained in the draft, the revision of the definitions of *wood* and *bark* is considered necessary.

- One member wondered whether wood in this draft covers furniture made of raw wood. However, a standard is planned on *Wood products and handicrafts made from raw wood* (2008-008), and would presumably address furniture made of raw wood. This may need to be confirmed. In addition, a sentence may be needed in the scope to explain that wood products and handicrafts are not covered.

#### Specific issues

<sup>12</sup> 2006\_029\_PestRiskManagementInternationalMovementWood

- [7] If this paragraph is kept (see general comment above), the TPG suggested considering whether the categories of processed wood material (“plywood, oriented strand board and fibreboard”) should be mentioned. Several members felt that individual names may not be internationally understood, and there may be variations on the terms used for similar categories (for example ISPM 15:2009 uses “plywood, particle board, oriented strand board or veneer”, and it is not clear how the categories in the draft relate to these). In addition, it may be difficult to give a comprehensive list here. Finally, one member felt that some terms used for mechanically processed wood may be reconsidered, for example should “particle wood” be used instead of “chips”? Is “wood residue” an internationally-approved used term, noting that “wood waste” is used in some regions?
- [38] 2<sup>nd</sup> sentence. “Specific phytosanitary requirements such as verification” is not clear. Does it mean “Specific phytosanitary requirements such as verification of measures that have been applied”?
- [39] “...may require debarked wood as a phytosanitary import requirement...”. It would be more appropriate to refer to the process instead of the outcome, i.e. “...may require removal of wood or bark freedom as a phytosanitary import requirement...”.
- [41] 3<sup>rd</sup> sentence “Wood moved as a commodity class with or without bark”. Which insects other than bark beetles are intended to be covered by “other bark insects”?
- [41] 5<sup>th</sup> sentence. “Wood moved as a commodity class with or without bark represents a pathway for the introduction and spread of quarantine pests”. It is suggested to replace “moved as a commodity class” by “moved as a commodity”.
- [42] 6<sup>th</sup> sentence. “Pest risk presented by wood commodities is dependent on a wide range of factors such as the commodity type, origin, presence of bark, intended use and any treatment applied to the wood”. Is “factor” the right term? It is confusing and may not cover appropriately what is described.
- [42] Last sentence. “Wood in the form of these commodities may or may not be accompanied by bark”. The phrase “may or may not be accompanied by bark” is an unusual wording; “with or without bark” is used in other instances.
- [44] “should not be required without appropriate technical justification” is the fundamentals of all IPPC work and should not need to be specified. There seem to be similarly redundant information in the background.
- [45] to [49] There are many more elements to be taken into account when doing PRA, and it may be less misleading to clearly indicate that these are only examples.
- [46] “on the surface of or within the wood commodity” is unclear, does it mean “on or in the wood”?
- [52] It is not clear what is meant by “wood fibre” and “bark tissue”, and the illustrations are not sufficient to explain what is meant. In addition, “bark tissue” is not used further in the standard, and “wood fibre” only once.
- [55] Is “factor” the right term? It is confusing and may not cover appropriately what is described.
- [56] What does “harvest region” (Secretariat note: this was edited and changed to “harvest location” since the TPG review) mean, and could it be replaced by a term which is already more widely used in ISPMs, such as “area of origin” or “place of production”?
- [72] “Most sawn wood (usually referred to as lumber or timber)”. “Lumber” has different meanings worldwide, and may be used for logs or growing trees. Deletion of the bracket is suggested.
- [119] “green wood”. Green is confusing, and it is suggested to use e.g. “freshly-cut wood”.
- [123] “phytosanitary security”. Wrong use of defined term. Rewording is needed
- [160] “forestry/silvicultural”. “/” should be avoided throughout the text. Also, are both forestry and silvicultural needed, or could one word be kept?
- [170] The meaning of “verification” is not clear.

The TPG:

- (16) *invited* the SC to add the definitions of *wood* and *bark* to the List of Topics for IPPC Standards, for possible revision.

- (17) *invited* the SC to consider the TPG review of consistency for the draft *Management of phytosanitary risks in the international movement of wood* (2006-029).

### **5.3.4 Movement of growing media in association with plants for planting in international trade (2005-004)<sup>13</sup>**

The TPG reviewed the draft<sup>14</sup> and raised the following consistency issues:

- [32] “pest risk factors” should be used instead of “risk factors”.
- [33] “constituent” would be more correct than “component”.
- [38], [45], [77], [78] The meaning of “relative pest risks” is not clear. If it is meant as relative to each other, “relative” is not needed.
- [39] “organisms not yet identified as pests”. In other ISPMs, the wording “organisms deemed to be pests” has been used.
- [44] “Recommendations contained in ISPM 36:2012...”.”Guidance contained in ISPM 36:2012...” would be more appropriate.
- [89] All instances of “free of” should be replaced by “free from” (English).
- [53] to [70] Sections 5.1 to 5.4 seem to mix measures applied to the growing media and measures applied to the plants.

The TPG:

- (18) *invited* the SC to consider the TPG review of consistency for the draft *Movement of growing media in association with plants for planting in international trade* (2005-004).

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

### **6.1 General recommendations on consistency (as modified following the TPG Oct 2012 meeting. To be reviewed and completed as needed)**

The *General recommendations on consistency* had been modified based on the discussions as the last meeting<sup>15</sup>. The TPG recommended that it was not necessary to indicate the date of addition of each recommendation. The *General recommendations on consistency* would be further modified after the meeting and presented to the SC in May 2013.

The TPG:

- (19) *invited* the SC to note the modified *General recommendations on consistency* (Annex 6) and to encourage the implementation of those recommendations by expert drafting groups and others directly involved in drafting ISPMs.

### **6.2 Proposal regarding consistency across standards**

#### **6.2.1 Proposal and options**

A proposal regarding consistency across standards had been developed following the October 2012 meeting<sup>16</sup>, and was reviewed and modified. The TPG chose one option from those available, and this would be presented to the SC. The proposal is attached as Annex 7, and also incorporates the proposals made in relation to phytosanitary status (see 6.2.2).

The TPG:

- (20) *invited* the SC to review the paper on consistency across standards, including specific proposals regarding *phytosanitary status*.

<sup>13</sup> 2005-004\_GrowingMedia

<sup>14</sup> 2006\_029\_PestRiskManagementInternationalMovementWood

<sup>15</sup> TPG\_2013\_Feb\_15

<sup>16</sup> TPG\_2013\_Feb\_22

## 6.2.2 Example of phytosanitary status

The TPG discussed a proposal to reduce confusion in ISPMs regarding the use of *phytosanitary status*<sup>17</sup>. The proposal was modified and integrated to the paper on consistency across standards (see under 6.2.1 and Annex 7). One specific proposal was that there may be a need to define the term *phytosanitary status (of a consignment accompanied by a PC)*, to cover all instances in ISPMs where the term *phytosanitary status* is used in relation to consignments. One member drafted a preliminary definition: “Whether or not all elements attested on the PC are and remain correct”. One aspect to be discussed further would be whether, when used in this context, all the elements on the PC were covered by the phytosanitary status of the consignment.

## 6.2.3 Two proposals pending from TPG October 2012

Two proposals were pending consideration from the TPG October 2012<sup>18</sup>. The first related to the use of the words *impact, consequence, importance, damage, harm, effect* in ISPMs. The member who had made this proposal suggested that, although the use of these terms was slightly problematic and may need to be reviewed in the future, it did not need consideration at this stage.

The second proposal related to *authorize, accredit, certify*, which are used in ISPMs with overlapping meanings. The member who had raised this issue believed that this was a substantial issue for the understanding of ISPMs. There was a need to analyse this issue and see how the confusion in ISPMs could be reduced. The steward of the TPG is also the steward of the ISPM on *Minimizing pest movement by sea containers (2008-001)* and noted that bodies and companies operating in that domain for certification activities were already following an harmonized terminology, which should be taken into account within the framework of the IPPC. One member noted that the English language makes a difference between *authorize* and *accredit*, but he wondered whether this was the case in all languages. The TPG recommended that this issue should be analysed and would ask the SC to add this subject to the List of Topics for IPPC Standards. If this was accepted, an analysis would be conducted for the next meeting, including: 1. an analysis of the use of this term in ISPMs, and 2. whether the terminology is well defined and internationally accepted already with other domains, including possibly through some ISO standards.

The TPG:

- (21) *invited* the SC to add the terms *authorize, accredit, certify* as one subject on the List of Topics for IPPC Standards.

## 6.3 One question from the SC regarding a change proposed for ISPM 23

The TPG reviewed an issue raised by the SC in November 2012 in relation to one ink amendment proposed for ISPM 23<sup>19</sup>. One SC member had wondered whether *regulated pests* should be replaced by *regulated non-quarantine pest* in the following ink amendment (in section 2.3.1 Pests, 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph, bullet 2): “no ~~specified pest~~ tolerance level has been ~~identified~~ specified for regulated pests”. The TPG noted that the use of *regulated pest* is correct and in line with ISPM 31:2008 (*Methodologies for sampling of consignments*), and did not suggest that the change be made.

## 7. Annotated glossary: 2011 and 2012 amendments

The TPG reviewed the revised version of the annotated glossary<sup>20</sup> prepared by Mr. Ian Smith. The annotated glossary is published every three years, and is due for publication in 2013. Some comments were made during the meeting, and further suggestions were made during discussion of various agenda items.

---

<sup>17</sup> TPG\_2013\_Feb\_20

<sup>18</sup> TPG\_2013\_Feb\_10

<sup>19</sup> TPG\_2013\_Feb\_26

<sup>20</sup> TPG\_2013\_Feb\_21

The TPG:

- (22) *decided* that the 2013 version of the annotated glossary would be modified after the meeting by Mr. Ian Smith, sent to the TPG for final verification, and submitted to the SC for comments as the new version to be published in 2013.
- (23) *invited* the SC to note that the 2013 version of the annotated glossary is being finalized and will be submitted to the SC for comments via an e-forum.

## 8. Explanation of glossary terms

This is a standing agenda item, whereby members identify some glossary terms and definitions requiring further explanations (and not already explained in other places, such as the annotated glossary). These terms and definitions are discussed during the TPG meeting and the need for additional explanations discussed. The proposals submitted to the October 2012 TPG meeting were discussed<sup>21</sup>.

*Detention versus confinement (of a regulated article).* One member wondered about the difference between these terms. The TPG member for the Arabic language added that these terms are translated in Arabic in the same way. It was clarified that a consignment that is detained is not necessarily confined (the latter implying the application of phytosanitary measures). Detention may be used on suspicion, while confinement applies to a known issue. Confinement may also apply in the longer term, e.g. holding plants in quarantine, while detention relate to a consignment recently arrived and to be released. Finally, confinement is one option for detention, the other being custody. The TPG agreed that these terms and definitions were appropriate.

*Harmonization.* The definition uses the phrase “common standards”. One member noted that “common” is in the WTO definition of harmonization, which was used as the basis for the IPPC definition, but seems redundant. The TPG noted that this was a minor issue that did not warrant a change.

*Integrity.* The definition uses the wording “maintained without loss, addition or substitution” and one member wondered why *loss* was mentioned; if a consignment arrives at destination with some parts missing (because of an incidental loss during transport after dispatch), would its integrity be compromised? It was clarified that this intends to cover situations such as intentional loss (i.e. infested plants “lost” during transport) or cases where some elements may have been stolen. In any case, if the consignment arrives with only a part of its original composition, its integrity would not be maintained. This does not prejudice of whether the consignment will be accepted or refused. The TPG agreed that the mention of “loss” in the definition was appropriate. A note would be added to the annotated glossary.

*Quarantine pest.* The definition uses the wording “a pest .... not yet present there, or ...”. One member believed that the use of “yet” was confusing as it gave the impression that introductions cannot be prevented in the long term. However, this definition is in the IPPC, and the TPG decided that this point did not warrant a change.

*Transparency.* One member wondered whether this definition was needed, as the term is not IPPC-specific and is a widely understood SPS term. In addition, the description of the principle of transparency in ISPM 1:2006 (*Phytosanitary principles for the protection of plants and the application of phytosanitary measures in international trade*) seems to go beyond the definition, which links transparency to only “phytosanitary measures”. The TPG agreed that this is the only principle defined in the glossary, while all are detailed in ISPM 1:2006. However, it was not proposed that this definition be deleted or modified at this stage.

Finally, one member enquired whether the term *plant quarantine* was used in practice to describe the activities of the NPPOs. It was noted during the discussion that different general terms are used in

---

<sup>21</sup> TPG\_2013\_Feb\_11

different parts of the world and countries, such as *plant quarantine*, *plant health*, *internal quarantine* (for pests of distributions in only parts of the country), *plant protection*. Plant protection and plant health may be wider than only quarantine, but the use of the terms depend on how they are understood in the different countries.

## 9. Review of durations of record keeping in ISPMs

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. The TPG reviewed a paper developed by the Secretariat<sup>22</sup> and prepared an analysis and recommendations (Annex 8), which will be presented to the SC in May 2013.

The TPG:

(24) *invited* the SC to review the proposal on duration of record keeping in ISPMs.

## 10. Taxonomic classification of organisms and IPPC coverage of plants, including an agreed interpretation of the term “plants”

The TPG reviewed the document prepared by Mr Ian Smith<sup>23</sup> following the request of the November 2012 SC meeting. The proposal reviewed developments related to the taxonomic classification of organisms and made proposals relating to the IPPC coverage of plants. The TPG reviewed and modified the proposal. Some major points of discussion are reported below.

*Which organisms did countries intended to cover at the inception of the IPPC?* When the IPPC originally came into force in 1953, the plant kingdom in general was defined to include algae and fungi, although it is not clear whether the IPPC originally intended to cover all organisms in the plant kingdom, and whether that question was explicitly considered at the time. In a similar manner, it is unclear whether it was intended to cover both macro-organisms and micro-organisms. However, with the progressive splitting up of the original kingdoms into several new groups, some of the organisms are no longer considered part of the kingdom Plantae (for example, some of the algae that are most important as cultivated algae are not plants, but belong to the Kingdom Chromista). In addition, the coverage of IPPC as understood by countries may have evolved with time. Originally the IPPC was in practice targeting mostly cultivated plants, but has been explicitly recognized in recent years to cover the protection of uncultivated/unmanaged plants.

*Whether the coverage of the IPPC should take account of issues of practical implementation, or only of groups of organisms.* Some members supported that the IPPC should cover organisms that NPPOs are in a position to protect in practice. This should be taken into account when considering whether to cover for example micro-fungi or bacteria (see details below). Others believed that practical implementation is a separate issue, and that the IPPC community should look into the future and not be limited by current practice or lack of resources to address implementation. One member noted that the main target of implementation in practice is still true plants, and especially cultivated ones. The enlargement beyond cultivated plants to uncultivated/unmanaged plants had already created a situation in which the IPPC could be involved in the protection of an enormous numbers of wild plants, while in practice there may be few that could actually be protected.

*Whether micro-organisms should be covered.* Some members supported that from the practical point of view under the IPPC, the protection of plants applies essentially to macroscopic organisms (which may well extend to algae and fungi), and not micro-organisms. They had doubts that the IPPC could currently cover for example micro-algae, not even considering micro-fungi or bacteria. One reason is that some micro-organisms are pests (e.g. some fungi or bacteria); another reason is the fact that micro-organisms are widely distributed, that there are major difficulties in separating between species,

---

<sup>22</sup> TPG\_2013\_Feb\_12

<sup>23</sup> TPG\_2013\_Feb\_16

strains, virulent strains etc., and that strains may appear or disappear. They also doubted that NPPOs would ever be in a position to protect, for example, a yeast strain. Others noted that there are lots of plants already covered by the IPPC and for which nothing is done. Acceptance that the IPPC covers micro-organisms would not necessarily mean that something is done in the foreseeable future, but they could be covered while recognizing that in practice the IPPC would only be applied to limited cases. This would leave the possibility to do so in the future if necessary. This could cover both cultivated species and species in the wild.

*Whether bacteria should be covered.* Although discussions on separate Kingdoms for Bacteria and Archea had already started when the IPPC first came into force, those were still part of the Code of botanical nomenclature, and the separation into separate kingdoms had taken place afterwards. Consequently it could be considered that they were covered by the IPPC originally. However, they are not included in the proposal as there is little immediate prospect that they would require protection either for their economic importance or as components of biodiversity. One member noted that bacteria are generally considered as harmful organisms, and it would be preferable to not include them, although one person noted that useful bacteria (such as used in industrial processes, such as reclamation work in oil fields) should be covered by one convention or another. Some members believed that they should not be covered for practical considerations (i.e. the difficulties for NPPOs to deal with these).

In addition, the patterns of production and trade of for example cultivated macro-fungi and bacteria are different. Macro-fungi are more similar to plants. They are produced from planting material and widely traded as commodity for consumption and for planting, and may be hosts of pests (including bacteria, viruses, fungi or insects) that countries may want to keep out. Bacteria are “attacked” or outcompeted by other bacteria or viruses, but would probably be exchanged as cultures, which would then be used for local production. It is assumed that safety precautions are already taken under the auspices of for example OIE, Codex Alimentarius or environmental legislation for exchanging culture collections.

Regarding the solicitations from the side of the CBD that the IPPC covers some organisms, it was noted that the IPPC is in any case not mandated to protect ecosystems beyond the plants that belong to ecosystems. Thus, the protection of natural ecosystems in their entirety is the domain of CBD, whilst the IPPC contributes to that objective by addressing pest risks to plants in the wild.

