



Rome, Italy
15-19 October 2012

Technical Panel for the Glossary October, 2012

REPORT



Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

CONTENTS

1.	Opening of the meeting	5
1.1	Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat	5
1.2	Introductions	5
1.3	Brief presentation on the IPPC, TPG and roles of participants	5
1.4	Selection of the Chair and Rapporteur	5
1.5	Review and adoption of the agenda	5
1.6	Current specifications: TP5 (TPG) (2006) and Specification 1 (Review and updating of ISPM 5) (2001)	5
1.7	TPG activities in relation to languages.....	5
2.	Administrative Matters	8
3.	Reports.....	8
3.1	Previous meetings of the TPG (Oct. 2010 and Nov. 2011).....	8
3.2	Extracts from other meeting reports of relevance to the TPG (SC Nov 2010, CPM-6, SC May 2011, SC Nov 2011; CPM-7, SC May 2012).....	8
3.3	Changes to the standard setting process and implications for TPG work	8
3.4	Current work plan	9
4.	Review relating to draft ISPMs sent for member consultation in 2012 (1 July-20 October): consistency in the use of terms	9
4.1	<i>Determination of host status of fruits and vegetables to fruit fly (Tephritidae) infestation</i> (2006-031).....	9
4.2	Appendix 1 (<i>Electronic certification</i>) to ISPM 12:2011 (<i>Phytosanitary certificates</i>) (2006-003).....	10
4.3	Draft Annex (<i>Establishment of fruit fly quarantine areas within a pest free area in the event of an outbreak</i>) to ISPM 26:2006 (<i>Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)</i>) (2009-007).....	10
4.4	Draft Annex (Diagnostic protocol for <i>Guignardia citricarpa</i> Kiely) to ISPM 27:2006 (<i>Diagnostic protocols for regulated pests</i>) (2004-023).....	11
4.5	Draft Annex (Diagnostic protocol for <i>Tilletia indica</i> Mitra) to ISPM 27:2006. (<i>Diagnostic protocols for regulated pests</i>) (2004-014).....	11
5.	Review relating to draft ISPMs under the substantial concerns commenting period (15 May-30 Sept.): member comments and consistency in the use of terms	11
5.1	Draft revision of Annex 1 (<i>Approved treatments associated with wood packaging material</i>) of ISPM 15:2009 (<i>Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade</i>)	11
5.2	Draft Annex 4 (<i>Pest risk analysis for plants as quarantine pests</i>) and core text changes to ISPM 11:2004 (<i>Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests</i>) (2005-001).....	12
6.	Consideration of new or revised terms/definitions	12
6.1	Subjects on the TPG work programme	12
6.1.1	<i>phytosanitary status</i> (2010-004).....	12
6.1.2	<i>occurrence</i> (2010-026) and <i>presence</i> (2010-025)	13
6.1.3	<i>point of entry</i> (2010-005)	14
6.1.4	<i>systems approach(es)</i> (2010-002)	15
6.1.5	<i>identity</i> (2011-001).....	16