The TPG envisaged how the clarification proposed should be made (e.g. glossary term agreed interpretation of plant, supplement, SC recommendation to the CPM). The TPG agreed that an agreed interpretation of the definition of plants is not an option as *plant* is defined as a commodity, and the present consideration relates to species (or taxons). The clarification is thought important and needs a prominent place. The TPG finally concluded that an amendment to the scope of ISPM 5 would be preferable, and added it to the *Amendments to the glossary* (Annex 5). This would also be a suitable way of obtaining member views (through regular member consultation) on these highly important issues, and the TPG/SC proposal would also provide the appropriate taxonomic background to be taken into account.

The TPG:

- (25) *proposed* an amendment to the scope of ISPM 5 in relation to “plants” in the *Amendments to the glossary* to be presented to the SC May 2013.

## **11. TPG work plan and medium term plan**

### **11.1 TPG work plan for 2013-2014**

The TPG updated its work plan, based on discussions at the meeting, to be presented to the SC May 2013.

The TPG:

(26) *invited* the SC to note the TPG work plan for 2013-2014 (Annex 9 of the February 2013 TPG report).

## 11.2 Medium term plan

The TPG reviewed and updated its medium term plan<sup>24</sup>, to be presented to the SC May 2013. No major change was proposed, and adjustments mostly related to reflecting activities that had been completed since the medium term plan was last approved by the SC.

The steward raised the issue of the coverage of ISPM 5. He explained that some users consider that ISPM 5 is too limited as it provides definitions only for terms which are specific to the IPPC. These users also need a broader “dictionary” that would include ISPM 5 terms and definitions, but also other terms used in ISPMs and defined from other sources (including dictionaries). There had been a tendency in recent years to remove from ISPM 5 the terms that do not have a specific IPPC meaning. He noted that NAPPO had decided to keep those in its glossary, as they were felt helpful. The TPG discussed this issue and there was a broad agreement that ISPM 5, which is a standard under the IPPC, should include only the terms that are specific to the IPPC. The following issues were raised:

- ISPM 5 terms and definitions are subject to an adoption process, and this process would not be appropriate for other types of terms. Usual terms do not need to be adopted in this way, and can be found in other sources.
- The current approach of considering terms and definitions that are specific to the IPPC is realistic in terms of work load. The amount of work, especially by also considering language issues, is already large. The compilation of a broader document (giving many more definitions and referring to ISPM 5 for those that have a specific meaning under the IPPC) would be theoretically possible but would require considerable work.
- There is a good mechanism for countries to propose terms, if they feel that definitions are needed for some IPPC-specific terms.

The steward summarized that the TPG supported that ISPM 5 be limited to those terms with a specific meaning in the context of the IPPC.

The TPG:

(27) *invited* the SC to approve the TPG medium term plan (Annex 10 of the February 2013 TPG report).

(28) *invited* the SC to note the discussion related to the coverage of ISPM 5.

## 12. Membership of the TPG

The Secretariat noted that the term of two members ended in April 2013, Mr. Mohammad Katbeh Bader and Mr. Ian Smith, and thanked them for their contribution. He acknowledged the considerable contribution of Mr. Ian Smith who had worked on the glossary since its creation, through the glossary working group and then the TPG. The Secretariat recalled that the SC had previously agreed that Mr. Ian Smith could continue to be invited to meetings as an invited expert, on request.

One member noted that it may be considered whether the group should be enlarged to a non-FAO language member. This may lead to a better glossary and may facilitate the understanding of IPPC documents worldwide.

The TPG:

(29) *invited* the SC to agree that Mr. Ian Smith be invited as invited expert to the TPG meeting in March 2014.

---

<sup>24</sup> TPG\_2013\_Feb\_13

### 13. Other issues

#### 13.1 ISO standard 704 (2009) “Terminology work – principles and methods”

The Secretariat recalled that the ISO standard 704 (2009) “Terminology work — Principles and methods” had first been brought to the attention of the TPG by Ms Reinouw Bast-Tjeerde, former TPG member. She had proposed that ISPM 5 terms and definitions be added to the Government of Canada's terminology and linguistic data bank (Termium), but this had not been possible as ISPM 5 definitions were not compliant with this ISO Standard. The Secretariat had obtained copies of the ISO Standard, and the TPG discussed whether it should be used. The following issues were raised:

- It should be kept in mind that ISPM 5 should first serve its main users, i.e. in the phytosanitary area; there is currently no strong demand for glossary terms to be included into other compilations of terms, and making ISPM 5 definitions compliant with ISO Standard 704 is therefore not a priority.
- There is no obligation to follow ISO Standards, but this particular one gives guidance that is used over many areas to develop definitions. It could therefore be a valuable reference to draft ISPM 5 definitions and to improve the quality of definitions. It should not be “compulsory” for definitions to comply with these rules, and the standard would be used only as a reference. Complying with this standard is not a main priority in the use of resources and time of the TPG and the Secretariat, but guidance may be useful.
- The guidance provided could be considered for new or revised definitions, but could not be applied to existing terms and definitions, as this would be a monumental task for a limited benefit.
- The Secretariat noted that the ISO Standard 704 is very technical in its area, and using its guidance would necessitate that the different items are clarified and explained in relation to ISPM 5. This may require illustrating relevant points with examples from ISPM 5.

The TPG:

- (30) *invited* the Secretariat to contact the Terminology group within FAO to see whether this standard is used, and to investigate whether a member of that group could present at the next TPG meeting guidance from Standard 704 as well as examples of how this could be used for definitions in ISPM 5.

### 14. Date and venue of the next meeting

The meeting is provisionally schedule on 3-7 March 2014.

The TPG:

- (31) *invited* the Secretariat to consult TPG members on their availability at these dates later in 2013 (e.g. July).

### 15. Close

The steward thanked all participants for their contribution to the meeting.

**Annex 1: Agenda****MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL PANEL FOR THE GLOSSARY****4-7 February 2013****FAO headquarters, Canada Room (A356/7)**

<b>AGENDA ITEM</b>	<b>DOCUMENT NO.</b>	<b>PRESENTER</b>
<b>1. Opening of the meeting</b>		
1.1 Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat	-	Secretariat
1.2 Selection of the Chair and Rapporteur	-	-
1.3 Review and adoption of the agenda	TPG_2013_Feb_01	Chair
1.4 Current specification: TP5 (TPG) (2012) (for information)	<a href="http://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=1110798&amp;frompage=24119&amp;tx_publication_pi1[showUid]=128051&amp;type=publication&amp;L=0">www.ippc.int/index.php?id=1110798&amp;frompage=24119&amp;tx_publication_pi1[showUid]=128051&amp;type=publication&amp;L=0</a>	
<b>2. Administrative Matters</b>		
2.1 Local information	<a href="http://www.ippc.int/file_uploaded/1336745175_LocalInformation_2012-05-11.pdf">www.ippc.int/file_uploaded/1336745175_LocalInformation_2012-05-11.pdf</a>	Secretariat
2.2 Documents list	TPG_2013_Feb_02	Secretariat
2.3 Participants list	TPG_2013_Feb_03	Secretariat
<b>3. Reports</b>		
3.1 Previous meetings of the TPG (Oct. 2012).	<a href="http://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=1110712">www.ippc.int/index.php?id=1110712</a>	Steward
3.2 Extracts from other meeting reports of relevance to the TPG (SC Nov 2012) Engaging experts in the standard setting process (discussion to be based on 3.2.1 of the extracts of the SC November 2012 report)	TPG_2013_Feb_04	Secretariat
3.3 Current work plan The work plan was decided by the TPG 2012 but changes made based on decisions of the SC in November 2012. Changes will be outlined. The work plan will be updated during the meeting (agenda item 12.1)	Attached to 2012 TPG report (see under 3.1)	Secretariat
<b>4. Review relating to draft ISPMs sent for member consultation in 2012 (1 July-20 October)</b> The TPG will review member comments on terms and definitions, and the drafts for consistency in the use of terms. Recommendations will be transmitted to stewards and the SC-7 (May 2013). When countries make requests for definitions for new terms, the TPG also considers these and makes a recommendation for the SC to add, or not, these terms to the work programme. Volunteers for each term are identified as needed during TPG meetings. The TPG may also review the translations of new and revised terms/definitions in the drafts.	-	-
4.1 Determination of host status of fruits and vegetables to fruit fly (Tephritidae) infestation (2006-031) 1. Translations of terms and definitions (FR, ES) 2. Translations of terms and definitions (AR, CN, RU) 3. Member comments on terms and consistency	2006-031_fruitflyhoststatus 1.TPG_2013_Feb_05 2.TPG_2013_Feb_17, 18, 25 3.TPG_2013_Feb_06	Shaza, Hong, Andrei
4.2 Appendix 1 to ISPM 12:2011. Electronic certification (2006-003) • Member comments on terms and consistency (2006-003)	2006-003_electroniccertification TPG_2013_Feb_07	
4.3 Annex to ISPM 26:2006. Establishment of fruit fly quarantine areas within a pest free area in the event of an outbreak (2009-007) • Member comments on terms and consistency (2009-007)	2009-007_fruitflyquarantineareas TPG_2013_Feb_08	
<b>5. Consideration of new or revised terms/definitions</b>		
5.1 Draft amendments to the glossary as developed at the Oct 2012 meeting	TPG_2013_Feb_23	Secretariat
5.2 Subjects on the TPG work programme Volunteers are indicated on the work plan (Table 3) to prepare discussion papers for the meeting. Terms still needing volunteers will be discussed as part of the revised work plan. 5.2.1 pest list (see also extracts of SC November 2012 under agenda item 3.2) 5.2.2 pest freedom (2010-003) and related terms 5.2.3 cut flowers and branches	TPG_2013_Feb_09 Based on TPG 2012 report TPG_2013_Feb_14	Steward Shaza Omar

AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER
5.2.4 Definitions containing "occurrence"/"occur"	TPG_2013_Feb_19	Ebbe Nordbo
5.2.5 contaminating pest	TPG_2013_Feb_27	Ian Smith
5.2.6 additional declaration	TPG_2013_Feb_24	John Hedley
5.3 Advice on new or revised terms in other recent draft standards i.e. those presented to the SC in May 2013 for consideration for member consultation This point relates to draft terms and definitions proposed by expert drafting groups in new draft standards to be presented to the SC May 2013. There are no new definitions in the drafts available, but the TPG may review those with regards to consistency in the use of terms	2005-003_Preclearance, 2005-004_GrowingMedia, 2005-010_FF_Procedures, 2006-029_PestRiskManagementInternationalMovementWood	-
<b>6. Review of ISPMs for consistency of terms and style</b>	-	-
6.1 General recommendations on consistency (as modified following the TPG Oct 2012 meeting. To be reviewed and completed as needed)	TPG_2013_Feb_15	Secretariat
6.2 Proposal regarding consistency across standards		
6.2.1 Proposal and options	TPG_2013_Feb_22	Secretariat
6.2.2 Example of phytosanitary status (to be used in the proposal and options above, including regulatory status)	TPG_2013_Feb_20	Ebbe Nordbo
6.2.3 Two proposals pending from TPG Oct. 2012	TPG_2013_Feb_10	Ebbe Nordbo
6.3 One question from the SC regarding a change proposed for ISPM 23	TPG_2013_Feb_26 (see under agenda item 3.2, section 5.3)	
<b>7. Annotated glossary: 2011 and 2012 amendments</b> The annotated glossary, version 2, was finalized at TPG 2010. The next version should be finalized in 2013. The TPG considers yearly which amendments need to be made. The version considered at the TPG 2013 meeting will be submitted to the SC by e-decision and subsequently published.	TPG_2013_Feb_21	Ian Smith
<b>8. Explanation of Glossary terms</b> Members 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 the need for additional explanations (e.g. in the annotated glossary) discussed. Proposals were submitted to the Oct 2012 TPG meeting but not considered. Additional proposals may be submitted.	TPG_2013_Feb_11	Secretariat
<b>9. 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.	TPG_2013_Feb_12	IPPC Secretariat
<b>10 Taxonomic classification of organisms and IPPC coverage of plants, including an agreed interpretation of the term "plants"</b>	TPG_2013_Feb_16 TPG_2013_Feb_16REV1	Ian Smith
<b>11. TPG work plan and medium term plan</b>	-	
11.1 TPG work plan The TPG will update its work plan for the coming year, based on discussions at the meeting, to be presented to the SC May 2013.	To be prepared during the meeting	
11.2 Medium term plan The TPG will review and update its medium term plan, to be presented to the SC May 2013	TPG_2013_Feb_13	
<b>12. Membership of the TPG</b> Under that agenda item, members are also expected to notify any expected change in membership, so that calls can be organized in good time	See 2013_TPG_Feb_03 agenda item 1.1	
<b>13. Other issues</b>	-	
13.1 ISO standard on definitions NB: <b>Do not distribute or copy.</b> This version is protected by copyright and the IPPC Secretariat has bought copies only for TPG members.	<a href="http://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=79891&amp;frompage=79891&amp;tx_publication_pi1[showUid]=2185975&amp;type=publication&amp;L=0">www.ippc.int/index.php?id=79891&amp;frompage=79891&amp;tx_publication_pi1[showUid]=2185975&amp;type=publication&amp;L=0</a>	
<b>14. Date and venue of the next meeting</b>	-	
<b>15. Close</b>	-	

**Annex 2: Documents list****DOCUMENTS LIST**

<b>DOCUMENT NO.</b>	<b>AGENDA ITEM</b>	<b>DOCUMENT TITLE</b>	<b>DATE POSTED / DISTRIBUTED</b>
2005-003_Preclearance	5.3	Draft Annex to ISPM 20:2004 - Phytosanitary pre-clearance (2005-003)	2013-01-23
2005-004_GrowingMedia	5.3	Movement of growing media in association with plants for planting in international trade (2005-004)	2013-01-23
2005-010_FF_Procedures	5.3	Phytosanitary procedures for fruit fly (Tephritidae) management (2005-010)	2013-01-23
2006-003_electronic certification	4.2	Draft ISPM: Appendix 1 to ISPM 12:2011. Electronic certification (2006-003)	2012-12-27
2006-029_PestRiskManagementInternationalMovementWood	5.3	Management of phytosanitary risks in the international movement of wood (2006-029)	2013-01-23
2006-031_fruitflyhoststatus	4.1	Draft ISPM: <i>Determination of host status of fruits and vegetables to fruit fly (Tephritidae) infestation</i> (2006-031)	2012-12-27
2009-007_fruitflyquarantineareas	4.3	Draft ISPM: Annex to ISPM 26:2006. <i>Establishment of fruit fly quarantine areas within a pest free area in the event of an outbreak</i> (2009-007)	2012-12-27
TPG_2013_Feb_01	1.3	Draft Annotated Agenda	2013-02-01
TPG_2013_Feb_02	2.2	Documents list	2013-02-01
TPG_2013_Feb_03	2.3	Participants list	2012-12-27
TPG_2013_Feb_04	3.2	Extracts from other meeting reports of relevance to the TPG (SC Nov 2012)	2012-12-27
TPG_2013_Feb_05	4.1	Translations of terms and definitions (FR, ES) (2006-031)	2012-12-27
TPG_2013_Feb_06	4.1	Member comments on terms and consistency	2012-12-27
TPG_2013_Feb_07	4.2	Member comments on terms and consistency (2006-003)	2012-12-27
TPG_2013_Feb_08	4.3	Member comments on terms and consistency (2009-007)	2012-12-27
TPG_2013_Feb_09	5.2.1	Subject: Pest list	2012-12-27
TPG_2013_Feb_10	6.2.3	Pending consistency proposals	2012-12-27
TPG_2013_Feb_11	8	Explanation of Glossary terms	2012-12-27
TPG_2013_Feb_12	9	Review of durations of record keeping in ISPMs	2012-12-27
TPG_2013_Feb_13	11.2	Medium term plan	2012-12-27
TPG_2013_Feb_14	5.2.3	Subject: Cut flowers and branches	2013-01-10
TPG_2013_Feb_15	6.1	General recommendations on consistency	2013-01-10

DOCUMENT NO.	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE	DATE POSTED / DISTRIBUTED
TPG_2013_Feb_16	10	Taxonomic classification of organisms and IPPC coverage of plants, including an agreed interpretation of the term “plants”	2013-01-10
TPG_2013_Feb_16REV1	10	What are plants in the IPPC (revision of one part of TPG_2013_Feb_16)	2013-02-07
TPG_2013_Feb_17	4.1	Translations of terms and definitions (Ar) (2006-031)	2013-01-10
TPG_2013_Feb_18	4.1	Translations of terms and definitions (Zh) (2006-031)	2013-01-18
TPG_2013_Feb_19	5.2.4	Definitions containing <i>occurrence/occur</i>	2013-01-18
TPG_2013_Feb_20	6.2.2	Example of <i>phytosanitary status</i>	2013-01-18
TPG_2013_Feb_21	7	Annotated glossary: 2011 and 2012 amendments	2013-01-18
TPG_2013_Feb_22	6.2.1	Proposal regarding consistency across standards	2013-01-23
TPG_2013_Feb_23	5.1	Draft amendments to the glossary as developed at the Oct 2012 meeting	2013-01-23
TPG_2013_Feb_24	5.2.6	Subjects on the TPG work programme: Additional Declaration	2013-01-23
TPG_2013_Feb_25	4.1	Translations of terms and definitions (Ru) (2006-031)	2013-02-01
TPG_2013_Feb_26	6.3	Ink amendment in ISPM 23	2013-02-01
TPG_2013_Feb_27	5.2.5	Contaminating pest	2013-02-04

**Annex 3: Participants list****PARTICIPANTS LIST (with TPG membership details)**

A check (✓) in column 1 indicates confirmed attendance at the meeting.

	Participants details			TPG member's term	
	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Participant role	Email address	begins	ends
✓	Mr John HEDLEY Biosecurity New Zealand Ministry for Primary Industries Pastoral House, 25 The Terrace P.O. Box 2526 Wellington, New Zealand Tel: (+64) 4 894 0428 Fax: (+1) 64 4 894 0742	Steward / English	<a href="mailto:John.Hedley@mpi.govt.nz">John.Hedley@mpi.govt.nz</a>	2008 (CPM-3)	2013 (2nd term 2013-2018)
✓	Ms Beatriz MELCHO Ministry of Livestock, Agriculture and Fisheries, General Direction of Agricultural Services, Plant Protection Division Avda. Millan 4703 CP 12900 Montevideo, Uruguay Tel: (+598) 2 309 8410 ext 267	Spanish	<a href="mailto:bmelcho@mgap.gub.uy">bmelcho@mgap.gub.uy</a> ; <a href="mailto:bemelcho@hotmail.com">bemelcho@hotmail.com</a>	November 2010	2015
✓	Ms Hong NING No. 4 Wuhouci Street, Chengdu, Sichuan, P.R.C. 610041 Tel: (+86) 28 85505251 Fax: (+86) 28 85505251	Chinese	<a href="mailto:ninghong2006@yahoo.com.cn">ninghong2006@yahoo.com.cn</a>	September 2012	2017
✓	Mr Ebbe NORDBO Danish AgriFish Agency Nyropsgade DK - 1780 Copenhagen V, Denmark Tel: (+45) 45 263 891 Fax: (+45) 45 263 613	English	<a href="mailto:eno@naturerhverv.dk">eno@naturerhverv.dk</a>	November 2009	2014
✓	Ms Shaza Roushdy OMAR Phytosanitary Specialist Central Administration for Plant Quarantine Ministry of Agriculture 1 Nadi al Said Street Dokki, Giza, Egypt Mobile: (+20) 1111070634 Fax: (+20) 237608574	Arabic	<a href="mailto:shaza.roshty@gmail.com">shaza.roshty@gmail.com</a>	October 2012	2017
✓	Mr Andrei ORLINSKI European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization 21 bd. Richard Lenoir 75011 Paris, France Tel: (+33) 1 45 20 77 94 (+33) 1 45 20 78 09 Fax: (+33) 1 70 76 65 47	Russian	<a href="mailto:Orlinski@eppo.int">Orlinski@eppo.int</a>	November 2010	2015

	Participants details			TPG member's term	
	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Participant role	Email address	begins	ends
✓	Mr Ian SMITH c/o European Plant Protection Organization 21 bd. Richard Lenoir 75011 Paris, France	French	<a href="mailto:ian@ianclaresmith.com">ian@ianclaresmith.com</a>	2008 (CPM-3)	2013
✓	Ms Fabienne GROUSSET Standard Setting IPPC Secretariat FAO, Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00153 Rome, Italy Tel: +45 24483502 (cellphone)	IPPC Secretariat	<a href="mailto:Fabienne.Grousset@fao.org">Fabienne.Grousset@fao.org</a>		
✓	Ms Eva MOLLER Standard Setting IPPC Secretariat FAO, Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00153 Rome, Italy Tel: +390657052855	IPPC Secretariat	<a href="mailto:Eva.Moller@fao.org">Eva.Moller@fao.org</a>		

***Not attending***

	Participants details			TPG member's term	
	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Participant role	Email address	begins	ends
	Mr Mohammad KATBEH-BADER 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	Arabic	<a href="mailto:katbehbader@moa.gov.jo">katbehbader@moa.gov.jo</a>	2008 (CPM-3)	2013

**Annex 4: Language versions of terms and definitions in draft ISPMs for MC****LANGUAGE VERSIONS OF TERMS AND DEFINITIONS IN DRAFT ISPMs FOR MEMBER CONSULTATION: DETERMINATION OF HOST STATUS OF FRUITS AND VEGETABLES TO FRUIT FLY (TEPHRITIDAE) INFESTATION (2006-031)**

The TPG reviewed the definitions as already translated in Spanish and French, and suggested translations for Arabic, Chinese and Russian. The English definitions at the time of consideration were:

host status	the condition of a plant as a host for a pest.
natural host	a plant species or cultivar that has been found to be infested under natural field conditions by the target fruit fly species and to sustain the production of reproductive adults.
non natural host	a plant species or cultivar that is not a natural host but has been scientifically demonstrated to be infested and to sustain the production of reproductive adults of the target fruit fly species under the semi natural field conditions set out in this standard.
non-host	a plant species or cultivar that is neither a natural host nor a non-natural host of the target fruit fly species.

**Spanish** (Review of existing translation)

condición de hospedante	la condición de una planta como hospedante de una plaga.
hospedante natural	una especie o <del>cultivar</del> <del>variedad</del> de planta que se ha demostrado que, <del>en condiciones naturales sobre el terreno,</del> se <del>ha encontrado</del> <del>encuentra</del> infestada por la especie objetivo de moscas de la fruta <u>en condiciones naturales de campo</u> y sostiene la producción de adultos con capacidad reproductiva.
hospedante no natural	una especie o <del>cultivar</del> <del>variedad</del> de planta que no es un hospedante natural pero que se ha demostrado científicamente que está infestada y sostiene la producción de adultos con capacidad reproductiva de la especie objetivo de moscas de la fruta en las condiciones seminaturales <u>de camposobre el terreno</u> especificadas en la presente norma.
no hospedante	una especie o <del>variedad</del> <del>cultivar</del> de planta que no es hospedante natural ni hospedante no natural de la especie objetivo de moscas de la fruta.

**French** (Review of existing translation). No modification proposed.

**Arabic** (Suggested translation)

حالة العائل	حالة النبات كمضيف للآفة.
العائل الطبيعي	نوع من النبات أو صنف وجد مصاباً بذبابة الفاكهة المستهدفة تحت ظروف الحقل الطبيعية وتعزز إنتاج حشرات كاملة ذو قدرة تكاثرية.
العائل الغير- طبيعي	نوع من النبات أو صنف لا يعد عائل طبيعي ولكن تم الإثبات علمياً انه أصيب بذبابة الفاكهة وعزز إنتاج حشرات كاملة ذو قدرة تكاثرية تحت ظروف حقلية شبه طبيعية المحددة في هذا المعيار.
الغير- عائل	نوع من أنواع النبات أو صنف لا يعتبر عائل طبيعي ولا عائل غير طبيعي لذبابة الفاكهة المستهدفة

**Chinese (Suggested translation)**

寄主状态	作为有害生物寄主植物的存在状况。
自然寄主	已发现在田间自然条件下会被目标果实蝇侵染，并产生具有繁殖能力的成虫的植物物种或品种。
非自然寄主	不属于自然寄主，但已经被科学证明在本标准中所列半田间自然条件下会被目标果实蝇侵染，并产生具有繁殖能力的成虫的植物物种或品种。
非寄主	既不属于目标果实蝇的自然寄主，又不属于目标果实蝇的非自然寄主的植物物种或品种。

**Russian (Suggested translation)**

статус хозяина	приемлемость растения в качестве хозяина для вредного организма.
естественный хозяин плодовой мухи	вид или сорт растения, который встречается зараженным в естественных полевых условиях видом-мишенью плодовой мухи и обеспечивает развитие взрослых особей, способных к воспроизводству.
искусственный хозяин	вид или сорт растения, который не является естественным хозяином, но было научно доказано, что он заражается и обеспечивает развитие взрослых особей вида-мишени плодовой мухи, способных к воспроизводству, в полустественных полевых условиях, описанных в настоящем стандарте.
не хозяин	вид или сорт растения, не являющийся ни естественным, ни искусственным хозяином вида-мишени плодовой мухи.

## Annex 5: Amendments to ISPM 5

### DRAFT AMENDMENTS TO ISPM 5 (1994-001)

#### EXPLANATORY NOTE FOR THE MAY 2013 STANDARDS COMMITTEE MEETING

At its meetings in October 2012 and February 2013, the Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG) made proposals in relation to additions, revisions and deletions of terms and definitions in ISPM 5. As in past years, it is proposed that some explanations be given for each proposal in the document that will be sent for member consultation. In addition, when discussing the issue of the coverage of "plants" at its meeting in February 2013, the TPG proposed a change of the scope of ISPM 5, and this was added to this paper. This paper was finalized based on the discussions at the October 2012 and February 2013 meetings of the TPG. The proposals refer to individual terms in the *List of Topics for IPPC Standards* and to consequential changes arising from proposals on those terms and definitions. This paper is presented to the May 2013 SC for review prior to member consultation.

<b>Date of this document</b>	2013-02-28
<b>Document category</b>	Amendments to ISPM 5 ( <i>Glossary of phytosanitary terms</i> )
<b>Current document stage</b>	To 2013-05 SC for approval for MC
<b>Origin</b>	CEPM (1994) added topic:1997-001, Amendments to ISPM 5: Glossary of phytosanitary terms
<b>Major stages</b>	Specification TP5. 2012-10 and 2013-02 TPG drafted text
<b>Notes</b>	----

Members are asked to consider the following proposals for additions, revisions and deletions in ISPM 5, as well as a proposal for the revision of the scope of ISPM 5. Brief explanations are given for each proposal. For revisions of terms and definitions, just the proposed changes are open for comment.

#### 1. ADDITIONS

##### 1.1 EXCLUSION (2010-008)

###### *Background*

In 2009, the Technical Panel for Fruit Flies (TPFF) developed a proposal for a definition for *exclusion* in the draft ISPM on phytosanitary procedures for fruit fly management. The term was added to the *List of Topics for IPPC Standards* by the SC in April 2010 based on a TPG proposal. The TPFF definition was reviewed and modified by the TPG in October 2010, reviewed by the SC in May 2011, and sent for member consultation in June 2011. In view of comments received, the TPG in November 2011 suggested that *exclusion* should be reconsidered in association with *containment*, *suppression*, *eradication* and *control* (already on the *List of Topics for IPPC Standards* – proposals further below). A revised proposal was proposed by the TPG in October 2012 and reviewed by the SC in May 2013. The following points may be considered:

- It is useful to add this term and definition to the existing collection of measure-related terms that includes *containment*, *eradication* and *suppression*. The definition should be broad as the term has a wider application than only fruit fly management, and has the same basic form as the other terms for measures.
- It is recommended to use *official* measures instead of *phytosanitary measures* for all definitions in this group (*exclusion*, *containment*, *suppression*, *eradication* and *control*). *Phytosanitary measures* relates to regulated pests only (i.e. quarantine pests or regulated non-quarantine pests), but there is no need to restrict the definition of these terms to regulated pests. On the contrary, the terms *exclusion*, *containment*, *suppression*, *eradication* and *control* do not only relate to quarantine pests of the country where the measures are applied, so *official* measures is more appropriate. Countries may also apply *exclusion* for its own benefit, and not with regards to the regulated pests of another country.
- The term is qualified by (*of a pest*) so that the word *exclusion* can still be used in its common English meaning in other contexts, as it is currently the case in various ISPMs (such as *...excludes wood packaging material...* in ISPM 15:2009, *products excluded* and *exclude an area* in ISPM 22:2005, *exclusion of chemicals* in ISPM 27:2006). The use of a qualifier is also consistent with other glossary terms such as *control*, *entry*, *establishment* etc.

- The term *introduction* (i.e. *entry* and *establishment*) is used and not *entry*. A package of exclusion measures might include measures to prevent *establishment* in cases of transience or incursion.
- Although the definition of *introduction* already refers (indirectly) to an area by using the term *entry*, the words *into an area* was added for clarification, as the concept of exclusion is linked to a defined area, whether a country or an area within a country, or between several countries.
- It was considered whether the wording *the application of measures in and around an area* should be used, to be consistent with the definition of *containment* and to cover for the case of a buffer zone. It is recognized that the definition for *exclusion* was originally developed to apply to pest free areas or ALPPs for fruit flies (in which case it is restricted to the application of measures *in and around an area*), However, *exclusion* needs to be used in other contexts than for fruit fly PFAs or ALPPs. *In and around an area* is not relevant in the very common scenario where the area under exclusion is a whole country, or when exclusion measures to the benefit of one country are applied in another country.

#### **Proposed addition**

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

## **1.2 PRODUCTION SITE (2012-004)**

### **Background**

The term *production site* was added to the *List of Topics for IPPC Standards* by the SC in April 2012 based on a TPG proposal. A definition was proposed by the TPG in October 2012 and reviewed by the SC in May 2013. The following points may be considered:

- The term *production site* is often used in standards and a definition would be useful. *Pest-free production sites* was used in ISPM 10: 1999, and is defined in ISPM 5, to cover for situations where such a site is designated within a place of production without at the same time making that a *pest-free place of production*. The term *place of production* is already defined.
- The proposed definition identifies a production site as a separate unit within a place of production.
- In ISPMs, production sites are defined for phytosanitary purposes (and not for other purposes), and this should be stated in the definition.
- As a consequence of defining *production site*, the definitions of *place of production* and *pest-free production site* need to be adjusted (see section 2.4).

#### **Proposed addition**

<b>production site</b>	A defined portion of a <b>place of production</b> that is managed for phytosanitary purposes as a separate unit
------------------------	---

## **2. REVISIONS**

### **2.1 POINT OF ENTRY (2010-005)**

#### **Background**

The term *point of entry* (2010-005) was added to the *List of Topics for IPPC Standards* by the SC in November 2010 based on a TPG proposal. A revised definition was proposed by the TPG in October 2012 and reviewed by the SC in May 2013. The following points may be considered:

- The use of *border* reduces the scope of the definition. Phytosanitary operations may not take place at the border, but may take place inland at some other officially designated locations. It is a common practice in many countries to have land points of entry inside countries, far from borders.
- *Land point*, which remains by deleting *border*, is not a correct English expression. Considering that points of entry may be for example a facility, nursery, orchard, factory, etc., the word *location* was chosen.
- The use of *and/or* should be avoided. *Or* is appropriate here.
- *Import* is the usual term in ISPMs.
- *It was* thought useful to maintain the reference to airport and seaport in the definition, i.e. to not simplify the definition further by using *any location* instead of *airport, seaport or any other location*.

**Original definition**

<b>point of entry</b>	Airport, seaport or land border point <b>officially</b> designated for the importation of <b>consignments</b> , and/or entrance of passengers [FAO, 1995]
-----------------------	---

**Proposed revision**

<b>point of entry</b>	Airport, seaport or <u>any other location</u> and border point <b>officially</b> designated for the importation of <b>consignments</b> , and/or <u>the</u> entrance of passengers
-----------------------	---

**2.2 SYSTEMS APPROACH(ES) (2010-002)****Background**

The term *systems approach(es)* was added to the *List of Topics for IPPC Standards* by the SC in November 2010 based on a TPG proposal. A revised definition was proposed by the TPG in October 2012 and reviewed by the SC in May 2013. The following points may be considered:

- A systems approach is a pest risk management option, and this is mentioned in the revised definition to clarify the concept.
- The wording *risk management measures* is replaced by *official measures*. This wording reflects that systems approaches may be used not only for regulated pests, and is therefore preferred instead of *phytosanitary measures*.
- The current definition includes three important elements, retained in the final proposal, i.e. the system approach integrates phytosanitary measures, two of those act independently, and the measures have a cumulative effect.
- The definition should not specify the outcome of the systems approach, and prejudice that it is successful. The phrase *achieve the appropriate level of protection against regulated pests* was therefore deleted. However, the objective, i.e. pest risk management, is retained.
- Bracketed plural such as “(es)” should generally be avoided in ISPMs and in this case is not necessary as the definition was reworded to be defined as a pest risk management option.

**Original definition**

<b>systems approach(es)</b>	The integration of different risk management measures, at least two of which act independently, and which cumulatively achieve the appropriate level of protection against <b>regulated pests</b> [ISPM 14:2002; revised ICPM, 2005]
-----------------------------	--

**Proposed revision**

<b>systems approach(es)</b>	<del>The integration of</del> <b>Pest risk management</b> option that integrates different risk management <b>official</b> measures, at least two of which act independently, <u>with cumulative effect</u> and which cumulatively achieve the appropriate level of protection against <b>regulated pests</b>
-----------------------------	---

**2.3 SUPPRESSION (2011-002), ERADICATION (2011-003), CONTAINMENT (2011-004), CONTROL (2011-005)****Background**

The terms *suppression*, *eradication*, *containment* and *control* were added to the *List of Topics for IPPC Standards* by the SC in May 2011 based on a TPG proposal. Revised definitions were proposed by the TPG in October 2012 and reviewed by the SC in May 2013. The following points may be considered:

- *For all definitions:* *official measures* was used instead of *phytosanitary measures*, for reasons detailed under exclusion (see section 1.1).
- *For containment:* the term has been qualified by *(of a pest)* for consistency. The term is used in ISPM 3:2005 for biological control agents, but the theme of ISPM 3: 2005 in any case is about biological control agents as (possible) pests, so *(of a pest)* is adequate for its use in ISPM 3:2005.
- *For eradication:* for consistency with *containment* and *suppression*, *infested* was added to the definition. The term has been qualified by *(of a pest)* for consistency.