6.1.6	<i>exclusion</i> (2010-008), <i>suppression</i> (2011-002), <i>eradication</i> (2011-003), <i>containment</i> (2011-004), <i>control</i> (2011-005)	17
6.1.7	<i>pest freedom</i> (2010-003)	18
6.1.8	<i>organism</i> (2010-021), <i>pest</i> (2010-022), <i>naturally occurring</i> (2010-023)	19
6.1.9	<i>restriction</i> (2010-027)	19
6.1.10	production site (2012-004)	20
6.1.11	<i>endangered area</i> (2012-002), <i>protected area</i> (2012-003), <i>controlled area</i>	20
6.1.12	<i>re-export</i> (of a <i>consignment</i>) (2010-024), <i>consignment in transit</i> (2010-039)	21
6.1.13	<i>quarantine station</i>	22
6.1.14	<i>tolerance level</i> (2012-005)	22
6.1.15	<i>quarantine area</i> (2012-006)	23
6.2	Advice on new or revised terms in other recent draft standards i.e. those going out for consultation next year.....	24
7.	Review of ISPMs for Consistency of Terms and Style	24
7.1	Background documents	24
7.2	Draft consistency tables	24
7.2.1	ISPM 23:2005 (<i>Guidelines for inspection</i>) and 7.2.2 ISPM 25:2006 (<i>Consignments in transit</i>).....	25
7.2.3	ISPM 5	25
7.2.4	ISPM 20:2004 (<i>Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system</i>).....	26
7.2.5	ISPM 16:2002 (<i>Regulated non-quarantine pests: concept and application</i>).....	26
7.2.6	ISPM 9:1998 (<i>Guidelines for pest eradication programmes</i>).....	26
7.2.7	ISPM 17:2002 (<i>Pest reporting</i>).....	27
7.2.8	Supplement 2 to ISPM 5 (<i>Guidelines on the understanding of potential economic importance and related terms including reference to environmental considerations</i>) ...	27
7.3	Additional proposals	27
8.	Annotated Glossary: 2011 and 2012 Amendments	28
9.	Explanation of Glossary Terms	28
10.	Review of Durations of Record Keeping in ISPMs.....	28
11.	Development of Brief Guidance on the Use of <i>should</i> , <i>shall</i> , <i>must</i> and <i>may</i> for the IPPC Style Guide for ISPMs	29
12.	TPG Work Plan, Medium Term Plan and Specifications	30
12.1	TPG work plan	30
12.2	Medium term plan	30
12.3	Specification TP5:2006 (<i>TPG</i>) and Specification 1:2001 (<i>Review and updating of ISPM 5</i>)	30
13.	Membership of the TPG	30
14.	Other issues.....	31
14.1	ISO standard on definitions.....	31
14.2	ISPM 5 on FAO terminology system.....	31
15.	Date and Venue of the Next Meeting	31
16.	Other business.....	32
17.	Close	32

APPENDIXES

Annex 1: Agenda.....33

Annex 2: Documents list36

Annex 3: Participants list38

Annex 4: TPG Consistency Suggestions.....40

Annex 5: Draft Amendments to the Glossary41

Annex 6: TPG Work Plan 2012-201351

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, especially the two new members, Ms Hong Ning (China) and Ms Shaza Omar (Egypt), respectively for Chinese and Arabic. Mr Mohammad Katbeh-Bader (Jordan) was unable to attend the meeting.

1.2 Introductions

The participants introduced themselves

1.3 Brief presentation on the IPPC, TPG and roles of participants

The Secretariat gave a brief introduction of the IPPC, the TPG and the roles of the participants.

1.4 Selection of the Chair and Rapporteur

Mr Hedley (New Zealand) was selected as Chairperson and Ms Melcho (Uruguay) as rapporteur.

1.5 Review and adoption of the agenda

The TPG adopted the agenda (Annex 1).

1.6 Current specifications: TP5 (TPG) (2006) and Specification 1 (Review and updating of ISPM 5) (2001)

The steward presented the current specifications for the TPG (Specification TP5) and noted that Specification 1¹ and TP5 would be discussed in further detail under agenda item 12.3.

1.7 TPG activities in relation to languages

The Secretariat presented the activity areas of the TPG in relation to languages as per its current terms of reference, past experience, current standard setting procedures and other elements². The Secretariat recalled that the Secretary of the IPPC is responsible for providing translations of ISPMs, and has delegated this authority to the FAO translation services. The TPG, as detailed in the Specification TP5, has three main roles in relation to languages:

- identify and avoid problems in translation when drafting definitions
- provide recommendations on the translation of draft terms and definitions (in particular at the time of member consultation)
- participate individually in the work of the relevant Language Review Group (LRG), which reviews ISPMs after adoption by CPM (the procedure for LRGs provides that the TPG member with expertise in that language should be invited to participate in the LRG).

The TPG requested clarification on the translation of draft ISPMs in the FAO languages in the revised standard setting process (presented under agenda item 3.3), and took note that due to limited resources the IPPC Secretariat sometimes limits the language versions during consultation periods. In addition, as the new substantial concerns commenting period (SCCP) has only formalized the ability for IPPC members to comment on draft ISPMs being presented to the SC and because the SC does not work with translated versions, these documents are in English.