- *For suppression.* The glossary term has been qualified by (*of a pest*) for consistency. Currently in ISPMs, *suppression* is used only in the sense of suppressing pests, except for one use in ISPM 2:2007, sect. 1.2.1, where *suppression* is used with a non-Glossary meaning: a (plant as) pest suppressing other plants. The definite article *the* beginning the definition could be deleted for consistency.
- *For control:* the words *of a pest population* were deleted, as *suppression*, *eradication* and *containment* mention to what they are applied. In addition *suppression* does refer to pest population while *eradication* and *containment* refer to a *pest* (note that *pest population* is necessary in the definition of suppression as you cannot suppress a *pest* (i.e. defined as a species))

#### Original definitions

<b>containment</b>	Application of <b>phytosanitary measures</b> in and around an infested <b>area</b> to prevent <b>spread</b> of a <b>pest</b> [FAO, 1995]
<b>eradication</b>	Application of <b>phytosanitary measures</b> to eliminate a <b>pest</b> from an <b>area</b> [FAO, 1990; revised FAO, 1995; formerly eradicate]
<b>suppression</b>	The application of <b>phytosanitary measures</b> in an infested <b>area</b> to reduce <b>pest</b> populations [FAO, 1995; revised CEPM, 1999]
<b>control (of a pest)</b>	<b>Suppression, containment</b> or <b>eradication</b> of a <b>pest</b> population [FAO, 1995]

#### Proposed revisions

<b>containment (of a pest)</b>	Application of <b>official phytosanitary</b> measures in and around an infested <b>area</b> to prevent <b>spread</b> of a <b>pest</b>
<b>eradication (of a pest)</b>	Application of <b>official phytosanitary</b> measures to eliminate a <b>pest</b> from an <b>infested area</b>
<b>suppression (of a pest)</b>	<del>The</del> Application of <b>official phytosanitary</b> measures in an infested <b>area</b> to reduce <b>pest</b> populations
<b>control (of a pest)</b>	<b>Suppression, containment</b> or <b>eradication</b> <del>of a pest population</del>

## 2.4 PLACE OF PRODUCTION AND PEST-FREE PRODUCTION SITE

### Background

Consequential changes to the definitions of *place of production* and *pest-free production site* are needed due to the proposed new definition for *production site* (see section 1.2). Revised definitions were proposed by the TPG in October 2012 and reviewed by the SC in May 2013. The following points may be considered:

- The changes proposed simplify the definitions of both terms in view of the proposed new definition of a *production site*.
- In addition for *pest-free production site*. The change from “does not occur” to “is absent” is a consequential change to the proposal to delete “occurrence” and to use “presence” or “present” (or “absent” for “does not occur”) (see section 3.1).

#### Original definitions

<b>place of production</b>	Any premises or collection of fields operated as a single production or farming unit. This may include production sites which are separately managed for phytosanitary purposes [FAO, 1990; revised CEPM, 1999]
<b>pest free production site</b>	A defined portion of a <b>place of production</b> in which a specific <b>pest</b> does not <b>occur</b> as demonstrated by scientific evidence and in which, where appropriate, this condition is being <b>officially</b> maintained for a defined period and that is managed as a separate unit in the same way as a <b>pest free place of production</b> [ISPM 10:1999]

*Proposed revisions*

<b>place of production</b>	Any premises or collection of <b>fields</b> operated as a single production or farming unit. <del>This may include production sites which are separately managed for phytosanitary purposes</del>
<b>pest free production site</b>	A <b>production site</b> <del>defined portion of a place of production</del> in which a specific <b>pest</b> <del>does not occur</del> is absent as demonstrated by scientific evidence and in which, where appropriate, this condition is being <b>officially</b> maintained for a defined period <del>and that is managed as a separate unit in the same way as a pest free place of production</del>

**2.5 QUARANTINE STATION (2010-013)***Background*

The term *quarantine station* was added to the *List of Topics for IPPC Standards* by the SC in April 2010. A revised definition was proposed by the TPG in October 2010, reviewed by the SC in May 2011, and sent for member consultation in June 2011. The TPG in November 2011 reviewed member comments and maintained the same proposed definition with completed explanations. The November 2011 SC returned the proposal to the TPG for further consideration. The TPG in October 2012 again discussed the proposal, submitted an unchanged definition to the SC with added explanations. The revised definition was reviewed by the SC in May 2013. The following points may be considered:

- 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, when being subject to phytosanitary regulation).
- The definition was broadened to include other regulated articles and to mentioning beneficial organisms as possible regulated articles. It is still considered useful to cover the different types of elements that can be kept in a quarantine station.
- 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 was considered whether *regulated articles* should be mentioned, as it covered not only plants and organisms, but also, for example, conveyances. It is noted that quarantine stations are used in practice for various regulated articles, such as baggage, pots or soil, and even vehicles or material, especially when quarantine stations are situated close to a point of entry. There is no need to restrict the definition. Definitions do not specify what countries should do or not do, and countries may have different practices and requirements regarding regulated articles in quarantine stations.
- The definition uses *quarantine*, which includes *regulated articles* in its definition.
- Responses to member comments in 2011 may be found in the TPG 2011 meeting report.
- The expanded term *phytosanitary quarantine station* was considered. However, no other types of quarantine stations than those for phytosanitary purposes are mentioned in ISPMs so the word phytosanitary is not needed.

*Original definition*

<b>quarantine station</b>	<b>Official station for holding plants or plant products in quarantine</b> [FAO, 1990; revised FAO, 1995; formerly <b>quarantine station or facility</b> ]
---------------------------	--

*Proposed revision*

<b>quarantine station</b>	<b>Official station for holding plants, plants products <u>or other regulated articles, including beneficial organisms, in quarantine</u></b>
---------------------------	---

## 2.6 CUT FLOWERS AND BRANCHES (2008-005)

### Background

The term *cut flowers and branches* was added to the *List of Topics for IPPC Standards* by the SC in April 2012. The issue had been discussed in relation to the now approved Specification 56 *International movement of cut flowers and branches*. The SC asked the TPG to "review the current definition, in particular, to state clearly in the definition of cut flowers and branches that they are for decorative/ornamental purposes only, are not intended for propagation, and include fruit and other propagules for ornamental use." A revised definition was proposed by the TPG in February 2013 and reviewed by the SC in May 2013. The following points may be considered:

- The current definition already states that the material concerned is for decorative use and not for planting, and this is considered appropriate to indicate that the material is not intended for propagation.
- The definition needs to cover a large commodity class, defined by its intended use, *for decorative use and not for planting*. This category covers a wide variety of plant parts, such as cut flowers, cut branches, with or without propagules, with or without foliage, but also roots, leaves, etc.
- It is not possible to list exhaustively all parts of plants concerned in the definition, and the addition of "any" is proposed.
- The term *cut flowers and branches* is too restrictive to describe the diversity of plant parts covered. *Cut flowers* was maintained as it is an evocative term for the type of material covered, corresponds to the largest part of trade for this commodity class, and is used in ISPMs (ISPM 16:2002, ISPM 21:2004 and ISPM 32:2009). *Cut* is kept as it reflects the nature of all the plant parts concerned. The wording *other decorative plant parts* is proposed to replace *branches* in order to better correspond to the definition.
- *fresh* is maintained as this corresponds to the plant parts that represent an important trade volume and for which pest risk is recognized to be higher.

### Original definition

<b>cut flowers and branches</b>	A <b>commodity class</b> for fresh parts of <b>plants</b> intended for decorative use and not for <b>planting</b> .
---------------------------------	---

### Proposed revision

<b>cut flowers and <del>branches</del> <u>other decorative plant parts</u></b>	A <b>commodity class</b> for <u>any</u> fresh parts of <b>plants</b> intended for decorative use and not for <b>planting</b> .
--	--

## 2.7 AREA OF LOW PEST PREVALENCE, COMMODITY PEST LIST, HABITAT, PEST FREE AREA, PEST FREE PLACE OF PRODUCTION, PEST FREE PRODUCTION SITE, SURVEILLANCE, SURVEY

### Background

Consequential changes to the definitions below are needed due to the proposed deletion of the definition of *occurrence* (see section 3.1). Revised definitions were proposed by the TPG in February 2013 and reviewed by the SC in May 2013. The following points may be considered:

- it is proposed that only *presence* and *present* are used in ISPMs.
- *Is absent* was preferred to *is not present* to replace the negative form *does not occur*. This term is also used in ISPM 8 and avoids the use of a negative form in the definitions concerned.

### Original definitions

<b>area of low pest prevalence</b>	An <b>area</b> , whether all of a country, part of a country, or all or parts of several countries, as identified by the competent authorities, in which a specific <b>pest occurs</b> at low levels and which is subject to effective <b>surveillance, control</b> or <b>eradication</b> measures-[IPPC, 1997]
<b>commodity pest list</b>	A list of <b>pests occurring</b> in an <b>area</b> which may be associated with a specific <b>commodity</b> [CEPM, 1996]
<b>habitat</b>	Part of an <b>ecosystem</b> with conditions in which an <b>organism</b> naturally occurs or can establish [ICPM, 2005]
<b>pest free area</b>	An <b>area</b> in which a specific <b>pest</b> does not <b>occur</b> as demonstrated by scientific evidence and in which, where appropriate, this condition is being <b>officially</b> maintained [FAO, 1995]

<b>pest free place of production</b>	<b>Place of production</b> in which a specific <b>pest</b> does not <b>occur</b> as demonstrated by scientific evidence and in which, where appropriate, this condition is being <b>officially</b> maintained for a defined period [ISPM 10:1999]
<b>pest free production site</b>	A defined portion of a <b>place of production</b> in which a specific <b>pest</b> does not <b>occur</b> as demonstrated by scientific evidence and in which, where appropriate, this condition is being <b>officially</b> maintained for a defined period and that is managed as a separate unit in the same way as a <b>pest free place of production</b> [ISPM 10:1999]
<b>surveillance</b>	An <b>official</b> process which collects and records data on <b>pest occurrence</b> or absence by <b>survey, monitoring</b> or other procedures [CEPM, 1996]
<b>survey</b>	An <b>official</b> procedure conducted over a defined period of time to determine the characteristics of a <b>pest</b> population or to determine which species <b>occur</b> in an <b>area</b> [FAO, 1990; revised CEPM, 1996]

### Proposed revisions

<b>area of low pest prevalence</b>	An <b>area</b> , whether all of a country, part of a country, or all or parts of several countries, as identified by the competent authorities, in which a specific <b>pest occurs is present</b> at low levels and which is subject to effective <b>surveillance, control</b> or <b>eradication</b> measures-[IPPC, 1997]
<b>commodity pest list</b>	A list of <b>pests occurring present</b> in an <b>area</b> which may be associated with a specific <b>commodity</b> [CEPM, 1996]
<b>habitat</b>	Part of an <b>ecosystem</b> with conditions in which an <b>organism is naturally occurs present</b> or can establish [ICPM, 2005]
<b>pest free area</b>	An <b>area</b> in which a specific <b>pest does not occur is absent</b> as demonstrated by scientific evidence and in which, where appropriate, this condition is being <b>officially</b> maintained [FAO, 1995]
<b>pest free place of production</b>	<b>Place of production</b> in which a specific <b>pest does not occur is absent</b> as demonstrated by scientific evidence and in which, where appropriate, this condition is being <b>officially</b> maintained for a defined period [ISPM 10:1999]
<b>pest free production site</b>	A defined portion of a <b>place of production</b> in which a specific <b>pest does not occur is absent</b> as demonstrated by scientific evidence and in which, where appropriate, this condition is being <b>officially</b> maintained for a defined period and that is managed as a separate unit in the same way as a <b>pest free place of production</b> [ISPM 10:1999]
<b>surveillance</b>	An <b>official</b> process which collects and records data on <b>pest presence occurrence</b> or absence by <b>survey, monitoring</b> or other procedures [CEPM, 1996]
<b>survey</b>	An <b>official</b> procedure conducted over a defined period of time to determine the characteristics of a <b>pest</b> population or to determine which species <b>occur are present</b> in an <b>area</b> [FAO, 1990; revised CEPM, 1996]

## 3. DELETIONS

### 3.1 OCCURRENCE (2010-026)

#### Background

The terms *occurrence* and presence (2010-025) were added to the *List of Topics for IPPC Standards* by the SC in April 2010 based on a TPG proposal to consider how they are used in English and if a single term can be recommended, noting that both terms in ISPMs are translated into only one in French (*presence*) and Spanish (*presencia*). Deletion of *occurrence* was proposed by the TPG in October 2012 and reviewed by the SC in May 2013. No action was recommended for *presence*. The following points may be considered:

- *Occurrence* is defined in terms of presence that would imply a status more specific and restricted than *presence*. However, that distinction does not exist in other languages. The actual use in ISPMs does not seem to intend or require such distinction. Similarly, the Convention text (written prior to the definition of *occurrence*) uses the two terms synonymously.
- The current definition of *occurrence* (referring to a degree of permanence) seems counter-intuitive to the normal English meaning of the word (referring to a sudden event).

- It is suggested that the terms *presence* and *occurrence* should be acknowledged as synonyms in current ISPMs, and that only *presence* and *present* (or *absent* for "does not occur") be preferably used in future standards.
- In addition, the current definition of *occurrence* (i.e. "...officially recognized to be indigenous or introduced and not officially reported to have been eradicated") refers to requirements, while definitions should not make such requirements.
- It is proposed to delete the definition of *occurrence*, not define *presence*, and allow the various grades and nuances of *presence* be dealt with only in the revised ISPM 8:1998.
- Due to the proposal to delete *occurrence* a number of consequential changes to other glossary definitions are needed (see section 2.7)

#### *Proposed deletion*

<b>occurrence</b>	The presence in an <b>area</b> of a <b>pest officially</b> recognized to be indigenous or <b>introduced</b> and not <b>officially</b> reported to have been <b>eradicated</b> [FAO, 1990; revised FAO, 1995; ISPM No. 17; formerly <b>occur</b> ]
-------------------	---

### 3.2 ORGANISM (2010-021), NATURALLY OCCURRING (2010-023)

#### *Background*

The terms *organism* and *naturally occurring* were added to the *List of Topics for IPPC Standards* by the SC in April 2010 based on a TPG proposal, to review the definitions and use in ISPMs of pest, organism and naturally occurring. Deletion of *organism* and *naturally occurring* was proposed by the TPG in October 2012 and reviewed by the SC in May 2013 (note: it was proposed that the definition of *pest* remains as it is). The following points may be considered:

- The term *naturally occurring* is used only in the glossary definition of *organism*. Variants are used in ISPMs, but with different meanings (e.g. the place where an organism naturally occurs, i.e. its place of origin; a place where the natural occurrence of a pest is low). The glossary definition of *naturally occurring* has no meaning or relevance in these contexts.
- *Organism* is a common term, which is not used in ISPMs with any specific meaning for IPPC purpose. It was originally defined as an individual term for the purpose of ISPM 3:2005, but is used in other contexts.

#### *Proposed deletions*

<b>naturally occurring</b>	A component of an <b>ecosystem</b> or a selection from a wild population, not altered by artificial means [ISPM 3:1995]
<b>organism</b>	Any biotic entity capable of reproduction or replication in its <b>naturally occurring</b> state [ISPM 3:1995; revised ISPM 3:2005]

### 3.3 RESTRICTION (2010-027)

#### *Background*

The term *restriction* was added to the *List of Topics for IPPC Standards* by the SC in April 2010 based on a TPG proposal, to review its use in ISPM as it seemed to not be used consistently. Deletion of *restriction* was proposed by the TPG in October 2012 and reviewed by the SC in May 2013. The following point may be considered:

- *Restriction* is used according to its definition in some cases, but in other cases not. In the former case, it would always be possible and more correct to reword (as a matter of consistency) the text by reference to *phytosanitary import requirements*, and the definition of *restriction* is therefore not needed. Most ISPMs already refer to the establishment of *phytosanitary import requirements* rather than to *restrictions*.

#### *Proposed deletion*

<b>restriction</b>	A <b>phytosanitary regulation</b> allowing the importation or movement of specified <b>commodities</b> subject to specific requirements [CEPM, 1996; revised CEPM, 1999]
--------------------	--

### 3.4 PROTECTED AREA (2012-003), CONTROLLED AREA

#### Background

The terms *endangered area* and *protected area* were added to the *List of Topics for IPPC Standards* by the SC in April 2012 based on a TPG proposal. Deletion of *protected area* was proposed by the TPG in October 2012 and reviewed by the SC in May 2013. Deletion of *controlled area* was also proposed as a consequence. No change was proposed for the definition of *endangered area*. The following points may be considered:

- *protected area* and *controlled area* are redundant, making the collection of area-related definitions overly complicated. Both are defined as particular cases of *regulated area*, applied in one case for *endangered areas*, and in the other for *quarantine areas*.
- *controlled area* has not been used in ISPMs.
- *Protected area* is used in ISPMs to a very limited extent, in one case (in ISPM 11: 2004) with a different meaning (referring to the protection of nature). Where referring in ISPMs to a *regulated area*, that term could be used instead for consistency.
- The term *protected area* was meant to apply to *endangered area*, i.e. in the context of PRA. However the revised ISPM 2 already uses the term *regulated area*.
- Where *protected area* is used in ISPMs, it is described as being subject to other constraints than in the definition (i.e. technical justification and non-discrimination, but not as being the minimum area).

#### Proposed deletions

<b>controlled area</b>	A <b>regulated area</b> which an <b>NPPO</b> has determined to be the minimum <b>area</b> necessary to prevent <b>spread</b> of a <b>pest</b> from a <b>quarantine area</b> [CEPM, 1996]
<b>protected area</b>	A <b>regulated area</b> that an <b>NPPO</b> has determined to be the minimum <b>area</b> necessary for the effective protection of an <b>endangered area</b> [FAO, 1990; omitted from FAO, 1995; new concept from CEPM, 1996]

### 3.5 RE-EXPORTED CONSIGNMENT (2010-024), CONSIGNMENT IN TRANSIT (2010-039)

#### Background

The terms *re-exported consignment* and *consignment in transit* were added to the *List of Topics for IPPC Standards* by the SC in April 2010 based on a TPG proposal. Revised definitions for *re-exported consignment* (then proposed to become *re-export (of a consignment)*) and *consignment in transit* were proposed by the TPG in October 2010 and reviewed by the SC in May 2011. The SC decided to send *consignment in transit* for member consultation and returned the revised definition of *re-exported consignment* to the TPG. The TPG November 2011, based on member comments, proposed to reconsider the definition of *consignment in transit* together with that of *re-exported consignment*. Deletion of *consignment in transit* and *re-exported consignment* was proposed by the TPG in October 2012 and reviewed by the SC in May 2013. The following points may be considered:

- TPG 2011 responses to comments for *consignment in transit* can be found in the 2011 meeting report.
- The concepts of import, re-export, export, transit are not specific to the phytosanitary domain; the specificity is the focus on consignments. However, the complex issue of identifying and implementing phytosanitary measures for consignments in transit and re-exported consignments are described in details in ISPMs (ISPM 25:2006 and ISPM 12:2011), and definitions are not needed.

#### Proposed deletions

<b>consignment in transit</b>	A <b>consignment</b> which passes through a country without being imported, and that may be subject to <b>phytosanitary measures</b> [FAO, 1990; revised CEPM, 1996; CEPM 1999; ICPM, 2002; ISPM 25:2006; formerly country of transit]
<b>re-exported consignment</b>	<b>Consignment</b> that has been imported into a country from which it is then exported. The <b>consignment</b> may be stored, split up, combined with other <b>consignments</b> or have its <b>packaging</b> changed [FAO, 1990; revised CEPM, 1996; CEPM, 1999; ICPM, 2001; ICPM, 2002; formerly country of re-export]

### 3.6 CONTAMINATING PEST (2012-001)

### Background

The term *contaminating pest* was added to the *List of Topics for IPPC Standards* by the SC in April 2012 based on a TPG proposal. Deletion of *contaminating pest* was proposed by the TPG in February 2013. The following points may be considered:

- The definition of *contaminating pest* is limited to pests carried by a commodity, and does not cover pests carried e.g. by conveyances. It is therefore limited.
- However, there is a definition of *contamination* that covers appropriately all cases of contaminations by pests or regulated articles (Contamination: Presence in a **commodity**, storage place, conveyance or container, of **pests** or other **regulated articles**, not constituting an **infestation** (see **infestation**) [CEPM, 1997; revised CEPM, 1999])
- Instead of revising the definition of *contaminating pest*, deletion is proposed as the wording *contaminating pest* can be still be used as a derived form of *contamination*, which is defined appropriately, and it is preferable to avoid duplicating definitions.

### Proposed deletion

<b>contaminating pest</b>	A <b>pest</b> that is carried by a <b>commodity</b> and, in the case of <b>plants</b> and <b>plant products</b> , does not infest those <b>plants</b> or <b>plant products</b> [CEPM, 1996; revised CEPM, 1999]
---------------------------	---

## 4. UNDERSTANDING OF “PLANTS” IN THE IPPC AND ITS ISPMS AND CONSEQUENTIAL REVISION OF THE SCOPE OF ISPM 5

### Background

In 2012, the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) raised the issue of whether the IPPC covered algae, bryophytes and fungi. It was noted that, when the IPPC was developed, living organisms were divided into only two kingdoms: plants and animals, and that these other organisms would have been covered under the term *plants*. At the request of the Secretariat, the Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG) had preliminary discussions in October 2012. In November 2012, the SC requested the TPG to produce a document on the taxonomic classification of organisms, such as algae, bryophytes and fungi, and the IPPC coverage of plants. The proposal below was developed by the TPG in February 2013 and reviewed by the SC in May 2013.

#### What are “plants” for the IPPC?

There has never been a clear definition of what is to be understood by “plants” in the IPPC. Originally, the emphasis was on plants which are exploited for economic reasons by man, and which need to be protected from pests carried to new areas by international trade. In practice, this meant angiosperms, gymnosperms and pteridophytes (broadly “higher” or “vascular” plants). Yet the concept of plants for the botanical community at that time extended to bryophytes, algae, fungi and even bacteria, indeed everything that was not animal. This was reflected in the fact that the same Code of botanical nomenclature applied to all these organisms. In practice, the direct economic importance of these various other “plants” was not very great, nor did they need to be protected against the introduction and spread of pests. However, at that time, certain algae and fungi were exploited for economic reasons by man, and would presumably have qualified to be considered under the IPPC (though in fact no cases can be recalled).

Article IV.2.b of the new revised text of the IPPC (IPPC, 1997) makes it clear that the IPPC is also concerned with pests affecting uncultivated/unmanaged plants (“wild flora”) and with environmental effects and consequences that result from these effects on plants, as reflected in various CPM decisions and in ISPM 11:2004 [*date to be adjusted after CPM-8*] (including its Annex 1). The scope of the IPPC now overlaps with that of the Convention on Biodiversity (CBD), for plants. In practice, the CBD aims to protect species of all kinds of higher plants, including bryophytes. Algae and fungi are also covered by the CBD (whether they are considered to be plants or not).

#### Modern classification of plants

In the 21<sup>st</sup> century, the classification of organisms into “kingdoms” has greatly changed. There are no longer just the two kingdoms Animalia and Plantae, but at least seven (Archaea, Bacteria, Animalia, Protozoa, Chromista, Fungi, Plantae). A fuller account of the changes is presented in Appendix I. In modern terms, fungi and many algae are not plants. This leads to an apparent restriction in the scope of the IPPC, and it is accordingly proposed to make a specific declaration that restores the former implicit scope, and asserts it explicitly. It is clear that

certain algae and fungi are open to protection under the IPPC because of their economic exploitation, while others are important components of biodiversity.

#### **Proposal for the understanding of “plants” in the IPPC and its ISPMs**

The recent International Botanical Congress in Melbourne (July 2011) has renamed the Code of botanical nomenclature. It is now the “International Code of Nomenclature for algae, fungi, and plants”. **The TPG suggests that the IPPC should state that its scope extends to algae and fungi, as well as plants, consistent with the “International Code of Nomenclature for algae, fungi, and plants”.**

#### **Means of formal inclusion of this understanding into IPPC documentation**

It is suggested that this understanding is included formally into IPPC documentation by amending the scope of ISPM 5. This is preferred, instead of amending the current definition of “plants” (which relates to plants as a commodity) or of developing an *agreed interpretation* of “plants”.

#### **Proposed revision of the scope of ISPM 5**

This reference standard is a listing of terms and definitions with specific meaning for phytosanitary systems worldwide. It has been developed to provide a harmonized internationally agreed vocabulary associated with the implementation of the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) and International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPMs).

Within the context of the IPPC and its ISPMs, all references to plants should be understood to extend to algae and fungi, consistent with the “International Code of Nomenclature for algae, fungi, and plants”.

#### **Questions arising from this proposal**

- 1) The proposal is made in relatively simple terms, because its expression in greater detail would make it very much more complex (see Appendix 1). In scientific terminology, the proposed scope would be Plantae, Chromista and Fungi, but these categories do not exactly correspond to the English-language equivalents.
- 2) Some plants, and many algae and fungi, are microorganisms. For this reason, it is much less likely that they would be actively considered for protection under the IPPC. However, the dividing line between macroorganisms and microorganisms is not clear, and it does not seem appropriate to draw a line to exclude the latter.
- 3) The kingdoms Bacteria and Archaea are not included in the proposal. These organisms were at one time covered by the Code of botanical nomenclature, but now have their separate Code. They are all microorganisms. It has been suggested that they should be included, but there is little immediate prospect that they would require protection either for their economic importance or as components of biodiversity.

#### **Appendix 1 - Table of Kingdoms**

<b>New kingdom</b>	<b>Groups included*</b>	<b>Former classification</b>
Archaea	Primitive bacteria	Bacteria
Bacteria	Bacteria	Bacteria
	Cyanobacteria	Algae, and previously plants
Animalia	Animals	Animals
Protozoa	Protozoa	Animals
	Myxomycetes	Fungi, and previously plants
	Euglenozoa	Plants
Chromista	Phaeophyta (brown algae)	Plants
	Diatoms (microalgae)	Plants
	Dinoflagellates (microalgae)	Plants
	Oomycetes	Fungi, and previously plants
Fungi	Fungi and lichens	Fungi, and previously plants
Plantae	Higher plants and ferns	Plants
	Bryophytes	Plants
	Chlorophyta (green algae)	Plants
	Charophyta (stoneworts)	Plants
Plantae (or possibly another kingdom)	Rhodophyta (red algae)	Plants

\* There are other small groups of Algae (previously plants), now in Chromista or Plantae, which have been omitted for simplicity

## Annex 6: General recommendations on consistency

### GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS ON CONSISTENCY

*(first developed at TPG 2010; noted by the May 2011 SC; modified by the TPG 2012 and TPG 2013 meetings; for presentation to the SC May 2013)*

One task of the Technical Panel for the Glossary is to review ISPMs, adopted or draft, for consistency in the use of terminology, especially of the Glossary terms. During consistency review, in particular during the review of adopted ISPMs in 2009-2012, the TPG has identified a number of points where greater consistency is needed. General recommendations on these points are set out in this document. They have been applied to the ISPMs reviewed, and should also be taken into consideration in drafting new ISPMs.

These recommendations mainly concern two related principles:

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

#### List of terms considered below

Acceptable level of risk, appropriate level of protection	Phytosanitary measures, phytosanitary actions
Contamination	Point of entry
Country, contracting party, NPPO	Presence, occurrence
Efficacy, effectiveness	Prevalence
Intended use	Restriction
(Non-)compliance, (non-)conformity	Security, phytosanitary security
Official	Shipment
Pest-free	and/or
Pest risk management	References to the text of the IPPC
Phytosanitary certificate, certificate	"r" and "(s)"
Phytosanitary import requirements	

#### Recommendations on use of terms

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

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

##### *Contamination*

This is the Glossary term, defined in relation to commodities, and it should be used in preference to "contaminant".

##### *Country, contracting party, NPPO*

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

##### *Efficacy, effectiveness*

"Efficacy" is a special concept linked to efficacy of treatments, and the terms "efficacy" and "efficacious" should be used only in this context. The term "efficacy (of a treatment)" is correctly defined in the glossary in this sense. In other cases, the term "effectiveness" and its derived form

“effective” may be used, e.g. an effective measure, effectiveness of measures. The general understanding adopted is that efficacy refers to results under controlled conditions, whereas effectiveness refers to results in practice under natural conditions.

#### *Intended use*

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

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

According to IPPC Art. VII (2f), “Importing contracting parties shall...inform...of instances of non-compliance with phytosanitary certification...”. Furthermore, “Compliance procedure (for a consignment)” has been defined in the Glossary. Thus, in those cases, compliance and non-compliance are clearly linked to consignments and thus to import. For other cases of correct/incorrect implementation of measures (e.g. regarding requirements prescribed for an entire place of production) it might be more appropriate to use other terms such as (non-)conformity.

#### *Official*

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

#### *Pest risk management*

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

#### *Pest free*

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

#### *Phytosanitary certificate, certificate*

Where “certificate” or “certification” refers to phytosanitary certificate or phytosanitary certification, these terms should be used, to distinguish from other instances where certificate and certification may relate to other situations (e.g. CITES certificates, certification scheme, certification of facilities). In ISPM 12:2011, the plural term “phytosanitary certificates” refers to export and re-export certificates.

#### *Phytosanitary import requirements*

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

#### *Phytosanitary measures, phytosanitary actions*

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

#### *Point of entry*

This is the Glossary term. Firstly, “point of entry” should be used in preference to other wordings such as “port of entry”. Secondly, “point of entry” should not be used in relation to entrance points into a PFA or ALPP.

#### *Presence, occurrence*

The terms “presence” and “occurrence” have both been used in ISPMs in relation to pest status. In future ISPMs, it is recommended that the term “presence” should be preferred to the term “occurrence”. Note at February 2013, a proposal is being made to delete the definition of occurrence and that “presence” does not need a specific IPPC definition.

### *Prevalence*

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

### *Restriction*

Where this current glossary term has been used in ISPMs, it has mainly been used in the meaning of another glossary term, “phytosanitary import requirements”. For that meaning only, “phytosanitary import requirements” should be used in the future. The glossary term “restriction” is proposed for deletion in 2013 and could be used with its general English meaning in the future.

### *Security, phytosanitary security*

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

### *Shipment*

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

## **Other recommendations**

### *and/or*

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

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

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

### *“/” and “(s)”*

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

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

## Annex 7: Consistency across standards

### CONSISTENCY ACROSS ISPMs: PROPOSED PROCESS AND SPECIFIC PROPOSALS REGARDING *PHYTOSANITARY STATUS* (2010-004)

#### Introduction

At its meeting in October 2012, the TPG noted that there are cases where the meaning of a certain term used in ISPMs is unclear and this creates conflicts of meaning between ISPMs. This could be when a term is wrongly used across many ISPMs or covers different, unclear concepts. *Phytosanitary status* (2010-004 on the *List of Topics for IPPC Standards*) is one such case: the term is used in ISPMs in many different contexts and has different meanings in those different contexts.

#### 1. Proposal for a process

The TPG agreed that something should be done in such cases. This document was developed by the TPG at its meeting in February 2013 and provides a *Process for consistency across ISPMs* (Attachment 1), and proposals related to *phytosanitary status* (analysed in Attachment 2). The proposed process acknowledges the importance both of establishing guidance for future ISPMs to avoid that the issue is repeated in the future, and of making corrections to adopted standards, so that they become understandable.

Regarding future ISPMs, the TPG suggests that guidance be given to expert drafting groups and others involved in standard setting, so that terms causing across-ISPMs inconsistency are avoided (and other terms used in preference to them) or used correctly and consistently in future ISPMs. Such guidance should be given in the *General recommendations on consistency*, which is already an existing document regularly updated by the TPG and noted by the SC (presented under agenda item 9.5).

The proposed process, when applied to a specific term, may lead to the application of one or more of the following actions to lead to greater consistency in the use of terms:

- adjustments to existing ISPMs as ink amendments,
- other adjustments to be made at future revision of the relevant ISPMs
- recommendations for amendment to the *General recommendations on consistency* regarding the use of the term in future ISPMs;
- other necessary actions specific to the term concerned.

It therefore solves the issue for at least part of adopted ISPMs, by making use of ink amendments to make corrections where possible, and ensuring proper use of the term in the future.

It should be noted that the number of terms identified so far by the TPG as causing severe problems of understanding is very limited and is expected to remain so. The TPG recommends that the proposed process be only applied to such severe cases. Many other terms listed in the *General recommendations on consistency*, which have been used in an inconsistent manner in ISPMs, do not cause such serious problems for understanding in their current use and may remain until the relevant standards are being revised. With regards to other terms already on or proposed for the *List of Topics for IPPC Standards*, the TPG envisaged that *pest list* and the use of the terms *accreditation/authorization/certification* may need to be handled through the proposed procedure (to be confirmed following discussions at future TPG meetings).

Note. The SC is reminded that consistency in the use of terms is a regular task of the TPG, even if work on the particular topic of *Review of ISPMs (and minor modifications to ISPMs resulting from the review)* (2006-012) will have been completed by the ink amendments submitted to CPM-8 (2013).

#### 2. Specific analysis and proposals for *phytosanitary status* (2010-004)

A detailed analysis of the use of *phytosanitary status* and proposals are provided in Attachment 2.

### 3. Proposed SC decisions

The SC is invited to:

In relation to the consistency across standards in general:

- (1) *Agree* in principle that something should be done to address cases of across-ISPMS inconsistency that cause conflicts of meaning between ISPMS or render ISPMS incomprehensible.
- (2) *Approve* the *Process for consistency across ISPMS* (Attachment 1), to be integrated to the Procedural Manual
- (3) *Note* that the *General recommendations on consistency*, as developed and regularly updated by the TPG and noted or by the SC, are important to ensure proper use of terms in future ISPMS, and *asks* the Secretariat to make them available to expert drafting groups and others directly involved in drafting ISPMS (editor etc.).