Drafts recommended to the CPM for adoption are translated in all FAO languages. Under the revised standard setting procedure, contracting parties may only make formal objections 14 days prior to CPM. Once adopted, the standards may be reviewed by a LRG, if there is a LRG established for the specific language.

¹ TPG_2012_Oct_05

² TPG_2012_Oct_31

The TPG thought it important that the translations are improved where possible in the process. It was noted that for Arabic, Chinese and Russian this was possible mainly through the LRG process. One member emphasized that the current absence of member comments on translation or of a LRG does not mean that the adopted ISPM is correct in languages.

LRGs. The TPG noted the importance of LRGs in making sure that the adopted versions of ISPMs in languages are appropriate, in particular that the correct Glossary terminology is used, and enquired about the different LRGs. The Secretariat reported on the situation of the different languages:

- The LRGs for Spanish and French are in operation and function normally, except that the French LRG had not been able to meet the CPM established deadline.
- An LRG for Chinese had been created in 2012, but had not responded yet despite numerous requests from the Secretariat.
- An LRG for Russian was created and operated in 2011, but had not been active in 2012 because the coordinator had left. A replacement was being sought. The TPG member for the Russian language expressed concerns that the standards adopted in 2012 had not been reviewed by a LRG.
- There is no Arabic LRG. The TPG member for the Arabic language noted that there are regional variations in the terms used.

The Secretariat emphasized that although LRGs operate independently, they still require significant oversight by the Secretariat in terms of the work necessary to process the drafts and ensuring liaison with the different groups involved in the process. In the future, the Secretariat may also have to pay for the involvement of the FAO Translation Service in this process. This may impact the possibility to continue with the involvement of LRGs as these groups were set up to be cost neutral to the IPPC Secretariat.

The TPG insisted nevertheless that LRGs are the only mechanism by which IPPC members can ensure that ISPMs in languages, and the terminology used, are correct, and that such a review was therefore important. Proposals to improve the system were discussed.

The TPG expressed surprise to learn that not all languages benefited from an LRG. One member thought that IPPC members may not understand the LRG procedure, where one person is designated as the coordinator. They felt it should be relatively straightforward to create an LRG. The Secretariat noted that the CPM had adopted the procedure and that the Secretariat posts the related information on the IPP (<https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=1110770>), so efforts had been made to ensure all interested parties were informed.

The TPG noted that LRGs operate with a two-month deadline. This is a challenge for their coordinators who have to obtain comments and integrate them in that short period. The Secretariat noted that this period allows the Secretariat to process the LRG versions of ISPMs when the work load is less and allows that the revised standards in languages are published in time for the next CPM to note the changes. TPG members generally supported that it was more important to have correct standards than to have them available quickly. The time period for LRG review could be extended until the text is considered correct. The Secretariat noted that changing this time period would need a change of the CPM adopted procedure.

One member proposed that it should be possible to correct the standards whenever mistakes in translations are detected. However, the Secretariat noted that this would be complicated. In addition, it was also not straightforward for some FAO languages, where regional variations are very important and one cannot rely on the suggestion of one country.

Improving translation prior to the standards being presented for adoption. Some members were concerned that there is no automatic review of language versions until after adoption, and only if a LRG is created. The TPG suggested that translations should be improved before being presented for adoption at CPM, in particular to make sure that the correct terminology is used.

If language versions of draft ISPMs are made available for member consultation (MC), IPPC members are able to provide comments on translations.

Several members noted that some IPPC members prepare their comments based on the English versions in order to provide substantial and technical comments. The Secretariat added that translation comments are sometimes received for some languages but not often for others. The TPG proposed that a note could be made at MC to invite IPPC members to review translations of draft ISPMs.

One member proposed that the TPG should look at all translation comments. The Secretariat noted that the TPG could focus on translation issues that are fundamental, i.e. that of draft terms and definitions, and the correct use of Glossary terms in language versions was the responsibility of the IPPC Secretariat.