In relation to *phytosanitary status*:

- (4) *Review* and *approve* the ink amendments proposed to some ISPMS (Tables A in Attachment 2), to be presented to the CPM for noting.
- (5) *Ask* the Secretariat that changes proposed in Tables B be archived for future consideration when revising the ISPMS concerned.
- (6) *Agree* that the TPG attempts to develop a definition relating to the specific case of *phytosanitary status (of a consignment accompanied with a PC)*, and consequently *retain phytosanitary status* (2010-004) on the *List of Topics for IPPC Standards*.
- (7) *Add* the term *mark* as a subject to the *List of Topics for IPPC Standards* for revision (to replace the term *phytosanitary status* in the definition of *mark*).
- (8) *Note* the proposed amendment to the *General recommendations on consistency* in Attachment 2 and *request* the Secretariat to incorporate this proposal.

## Annex 7, Attachment 1

### Proposed process for consistency across ISPMs in relation to a specific term

#### Objective

To propose corrections to adopted standards, so that they become understandable, and to provide guidance for future ISPMs, in cases where the meaning of a term is unclear and this creates severe conflicts of meaning between ISPMs

#### Detailed process

- (1) The TPG identifies a case where the use of a specific term presents a severe problem for the understanding of ISPMs, and creates severe conflicts of meaning between ISPMs.
- (2) If not already on the *List of Topics for IPPC Standards*, the TPG recommends to the SC that the term be added.
- (3) For adopted standards, the TPG provides to the SC a detailed analysis of the use of the term throughout all ISPMs, and makes proposals as to how standards should be adjusted, separating clearly proposals relating to:
  - consistency, to be adjusted by ink amendments
  - substantial changes, to be adjusted at future revision
  - other changes needing another type of process (e.g. development of a definition for restricted meanings of the term, revision of an existing definition that uses the term).
- (4) For future standards, the TPG develops an explanation and recommendations, to be integrated in the *General recommendations on consistency*.
- (5) The SC reviews the analysis and proposals, and:
  - *reviews* and *approves* ink amendments to be submitted to the CPM for noting, and then incorporated by the Secretariat into the relevant ISPMs,
  - notes the proposals for future revision (to be archived by the Secretariat until the ISPMs are revised),
  - notes the proposed recommendation to be added to the *General recommendations on consistency* and
  - *approves* or *notes* any other proposal as appropriate

## Annex 7, Attachment 2

### Analysis of the use of ‘phytosanitary status’ in ISPMs and proposals related to consistent use of that term across ISPMs

#### Background

The Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG) in 2010 recognised that the non-defined expression *phytosanitary status* is used in many different connections. In November 2010, the SC added *phytosanitary status* to the *List of Topics for IPPC Standards* for the TPG to review its use in standards and consider whether the term needs to be clarified.

#### Current use of *phytosanitary status* and attempts for interpretations

*Phytopsanitary status* has been used in ISPMs in various contexts, as described below. The intended meaning varies considerably with the context. In order to overcome the huge ambiguity and inconsistency among the uses in various ISPMs, the TPG made the following proposals:

**1. Corrections through ink amendments.** In all cases where this is deemed relatively straightforward, *phytopsanitary status* be substituted by precise wording across existing ISPMs (Tables A)

**2. Correction at future revision.** For the more difficult contexts, where the intended meaning is too unclear or wide, and where simple substitutions cannot be used, *phytopsanitary status* should be substituted by adequate and precise text whenever the relevant ISPMs are revised (Tables B).

**3. Definition of *phytopsanitary status* (of a consignment accompanied with a PC).** The TPG suggests that a definition of *phytopsanitary status* for this specific context may be useful and could be attempted. This relates to cases where *phytopsanitary status* is used in relation to *consignments* in Table B.1).

**4. Revision of the definition of *mark*.** This definition needs revision to replace *phytopsanitary status* as appropriate (see Table C).

**5. Addition to the *General recommendations on consistency*.** The following amendment is proposed: “*Phytopsanitary status*:

The use of *phytopsanitary status* should be avoided as it presents a problem for the understanding of ISPMs, and creates conflicts of meaning between existing ISPMs. The defined terms *pest status* or *pest risk* may be used in some contexts. Note. The TPG is attempting to develop a definition for one specific situation linked to the use of *phytopsanitary status*, namely in relation to a consignment accompanied by a PC.”

#### TABLES A: PROPOSALS FOR INK AMENDMENTS

The ink amendments proposed in this section can be summarized as follows (details are given in each case in the tables below).

	<i>Phytopsanitary status</i> used in existing ISPMs in relation to	<i>Phytopsanitary status</i> can be replaced by
1	Pest	Pest risk
2	Pest detection	Pest status
3	Host plants	Pest risk
4	Area	Status of the pest in the area, pest status
5	Countries	Pest status

#### 1. Pertaining to *pest*

It appears that the intended meaning of the *phytopsanitary status* of a pest is: the intrinsic ability of a pest to establish, spread and cause economic impact. It is proposed to substitute *phytopsanitary status* to the defined term *pest risk*, as follows:

Table A.1 - Pertaining to pest				
ISPM	Section	Para	Current text	Proposed text
11	2.1.1.1	2	The taxonomic unit for the pest is generally species. The use of a higher or lower taxonomic level should be supported by scientifically sound rationale. In the case of levels below the species, this should include evidence demonstrating that factors such as differences in virulence, host range or vector relationships are significant enough to affect <b>phytosanitary status</b> .	The taxonomic unit for the pest is generally species. The use of a higher or lower taxonomic level should be supported by scientifically sound rationale. In the case of levels below the species, this should include evidence demonstrating that factors such as differences in virulence, host range or vector relationships are significant enough to affect <b>phytosanitary status pest risk</b> .
21	3.1.1.1	2	For the pest, the taxonomic unit is generally the species. The use of a higher or lower taxonomic level should be supported by a scientifically sound rationale. In the case of levels below the species (e.g. race), this should include evidence demonstrating that factors such as difference in virulence, host range or vector relationships are significant enough to affect the <b>phytosanitary status</b> .	For the pest, the taxonomic unit is generally the species. The use of a higher or lower taxonomic level should be supported by a scientifically sound rationale. In the case of levels below the species (e.g. race), this should include evidence demonstrating that factors such as difference in virulence, host range or vector relationships are significant enough to affect the <b>phytosanitary status pest risk</b> .

## 2. Pertaining to detection of a pest

The intended meaning of phytosanitary status of the detection of a pest as used in ISPM 26, Annex 1 (2011) (*Fruit fly trapping*) seems to refer to pest status. It is proposed to substitute in ISPM 26: Annex 1 *phytosanitary status* by the defined term *pest status*, as follows:

Table A.2 - Pertaining to detection of a pest				
ISPM	Section	Para	Current text	Proposed text
26	Annex 1		<p>Actions to apply the corrective action plan</p> <p>(1) <i>Determination of the <b>phytosanitary status</b> of the detection (actionable or non-actionable)</i></p> <p>(1.1) If the detection is a transient non-actionable occurrence (ISPM 8:1998), no further action is required.</p> <p>(1.2) If the detection of a target pest may be actionable, a delimiting survey, which includes additional traps, and usually fruit sampling as well as an increased trap inspection rate, should be implemented immediately after the detection to assess whether the detection represents an outbreak, which will determine necessary responsive actions. If a population is present, this action is also used to determine the size of the affected area.</p>	<p>Actions to apply the corrective action plan</p> <p>(1) <i>Determination of the <b>phytosanitary pest status</b> of the detection (actionable or non-actionable)</i></p> <p>(1.1) If the detection is a transient non-actionable occurrence (ISPM 8:1998), no further action is required.</p> <p>(1.2) If the detection of a target pest may be actionable, a delimiting survey, which includes additional traps, and usually fruit sampling as well as an increased trap inspection rate, should be implemented immediately after the detection to assess whether the detection represents an outbreak, which will determine necessary responsive actions. If a population is present, this action is also used to determine the size of the affected area.</p>

## 3. Pertaining to host plants

It appears the intended meaning of phytosanitary status of host plants is: *the intrinsic characteristics of the host plant that determines its suitability as a host and the damage that a pest could confer to that plant*. It is proposed to substitute *phytosanitary status* to the defined term *pest risk*.

Table A.3 - Pertaining to host plants				
ISPM	Section	Para	Current text	Proposed text

21	3.1.1.1	3	Also for the host, the taxonomic unit is generally the species. The use of a higher or lower taxonomic level should be supported by a scientifically sound rationale. In the case of levels below the species (e.g. variety), there should be evidence demonstrating that factors such as difference in host susceptibility or resistance are significant enough to affect the <b>phytosanitary status</b> . Taxa for plants for planting above the species level (genera) or unidentified species of known genera should not be used unless all species in the genus are being evaluated for the same intended use.	Also for the host, the taxonomic unit is generally the species. The use of a higher or lower taxonomic level should be supported by a scientifically sound rationale. In the case of levels below the species (e.g. variety), there should be evidence demonstrating that factors such as difference in host susceptibility or resistance are significant enough to affect the <b>phytosanitary status pest risk</b> . Taxa for plants for planting above the species level (genera) or unidentified species of known genera should not be used unless all species in the genus are being evaluated for the same intended use.
----	---------	---	--	--

#### 4. Pertaining to an area

It appears the intended meaning of *phytosanitary status* for area is in respect of the status of a pest in that area or, in one instance, of the actual pest incidence and distribution. It is proposed to substitute in two cases *phytosanitary status* by *status of the relevant pest in the area*, and in one case by *pest status*.

Table A.4 - Pertaining to area				
ISPM	Section	Para	Current text	Proposed text
29	Outline	1	Recognition of pest free areas (PFAs) and areas of low pest prevalence (ALPPs) is a technical and administrative process to achieve acceptance of the <b>phytosanitary status</b> of a delimited area. Technical requirements for establishment of PFAs and ALPPs, as well as certain elements relating to recognition, are addressed in other International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPMs). In addition, many principles of the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) are relevant.	Recognition of pest free areas (PFAs) and areas of low pest prevalence (ALPPs) is a technical and administrative process to achieve acceptance of the <b>status of the relevant pest in phytosanitary status-of</b> a delimited area. Technical requirements for establishment of PFAs and ALPPs, as well as certain elements relating to recognition, are addressed in other International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPMs). In addition, many principles of the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) are relevant.
30	2.2.1	4	The presence and distribution of fruit fly hosts should be recorded separately identifying commercial and non-commercial hosts. This information will help in planning the trapping and host sampling activities and may help in anticipating the potential ease or difficulty of establishing and maintaining the <b>phytosanitary status</b> of the area.	The presence and distribution of fruit fly hosts should be recorded separately identifying commercial and non-commercial hosts. This information will help in planning the trapping and host sampling activities and may help in anticipating the potential ease or difficulty of establishing and maintaining the <b>status of the relevant pest in phytosanitary status-of</b> the area.
30	Annex 2 (2)	Title	(2) <i>Determination of the <b>phytosanitary status</b></i> Immediately after detecting a population level higher than the specified level of low pest prevalence, a delimiting survey (which may include the deployment of additional traps, fruit sampling of host fruits and increased trap inspection frequency) should be implemented to determine the size of the affected area and more precisely gauge the level of the fruit fly prevalence.	(2) <i>Determination of the <b>phytosanitary pest status</b></i> Immediately after detecting a population level higher than the specified level of low pest prevalence, a delimiting survey (which may include the deployment of additional traps, fruit sampling of host fruits and increased trap inspection frequency) should be implemented to determine the size of the affected area and more precisely gauge the level of the fruit fly prevalence.

#### 5. Pertaining to countries

It appears the intended meaning of *phytosanitary status* for countries is in respect of the actual status of the pest. That meaning could be conferred by substituting *phytosanitary status* to phrases referring to the status of the pest.

Table A.5 - Pertaining to countries				
ISPM	Section	Para	Current text	Proposed text
1	1.7	1	Contracting parties should, in accordance with the IPPC, apply phytosanitary measures without discrimination between contracting parties if contracting parties can demonstrate that they have the same <b>phytosanitary status</b> and apply identical or equivalent phytosanitary measures.	Contracting parties should, in accordance with the IPPC, apply phytosanitary measures without discrimination between contracting parties if contracting parties can demonstrate that <del>they have the same phytosanitary status and</del> <u>the status of the relevant pest is the same and that they</u> apply identical or equivalent phytosanitary measures.
11	3.4	1	Appropriate measures should be chosen based on their effectiveness in reducing the probability of introduction of the pest. The choice should be based on the following considerations, which include several of the phytosanitary principles of ISPM 1:1993:....[5th indent:]  - <i>Principle of "non-discrimination"</i> : If the pest under consideration is established in the PRA area but of limited distribution and under official control, the phytosanitary measures in relation to import should not be more stringent than those applied within the PRA area. Likewise, phytosanitary measures should not discriminate between exporting countries of the same <b>phytosanitary status</b> .	Appropriate measures should be chosen based on their effectiveness in reducing the probability of introduction of the pest. The choice should be based on the following considerations, which include several of the phytosanitary principles of ISPM 1:1993:....[5th indent:]  <i>Principle of "non-discrimination"</i> : If the pest under consideration is established in the PRA area but of limited distribution and under official control, the phytosanitary measures in relation to import should not be more stringent than those applied within the PRA area. Likewise, phytosanitary measures should not discriminate between exporting countries <u>of the same phytosanitary status where the status of the relevant pest is the same</u> .
21	4.3	1	Appropriate measures should be chosen based on their effectiveness in limiting the economic impact of the pest on the intended use of the plants for planting. The choice should be based on the following considerations, which include several of the principles of plant quarantine as related to international trade (ISPM 1:1993): ...[5th indent:]  <i>Principle of "non-discrimination"</i> . Phytosanitary measures should not discriminate between exporting countries of the same <b>phytosanitary status</b> .	Appropriate measures should be chosen based on their effectiveness in limiting the economic impact of the pest on the intended use of the plants for planting. The choice should be based on the following considerations, which include several of the principles of plant quarantine as related to international trade (ISPM 1:1993): ...[5th indent:]  <i>Principle of "non-discrimination"</i> . Phytosanitary measures should not discriminate between exporting countries <u>of the same phytosanitary status where the status of the relevant pest is the same</u> .
24	2.4	1+2	The principle of non-discrimination requires that when equivalence of phytosanitary measures is granted for one exporting contracting party, this should also apply to contracting parties with the same <b>phytosanitary status</b> and similar conditions for the same commodity or commodity class and/or pest. Therefore, an importing contracting party which recognizes the equivalence of alternative phytosanitary measures of an exporting contracting party should ensure that it acts in a non-discriminatory manner. This applies both to applications from third countries for recognition of the equivalence of the same or similar measures, and to the equivalence of any domestic measures.  It should be recognized that equivalence of phytosanitary measures does not, however,	The principle of non-discrimination requires that when equivalence of phytosanitary measures is granted for one exporting contracting party, this should also apply to contracting parties <u>with the same phytosanitary status where the status of the relevant pest is the same</u> and similar conditions for the same commodity or commodity class and/or pest. Therefore, an importing contracting party which recognizes the equivalence of alternative phytosanitary measures of an exporting contracting party should ensure that it acts in a non-discriminatory manner. This applies both to applications from third countries for recognition of the equivalence of the same or similar measures, and to the equivalence of any domestic measures.  It should be recognized that equivalence of phytosanitary measures does not, however, mean that when a specific measure is granted equivalence for one exporting contracting party,

		mean that when a specific measure is granted equivalence for one exporting contracting party, this applies automatically to another contracting party for the same commodity or commodity class or pest. Phytosanitary measures should always be considered in the context of the pest status and phytosanitary regulatory system of the exporting contracting party, including the policies and procedures.	this applies automatically to another contracting party for the same commodity or commodity class or pest. Phytosanitary measures should always be considered in the context of the pest status and phytosanitary regulatory system of the exporting contracting party, including the policies and procedures.
--	--	--	--

## TABLES B: UNCLEAR USES THAT CANNOT BE EASILY CLARIFIED

The cases detailed below need further consideration and text changes, but these cannot be done as ink amendments.

### 1. Pertaining to *consignment*

The intended meaning of the phytosanitary status of a consignment is unclear, variable and apparently very wide. It may refer to the pest incidence (or pest freedom) of the consignment or to production conditions or measures pertaining to the produce prior to becoming a consignment. In some cases it includes the information on area of origin or of treatments, in other cases not. It may also in some cases be referring to the NPPO's judgement of which origin the consignment has. A definition for *phytosanitary status (of a consignment accompanied by a PC)* may be useful and should be further considered.

Table B.1 - Pertaining to <i>consignment</i>			
ISPM	Section	Para	Current text
7	2.2	Indent 6	The NPPO should have the capability to undertake the following functions: document and maintain the information regarding the phytosanitary import requirements where needed for phytosanitary certification and provide appropriate work instructions to personnel perform inspection, sampling and testing of plants, plant products and other regulated articles for purposes related to phytosanitary certification detect and identify pests identify plants, plant products and other regulated articles perform, supervise or audit the required phytosanitary treatments perform surveys and monitoring and control activities to confirm the <b>phytosanitary status</b> attested in phytosanitary certificates
12	Outline	6	Phytosanitary certificates may have a limited duration of validity as the <b>phytosanitary status</b> of consignments may change after issuance of phytosanitary certificates. The NPPO of the exporting country or the importing country may make relevant stipulations.
12	1.2	2+3	A phytosanitary certificate for export is usually issued by the NPPO of the country of origin. A phytosanitary certificate for export describes the consignment and, through a certifying statement, additional declarations and treatment records, declares that the <b>phytosanitary status</b> of the consignment meets phytosanitary import requirements. A phytosanitary certificate for export may also be issued in certain re-export situations for plants, plant products and other regulated articles originating in countries other than the country of re-export if the <b>phytosanitary status</b> of the consignment can be determined by the country of re-export (e.g. by inspection). A phytosanitary certificate for re-export may be issued by the NPPO of the re-exporting country in the case where the commodity in the consignment was not grown or processed to change its nature in that country and only where an original phytosanitary certificate for export or a certified copy is available. The phytosanitary certificate for re-export provides the link to a phytosanitary certificate issued in a country of export and takes into account any changes in <b>phytosanitary status</b> that may have occurred in the country of re-export.
12	1.6	1	The <b>phytosanitary status</b> of consignments may change after issuance of phytosanitary certificates and therefore the NPPO of the exporting or re-exporting country may decide to

			restrict the duration of the validity of phytosanitary certificates after issuance and prior to export.
12	5 (l) Certifying statement	4	In instances where phytosanitary import requirements are not specific, the NPPO of the exporting country may certify the general <b>phytosanitary status</b> of the consignment for any pests believed by it to be of phytosanitary concern.
22	3.1.4.3	1	In cases where an ALPP is established for a regulated pest, phytosanitary measures may be required to reduce the risk of entry of the specified pests into the ALPP (ISPM 20:2004). These may include:  regulation of the pathways and of the articles that require control to maintain the ALPP. All pathways into and out of the ALPP should be identified. This may include the designation of points of entry, and requirements for documentation, treatment, inspection or sampling before or at entry into the area.  verification of documents and of the <b>phytosanitary status</b> of consignments including identification of intercepted specimens of specified pest and maintenance of sampling records  confirmation of the application and effectiveness of required treatments  documentation of any other phytosanitary procedures
23	2.5	3	In many cases, pests or signs of pests that have been detected may require identification or a specialized analysis in a laboratory or by a specialist before a determination can be made on the <b>phytosanitary status</b> of the consignment. It may be decided that emergency measures are needed where new or previously unknown pests are found. A system for properly documenting and maintaining samples and/or specimens should be in place to ensure trace-back to the relevant consignment and to facilitate later review of the results if necessary.

## 2. Pertaining to wood packaging material

The intended meaning of the phytosanitary status of a wood packaging material is unclear and apparently very wide. It may refer to the pest incidence (or pest freedom) of the wood packaging material or to production conditions or measures (treatments applied, origin, wood species) pertaining to the wood packaging material.

ISPM	Section	Para	Current text
15	1		Wood originating from living or dead trees may be infested by pests. Wood packaging material is frequently made of raw wood that may not have undergone sufficient processing or treatment to remove or kill pests and therefore remains a pathway for the introduction and spread of quarantine pests. Dunnage in particular has been shown to present a high risk of introduction and spread of quarantine pests. Furthermore, wood packaging material is very often reused, repaired or remanufactured (as described in section 4.3). The true origin of any piece of wood packaging material is difficult to determine, and thus its <b>phytosanitary status</b> cannot easily be ascertained. Therefore the normal process of undertaking pest risk analysis to determine if measures are necessary, and the strength of such measures, is frequently not possible for wood packaging material. For this reason, this standard describes internationally accepted measures that may be applied to wood packaging material by all countries to reduce significantly the risk of introduction and spread of most quarantine pests that may be associated with that material.

## 3. Pertaining to plant, commodity and consignment in ISPM 12:2011 (*Phytosanitary certificates*), sect. 5, *Place of origin*

In that paragraph, the words *plant*, *commodity* and *consignment* are all used in the discussion of the concept of *place of origin*. In connection with any of those words, the intended meaning of the phytosanitary status is unclear. It may be interpreted as referring to the pests that could possibly be associated with the plants as infestation or contamination. However, it may also be taken to refer to the NPPO's perception of to which origin the plant/commodity/consignment should be deemed as belonging to, (in which case the ISPM text is tautological).

<i>of origin</i>			
ISPM	Section	Para	Current text
12	5	Place of origin	<p>The place of origin refers to places where the commodity was grown or produced and where it was possibly exposed to infestation or contamination by regulated pests. In all cases, the name of the country or countries of origin should be stated. Normally a consignment gains its <b>phytosanitary status</b> from the place of origin. Countries may require that the name or code of the pest free area, pest free place of production or pest free production site be identified. Further details on the pest free area, pest free place of production or pest free production site may be provided in the additional declaration section.</p> <p>If a commodity is repacked, stored or moved, its <b>phytosanitary status</b> may change over a period of time as a result of its new location through the possible infestation or contamination by regulated pests. <b>Phytopsanitary status</b> may also be changed by processing, disinfecting or treating a commodity that results in removing possible infestation or contamination. Thus a commodity may gain its <b>phytosanitary status</b> from more than one place. In such cases, each country and place, where necessary, should be declared with the initial place of origin in brackets, e.g. declared as “country X of export (country Y of origin)”.</p> <p>If different lots within a consignment originate in different places or countries, all countries and places where necessary should be indicated. To assist with trace-back in such cases, the most relevant place for undertaking trace-back may be identified, for example the exporting company where records are stored.</p> <p>If plants were imported to or moved within a country and have been grown for a specific period of time (depending on the commodity concerned, but usually one growing season or more), these plants may be considered to have changed their country or place of origin, provided that the <b>phytosanitary status</b> is determined only by that country or place of further growth.</p>

#### 4. Pertaining to potato propagation material in ISPM 33:2010 (*Pest free potato (Solanum spp.) micropropagative material and minitubers for international trade*)

The intended meaning of phytosanitary status in ISPM 33 seems wide referring in section 3.1.2 to the pest incidence resulting from treatment or handling while in section 3.3 it refers to plant health class or category (as based upon e.g. testing rigour, maternal stock, origin).

Table B.4 - Pertaining to potato propagation material in ISPM 33			
ISPM	Section	Para	Current text
33	3.1.2		<p>A facility used to establish pest free potato micropropagative material from new candidate plants should be authorized or directly operated by the NPPO specifically for this purpose. The facility should provide a secure means for establishing individual pest free potato micropropagative material from candidate plants and for holding these plants separately from tested material while awaiting required test results. Because both infested and pest free potato propagative material (tubers, plants <i>in vitro</i> etc.) may be handled in the same facility, strict procedures should be implemented to prevent contamination or infestation of pest free material. Such procedures should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>prohibition of entry of unauthorized personnel and control of the entry of authorized staff</li> <li>provision for the use of dedicated protective clothing (including dedicated footwear or disinfection of footwear) and hand washing on entry (with particular care being taken if staff members work in areas of higher phytosanitary risk, e.g. the testing facility)</li> <li>chronological records of actions in handling material so that production can, if necessary, be checked easily for contamination and infestation if pests are detected</li> <li>stringent aseptic techniques, including disinfection of work areas and sterilization of instruments (e.g. by autoclaving) between handling materials of a different <b>phytosanitary status</b>.</li> </ul>
33	3.3	1	<p>Exceptionally, establishment facilities may also maintain pest free potato micropropagative material provided that strict procedures are adopted and applied to prevent infestation of maintained material from other material of a lower <b>phytosanitary status</b>.</p> <p>These strict procedures include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the procedures in sections 3.1 and 3.2 to prevent infestation of the pest free potato micropropagative</li> </ul>

			material and to keep material of different <b>phytosanitary status</b> separate the use of separate laminar flow cabinets and instruments for the maintained material and for material of a lower <b>phytosanitary status</b> or implementation of stringent procedures to keep the processes of establishment and maintenance separate scheduled audit tests on the material maintained.
33	6		The management system, and operating procedures and instructions of each facility and the testing laboratory, should be documented in a manual(s). In developing such manual(s), the following should be addressed: the establishment, maintenance and propagation of pest free potato micropropagative material with particular attention paid to those control measures used to prevent infestation and contamination between the pest free potato micropropagative material and any material of another <b>phytosanitary status</b> the production of pest free minitubers, covering management, technical and operational procedures, with particular attention paid to those control measures used to prevent pest infection, infestation and contamination of the minitubers during their production, harvest and storage, and during transport to their destination all laboratory test procedures or processes to verify pest freedom

### 5. Pertaining to commodity or area in ISPM 13

It appears the intended meaning of phytosanitary status of a commodity or an area is in respect of the status of a pest. However, in the case of ISPM 13, the text that contains phytosanitary status is thought to not be necessary.

ISPM	Section	Current text	Proposed text
13	2	Notification is normally bilateral. Notifications and information used for notification are valuable for official purposes but may also be easily misunderstood or misused if taken out of context or used imprudently. To minimize the potential for misunderstandings or abuse, countries should be careful to ensure that notifications and information about notifications are distributed in the first instance only to the exporting country. In particular, the importing country may consult with the exporting country and provide the opportunity for the exporting country to investigate instances of apparent non-compliance, and correct as necessary. This should be done before changes in the <b>phytosanitary status</b> of a commodity or area, or other failures of phytosanitary systems in the exporting country are confirmed or reported more widely (see also good reporting practices for interceptions in ISPM 8:1998).	Notification is normally bilateral. Notifications and information used for notification are valuable for official purposes but may also be easily misunderstood or misused if taken out of context or used imprudently. To minimize the potential for misunderstandings or abuse, countries should be careful to ensure that notifications and information about notifications are distributed in the first instance only to the exporting country. In particular, the importing country may consult with the exporting country and provide the opportunity for the exporting country to investigate instances of apparent non-compliance, and correct as necessary. This should be done before <b>changes in the phytosanitary status of a commodity or area, or other</b> failures of phytosanitary systems in the exporting country are confirmed or reported more widely (see also good reporting practices for interceptions in ISPM 8:1998).

### 6. Pertaining to plants (as a pathway)

In ISPM 20:2004 (*Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system*), Sect. 4.2.1 the intended meaning seems to refer to freedom from specified pests with the plants and the growing conditions per se leading to that pest freedom. The following suggestion may be considered at revision.

ISPM	Section	Para	Current text	Proposed text
20	4.2.1	2	Measures required in the exporting country, which the NPPO of the exporting country may	Measures required in the exporting country, which the NPPO of the exporting country may be required

		<p>be required to certify (in accordance with ISPM 7:1997) include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• inspection prior to export</li> <li>• testing prior to export</li> <li>• treatment prior to export</li> <li>• produced from plants of specified <b>phytosanitary status</b> (for example grown from virus-tested plants or under specified conditions)</li> <li>• inspection or testing in the growing season(s) prior to export</li> <li>• origin of the consignment to be a pest free place of production or pest free production site, area of low pest prevalence or pest free area</li> <li>• accreditation procedures</li> <li>• maintenance of consignment integrity.</li> </ul>	<p>to certify (in accordance with ISPM 7:1997) include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• inspection prior to export</li> <li>• testing prior to export</li> <li>• treatment prior to export</li> <li>• produced from plants <u>of specified phytosanitary status free from specified pests or grown under specified conditions</u> (for example grown from virus-tested plants or under specified conditions)</li> <li>• inspection or testing in the growing season(s) prior to export</li> <li>• origin of the consignment to be a pest free place of production or pest free production site, area of low pest prevalence or pest free area</li> <li>• accreditation procedures</li> <li>• maintenance of consignment integrity.</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--

**7. Pertaining to plant material**

The intended meaning of the phytosanitary status of plant material as it appears in ISPM 36: 2012 (*Integrated measures for plants for planting*), Sect.2.2.1.8 is unclear. It may refer to any information that may be carried with a phytosanitary certificate (PC), i.e. from the general certification statement only in the simplest case to elaborated, specific information about pest freedom, origin in specified areas, the inspection or testing rigour used, treatments applied etc. It is suggested the text attempting to (re-)explain what information is carried by a PC and invoices is unnecessary. Furthermore, providing such explanation is actually inconsistent with all the following indents that do not specify which information is carried by the records mentioned. It is proposed to resolve the ambiguity in this case by deleting the unnecessary and confusing text.

Table B.7 - Pertaining to plant material				
ISPM	Section	Para	Current text	Proposed text
36	2.2.1.8	1	<p>Up-to-date records should be maintained and made available to the NPPO of the exporting country and, where justified, also to the NPPO of the importing country. The place of production manual should clearly identify individuals responsible for maintaining various records, and the location and manner in which such records are maintained. Records should be maintained as determined by the NPPO of the exporting country. Records should include date, name and signature of the person who carried out the task or prepared the document. Examples of records that may be required include:</p> <p>phytosanitary certificates and other information (e.g. invoices) that substantiate the origin and the <b>phytosanitary status</b> of incoming plant material</p> <p>results of the inspection of incoming plant material</p> <p>results of audits</p> <p>....</p>	<p>Up-to-date records should be maintained and made available to the NPPO of the exporting country and, where justified, also to the NPPO of the importing country. The place of production manual should clearly identify individuals responsible for maintaining various records, and the location and manner in which such records are maintained. Records should be maintained as determined by the NPPO of the exporting country. Records should include date, name and signature of the person who carried out the task or prepared the document. Examples of records that may be required include:</p> <p>phytosanitary certificates and other information (e.g. invoices) <u>that substantiate the origin and the phytosanitary status of related to the</u> incoming plant material</p> <p>results of the inspection of incoming plant material</p> <p>results of audits</p> <p>....</p>

**TABLE C****Pertaining to *regulated article***

It appears that the intended meaning of *phytosanitary status* for a regulated article in the definition of *mark* refers to the dual function of attesting that particular phytosanitary measures have been carried out or certain phytosanitary requirements (regarding freedom from particular pests) are being met. However, this is unclear and it is proposed that the definition be amended to become explicit and precise. In addition, one member noted that, although the definition originally applied to ISPM 15, it would be useful if it could be kept broad at revision (and not restricted to the mark in ISPM 15) as marks could be used in the future to attest for compliance with other types of phytosanitary import requirements. The following proposal will be taken into account when revising the definition.

Table C - Pertaining to <i>regulated article</i>				
ISPM	Section	Para	Current text	Proposed text
5		Mark	An <b>official</b> stamp or brand, internationally recognized, applied to a <b>regulated article</b> to attest its <b>phytosanitary status</b> [ISPM No. 15, 2002]	An <b>official</b> stamp or brand, internationally recognized, applied to a <b>regulated article</b> to attest <del>its phytosanitary status</del> <a href="#">that certain phytosanitary measures have been applied or that certain phytosanitary requirements are being met.</a>

## Annex 8: Review of duration of record keeping in ISPMs

### REVIEW OF DURATIONS OF RECORD KEEPING IN ISPMs

In October 2010, the TPG recommended to the Standards Committee 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 requested the TPG to perform this review and consider the need to make recommendations in this respect. At its meeting in February 2013, the TPG reviewed all instances of any formulation of record keeping or documentation in ISPMs (a complete table is given in TPG\_2013\_Feb\_12). This document presents a summary of the review and TPG recommendations to the SC.

A. Specific durations of record keeping are indicated in ISPMs only in a few cases:

- “at least one year” is used in relation to phytosanitary certificates in several ISPMs, notification documents in ISPM 13, diagnostic evidence in ISPM 27, monitoring inspections and treatment/dosimetry records in ISPM 18. This corresponds to records that may need to be available during that one year, but do not need to be maintained longer.
- “at least 24 months” is used for records of surveys and results of other operational procedures for fruit fly ISPMs 26, 30 and 35 on PFA, ALPP and systems approaches. This corresponds to systems (PFA, ALPP and systems approaches) which are put in place with a view to be maintained for some time, and for which records should be available for a longer period.
- “at least 5 years” is used for traceability requirement in ISPM 33 on potato. This corresponds to a specific situation where the traceability of generations of propagative material of potato needs to be ensured over several years.

B. In a few cases, durations are indicated in a different way, such as “a number of seasons” for results of trapping in ISPM 26; in ISPM 22, “a sufficient number of years” for establishment of the ALPP and “as many years as possible” prior to its establishment. This also corresponds to PFA or ALPP and assumes that records will be kept for more than 2 years.

C. Finally, in some cases ISPMs only mention that records are kept, without indication of time. This corresponds to technical justification for phytosanitary measures (e.g. ISPM 2), information related to pest records (e.g. in ISPM 1, ISPM 9, ISPM 19).

The TPG concluded that specific durations of record-keeping in current ISPMs (see A above) are appropriate, and do not need to be the same. Where specific durations need to be indicated in future ISPMs, the appropriate durations should be determined, taking also into account the durations indicated in existing standards for similar records.

However, the TPG noted that when a time is not specified (C. above), record-keeping is understood to be for an undetermined period, until the record is replaced by new data or until the operation the record justifies (e.g. phytosanitary measures) is cancelled. This is not specified in standards, and is left to the understanding of users. Aspects related to record-keeping may need to be clarified in future standards. In some cases, records would even need to be kept for an indefinite duration, especially in relation to pest status. The TPG noted in particular that ISPM 8 does not provide indications on record keeping, and this should be considered at revision.

The TPG invited the SC to:

1. *Note* that the specific durations of record keeping in current ISPMs are appropriate to the different situations considered.
2. *Recommend* that, in future ISPMs, specific durations should be indicated where necessary, but do not need to be the same. The durations indicated in existing standards for similar records should nevertheless be taken into account when deciding on a duration.
3. *Note* that, where a specific duration does not need to be indicated, it could nevertheless be considered whether general indications related to record-keeping should be included. In particular, the duration of record keeping may be for an undetermined period, until new data is available, and this may need to be clarified in standards where necessary. Where the justification for measures relies on records, it may be necessary to maintain these for as long as needed as a justification of the measures.

4. *Recommend* that the indefinite duration of record keeping for pest records should be taken into account when revising ISPM 8.
5. *Note* that an explanatory note on the indefinite duration of record keeping for pest records will be added in the annotated glossary.

**Annex 9: TPG work plan 2013-2014****TPG WORK PLAN 2013-2014****Last update 2013-03-18**Table 1: regular tasksTable 2: one-off tasksTable 3: terms on the TPG work programme as subjectsTable 4: Chronological summary of deadlines**Table 1 - Regular tasks**

Regular tasks	Detailed task		Responsible	Deadline	Comments	
1-Meeting reports: preparation and update to SC	2012	Draft report to Steward and rapporteur	Secretariat	10-11-2012		
		Steward and rapporteur send back draft report	Steward & rapporteur	10-12-2012		
		Secretariat finalizes report and sends to TPG	Secretariat	12-12-2012		
		TPG review report	All	31-12-2012		
		Final report	Secretariat with steward/rapporteur	03-2013		
	2013	Draft report to Steward and rapporteur	Secretariat	20-03		
		Steward and rapporteur send back draft report	Steward & rapporteur	10-04		
		Secretariat finalizes report and sends to TPG and posts for SC	Secretariat	30-04		
		TPG review report	All	15-05		
		Final report	Secretariat with steward/rapporteur	30-04		
	To SC May 2013	Prepare update (incl. decisions) for Oct 2012 and Feb 2013 meetings for SC May 2013	Secretariat with steward	22-03-2013		
	2- Draft ISPMs in member consultation	2012 MC	Reactions to comments/consistency review integrated in tables: all drafts, and sent to stewards via Secretariat	Secretariat with steward	28-02-2013	
			Reactions on translation of terms sent to Secretariat for consideration at next translation phase	Secretariat	28-02-2013	
			Reactions to requests for new terms and definitions in member comments	Secretariat with steward	28-02-2013	In TPG report
2013MC		check accuracy of translation of definitions in draft ISPMs. Members receive draft definitions for their language	French, Spanish	03-03-2014		
		Proposals of translations for Chinese, Arabic and Russian in draft ISPMs (if any)	Russian, Chinese, Arabic	03-03-2014		

		Review for possible inconsistencies and consideration of comments	All prior to meeting	03-03-2014	
		Terms and consistency comments extracted	secretariat	10-12-2013	
		Reactions to comments/consistency review integrated in tables: all drafts, and sent to stewards via Secretariat	Secretariat with <b>steward</b>	After TPG 2014	
		Reactions on translation of terms sent to Secretariat for consideration at next translation phase	Secretariat	After TPG 2014	
		Reactions to requests for new terms and definitions in member comments	Secretariat with <b>steward</b>	After TPG 2014	
3. Early draft ISPMs going to SC May prior to MC	2013	General comments compiled and sent to stewards and SC	Secretariat with <b>steward</b>	28-02-2013	In TPG report
	2014	TPG to review the drafts		03-03-2013	TPG 2014
		General comments compiled and sent to stewards	Secretariat with <b>steward</b>	tbd	
4- Drafts ISPMs in Substantial concerns commenting period (July-end September)	2013 SCCP- Possible consultation by email on terms and inconsistencies		Secretariat	14-10-2013	
5- Work on individual terms, leading to proposed Amendments to the Glossary	2013- Volunteer sends draft meeting paper to Secretariat		As allocated in Table 3	31-12-2012	TPG 2013
	2013 Draft amendments 2013 completed based on discussions at Feb 2013, to SC		Secretariat, Steward	20-03-2013	
	2013 Draft amendments in member consultation (possibly)			07 to 12-2013	
	2013 Draft amendments and member comments considered by TPG		As per steps in task 2		TPG 2014
	2014 Volunteer sends draft meeting paper to Secretariat		As allocated in Table 3	31-12-2013	TPG 2014
	2014 Draft amendments completed based on discussions at March 2014, to SC			tbd	
6- Annotated glossary – (to be published every 3 years)	2013 (for publication)	Document for TPG taking account of adoptions etc since TPG 2010	Ian Smith	10-11-2012	TPG 2013
		Revising	Secretariat / Ian Smith	15-03-2013	
		TPG for final review 15-04 (1 month)		15-05-2013	
		SC for e-decision		30-05-2013	
	2014 (intermediate)	to prepare intermediate update based on outcome of CPM, SC etc.	Ian Smith	31-12-2013	
		To review intermediate update	All	03-2014	TPG 2014
7- Explanation of glossary terms	Members to identify before the meeting some glossary terms/definitions requiring further explanations (and not already explained in other places, such as the annotated glossary).		All to send to Secretariat	31-08-2013	TPG 2014
8- Review of membership	Annual review of membership to make recommendations to SC on new members needed			03-2014	TPG 2014

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

One-off tasks	Detailed task	Responsible	Deadline	Comments
9- Review of ISPMs for	General recommendations on consistency: yearly updates 2013 as needed	All prior to meeting	04-02-2013	TPG 2013

<b>consistency and style (other than in draft ISPMs)</b>			Secretariat and steward to SC	20-03-2013	in TPG report
	General recommendations on consistency: yearly updates 2014 as needed		All prior to meeting	01-03-2014	TPG 2014
			Secretariat and steward to SC	tbd	
	Procedure for consistency changes across standards, mechanisms, examples etc.		Secretariat, steward	31-12-2012	TPG 2013
			To SC	20-03-2013	
	ISPM 5	Finalize table to SC	Secretariat + steward	25-10-2012	To SC Nov 2012
	ISPM 9	Finalize table to SC	Secretariat + steward	25-10-2012	To SC Nov 2012
	ISPM 23	Finalize table to SC	Secretariat + steward + ENO	25-10-2012	To SC Nov 2012
	ISPM 25	Finalize table to SC	Secretariat + steward + IMS	25-10-2012	To SC Nov 2012
	ISPM 17	Finalize table to SC	Secretariat + steward + BM	25-10-2012	To SC Nov 2012
	Suppl. 2 to ISPM 5	Finalize table to SC	Secretariat + steward + AO	25-10-2012	To SC Nov 2012
	ISPM 16	Finalize table to SC	Secretariat + steward	25-10-2012	To SC Nov 2012
	ISPM 20	Finalize table to SC	Secretariat + steward	25-10-2012	To SC Nov 2012
Ongoing consistency review		All during TPG 2014		TPG 2014	
<b>10. Review of duration of record keeping in ISPMs</b>	Working document (doc TPG_2012_Oct_33 to be reviewed and recommendations developed for the SC		All during TPG 2013		TPG 2013
		TPG to SC	20-03-2013		
<b>11. ISO standard 704 on terminology</b>	Presentation by FAO terminology		Secretariat to request	03-2014	
<b>12. Taxonomic classification and coverage of plants</b>	Paper for consideration		Ian Smith	01-2013	TPG 2013
	Proposal to SC as part of the Amendments to the Glossary		Steward and secretariat	20-03-2013	

**Table 3 - Terms on the TPG work programme as subjects**

Deadline for preparation of papers for TPG 2014 is **31 December 2013** for all terms.

		Source of the proposal	volunteer for preparation	Comments	Summary outcome of TPG 2013 and next step
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	Paper discussed at TPG 2013 No agreement found on how the definition should be revised, report

		Source of the proposal	volunteer for preparation	Comments	Summary outcome of TPG 2013 and next step
				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> .	to SC May 2013, for decision on how to proceed.
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.	Report to SC May 2013 first, for decision on if and how to continue
3.	organism (2010-021), pest (2010-022), naturally occurring (2010-023)	TPG discussion 2009	Ian Smith	Review the three definitions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Report to SC May 2013: no change to pest</li> <li>- Deletion of organism and naturally occurring proposed in <i>Amendments to the glossary 2013</i></li> <li>- no change proposed to <i>pest</i>; propose to SC that removed from the list of topics.</li> </ul>
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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Reconsider in Feb 2013 based on Oct 2012 report</li> <li>- propose to SC that definition not needed and ask that removed from the list of topics. No other change needed</li> </ul>
5.	phytosanitary status (2010-004)	TPG discussion 2010 Added SC November 2010	Ebbe Nordbo  Beatriz Melcho To be prepared for 2014 meeting	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.  Definition for phytosanitary status (of a consignment accompanied by a PC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- proposed actions added to the paper on consistency across standards</li> <li>- added general consistency recommendation</li> <li>- definition for phytosanitary status (of a consignment accompanied by a PC)</li> </ul>
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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Revised def in <i>Amendments 2013</i></li> <li>- Inform SC May 2013 that revision needed in 3 ISPMs.</li> <li>- add to general consistency recommendations</li> </ul>
7.	presence (2010-025),	TPG discussion 2009	Ebbe Nordbo and	To review the use in English ISPMs and in languages to make sure consistent.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Deletion of occurrence in</li> </ul>

		Source of the proposal	volunteer for preparation	Comments	Summary outcome of TPG 2013 and next step
	occurrence (2010-026)		Ian Smith	TPG 2010 discussed. Outcome detailed in the 2010 report	amendments to the glossary 2013 - add general consistency recommendation - revision of definitions containing occur in <i>Amendments to the glossary</i> - propose to SC that <i>presence</i> be deleted from list of topics
8.	re-export (of a consignment) (2010-024) consignment in transit (2010-039)	TPG discussion 2009  Back to TPG from SC May 2011	Andrei Orłinski	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> .	Consignment in transit: deletion (Amendments 2013)  Re-export of a consignment - Deletion (Amendments 2013).
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	- deletion (amendments 2013) - add general consistency recommendation
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.	- All for revision in amendments 2013
11.	systems approach (2010-002)	TPG discussion 2010 Added SC November	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	- Revision in amendments 2013 - TPG agree that not needed to

		Source of the proposal	volunteer for preparation	Comments	Summary outcome of TPG 2013 and next step
		2010		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]	define integrated measures (details to TPG report).
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)	- revision in Amendments 2013 (as sent for MC in 2011)
13.	contaminating pest (2012-001)	Added SC April 2012	Ian Smith	Definition to be reviewed to make sure that it covers the concepts normally expressed by a hitch-hiker pest. (see report of 2011 TPG meeting)	- deletion in Amendments 2013
14.	endangered area (2012-002), protected area (2012-003)	Added SC April 2012	Ian Smith	to consider whether the current definitions should be revised to be 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)	- deletion of <i>protected area</i> in Amendments 2013 - propose to SC that <i>endangered area</i> be deleted from list of topics
15.	production site (2012-004)	Added SC April 2012	Ian Smith	To clarify the ambiguity linked to place of production (see report of 2011 TPG meeting)	- new definition in Amendments 2013 - consequential: change to place of production and pest-free production site (both in Amendments 2013)
16.	tolerance level (2012-005)	TPFF 2010. Added SC April 2012	Secretariat	To be considered based on a draft revised definition proposed by the TPFF.	SC May 2013 to decide whether to add to the amendments 2013 or not revise for the moment (details and proposed def in report).
17.	quarantine area (2012-006)	TPFF 2011. Added SC April 2012	Secretariat	To be considered based on a draft revised definition proposed by the TPFF.	- Report to SC (details in report) - ask SC that subject becomes pending until ISPM 8 revised
18.	cut flowers and branches (2012-007)	Added SC April 2012	Shaza Omar	-Discussed by the SC in relation to the specification for the topic of <i>International movement of cut flowers and branches</i> . The SC asked the TPG to review the current definition of cut flowers and branches, in particular, to state clearly in the definition of cut flowers and branches that they: -are for decorative/ornamental purposes only; -are not intended for propagation;	- revision in Amendments 2013

		Source of the proposal	volunteer for preparation	Comments	Summary outcome of TPG 2013 and next step
				-include fruit and other propagules for ornamental use. -Additional point of discussion in the SC: in most cases, it is not branches that are traded, but only the foliage; however, this is covered in the definition of cut flowers and branches	
19.	pest list (2012-014)	SC November 2012	Shaza Omar To be prepared for 2014 meeting	To make recommendations on how to resolve the confusion around the use of the term pest list. SC concerns presented in TPG_2013_Feb_09. Further discussion in TPG February meeting report.	To be prepared for 2014 meeting
<b>Terms to be proposed to the SC May 2013, for addition to the List of Topics for IPPC Standards (from October 2012 and February 2013 meetings)</b>					
20.	Use of the terms authorize, accredit, certify		John Hedley John Hedley Secretariat (if added by SC May 2013)	To review the use of these terms in ISPMs and draft ISPMs, as well as terminology as used in other domains, and make proposal on use of terms. -Analyse use of terms in ISPMs -Enquire on terminology from maritime area - Investigate harmonized terminology in other domains  See details in February 2013 report	Propose addition to the List of topics to SC May 2013. Wait for outcome of the SC.
21.	wood		Andrei Orlinski (if added by SC May 2013)	See details in February 2013 report	Propose addition to the List of topics to SC May 2013. Wait for outcome of the SC.
22.	bark		Andrei Orlinski (if added by SC May 2013)	See details in February 2013 report	Propose addition to the List of topics to SC May 2013. Wait for outcome of the SC.
23.	kiln-drying		Andrei Orlinski (if added by SC May 2013)	Details in Oct 2012 TPG report	Propose addition to the List of topics to SC May 2013. Wait for outcome of the SC.
24.	trading partners		Ian Smith (if added by SC May 2013)	Details in Oct 2012 TPG report	Propose addition to the List of topics to SC May 2013. Wait for outcome of the SC.
25.	phytosanitary security (of a consignment)		Ebbe Nordbo (if added by SC May 2013)	Details in Oct 2012 TPG report	Propose addition to the List of topics to SC May 2013. Wait for outcome of the SC.
26.	visual examination		Shaza Omar (if added by SC May 2013)	Details in Oct 2012 TPG report	Propose addition to the List of topics to SC May 2013. Wait for outcome of the SC.
27.	mark		Secretariat (if added by SC May 2013)	To remove “phytosanitary status” in the definition. Proposal already exists. To be extracted from relevant document	Propose addition to the List of topics to SC May 2013. Wait for

		Source of the proposal	volunteer for preparation	Comments	Summary outcome of TPG 2013 and next step
					outcome of the SC.
<b>Terms related to consistency</b>					
28.	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. Proposals regarding the following terms sent back by SC and proposals made at TPG 2012:: <i>kiln-drying</i> , <i>phytosanitary measure</i> , <i>phytosanitary regulation</i> and <i>plant quarantine</i>	- kiln-drying (see 19 above), - phytosanitary measure, phytosanitary regulation and plant quarantine : changes proposed as part of consistency of ISPM 5 to Nov 2012 SC
29.	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	

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

2013-05-15	Table 1, activity 1	TPG members to comment on draft report of the February 2013 meeting
2013-05-15	Table 1, activity 6	TPG members to review annotated glossary
2013-10-31	Table 1, activity 4	Members to send comments on draft ISPMs in Substantial Concerns Commenting Period (July-September 2013) (if necessary)
2013-12-31	Table 1, activity 5	Members to send proposals on individual terms on the work plan
2014-03-03	Table 1, activity 3	TPG members to review early draft ISPMs (draft definitions and consistency)
2014-03-03	Table 2, activity 9	Consider the need for updates to the General recommendations on consistency
2014-08-31	Table 1, activity 7	Members to identify before the meeting glossary terms/definitions requiring further explanations (and not already explained in other places, such as the annotated glossary).

**Annex 10: TPG medium term plan****TPG MEDIUM TERM PLAN**

The TPG updated its *medium term plan as developed in 2010 and noted by the SC*.

SC query: “review their work programme and the continued need for their work, and develop a medium term plan for their work, identify key areas that may need addressing, set a completion date if possible, and report back to the SC.”

- Continued need for TPG work: As long as standards are developed, in relation to terms and definition, consistency of standards and any issue necessitating input relating to definitions.
- Key areas that may need addressing: The TPG considers that the key area for its work is the consideration of draft ISPMs (new terms and definitions, consistency in the use of terms, and review of translations of terms and definitions).
- TPG activities and medium term plan/completion date/comments:

Draft ISPMs for member consultation: - consideration of member comments on terms, - review of drafts for consistency in the use of terms - review of translations of terms/definitions	continuing	
Draft ISPMs at earlier stages of development - consideration of draft definitions (study of definitions and input translation of terms and definitions) - review of drafts for consistency in the use of terms	continuing	
Development and revision of terms and definitions	continuing	- subjects on the work plan as proposed in February 2013
Annotated glossary - yearly updates in TPG, including explanations as needed - finalization for publication every three years	continuing	Next publication 2013
Review of adopted ISPMs for consistency in the use of terms: - Main consistency programme, i.e. ISPMs identified in 2008 (ISPMs 5, 20, 23, 25, 9, 16, 17, supp 2 to ISPM5)  - later adjustments as needed (standard-by-standard or across standards)  - procedures  - <i>General recommendations on consistency</i>  - New process for consistency across standards	2013  continuing  2010  Ongoing  2013	Expected to terminate at CPM-8.  to address necessary changes as needed  providing the frame of the consistency study To be consolidated as needed at each meeting To consider adjustments across standards as needed
Work of the TPG in relation to languages: - general (e.g. definitions) - Review of glossary in languages	- continuing - continuing	Linked to draft ISPMs When TPG has members for all languages