If language versions of draft ISPMs are not made available for consultation, there could nevertheless be ways of improving the translations:

- When draft ISPMs are translated for the purpose of regional workshops, these translations could be provided to FAO translators as guidance when the ISPMs were officially sent for translation.
- The Secretariat noted that IPPC members could also include translation comments in OCS even if that language version was not available because translation comments are not restricted to the language versions posted; members would simply have to relate their comment to the corresponding paragraph number.
- The TPG could be involved in the translation of draft terms and definitions, as for French and Spanish. It was proposed that TPG members for Arabic, Chinese and Russian, could, if they wished so, propose draft translations of draft terms and definitions. These could be provided to translators as guidance when the drafts were sent for translation (i.e. once approved by the SC for presentation to CPM for adoption).

The TPG:

- (1) *invited* the TPG members for Arabic, Chinese and Russian to provide, if they wished so, translation of draft terms and definitions in the draft ISPMs under member consultation (see *Determination of host status of fruits and vegetables to fruit fly (Tephritidae) infestation (2006-031)*) for the February 2013 TPG meeting.

Particular situation of the Russian standards. The member for the Russian language recalled that the IPPC and the first 34 ISPMs had been informally translated by EPPO, relying on the input of phytosanitary experts. Many of these ISPMs are used in Russian-speaking countries. These Russian versions were used by the FAO Translation Service when they began translating the ISPMs into Russian, after Russian became an official FAO language, to be presented to CPM-8 (2013). He was concerned that FAO translators are not experts in phytosanitary matters and may focus on other aspects. This process may lead to two versions of the same ISPM, the phytosanitary experts' version currently in use in Russian-speaking country, and the FAO translators' version. The Secretariat corrected him stating that only ISPMs adopted by the CPM were considered official. He also noted that the cooperation established between the FAO Translation Services, EPPO and Russia at the time of the review of the IPPC and of ISPM 5 in Russian was excellent. However, this process was not followed for the remainder of the translations. The Secretariat noted that the ISPMs that will be presented for adoption at CPM-8 (2013) can be reviewed by the Russian LRG, if active.

In relation to the direct tasks of the TPG, the SC is invited to:

- (2) *note* that the TPG members for the Arabic, Chinese and Russian languages may provide translations of new and revised terms and definitions in draft ISPMs submitted to the 150-days MC period, as guidance for the FAO Translation Services at later stages in the process. This would first be attempted for the draft ISPMs under member consultation in 2012, with translations to be provided at the 2013 TPG meeting.
- (3) *consider* further the proposals below to improve the versions of ISPMs in languages, and in particular the use of the correct terminology:

- . In the documents accompanying drafts for the 150-days MC, the Secretariat could remind CPM members that they have the possibility to review versions in their language against the English one.
- . Point out to members that LRGs could also review the drafts during member consultation (without Secretariat's input), and input comments into OCS through their national contact point.
- . An extension of the period for LRGs to review adopted standards could be proposed, and recommendation be made to the CPM to change the LRG procedure accordingly.
- . Unofficial language versions of draft ISPMs as prepared for use in the regional workshops could be provided to the FAO Translation Services for guidance.

2. Administrative Matters

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

3. Reports

3.1 Previous meetings of the TPG (Oct. 2010 and Nov. 2011)

The report of the 2010 and 2011 meetings³ were presented for information. There was no comment.

3.2 Extracts from other meeting reports of relevance to the TPG (SC Nov 2010, CPM-6, SC May 2011, SC Nov 2011; CPM-7, SC May 2012)

The Secretariat highlighted points of interest from the reports of the SC and CPM since November 2010⁴. In particular, it was noted that the Cartagena Protocol had expressed interest in a document explaining its terminology in relation to the Glossary, as had been done with CBD terminology in Appendix 1 of ISPM 5 (2009, *Terminology of the Convention on Biological Diversity in relation to the Glossary of Phytosanitary Terms*), and may send a request to the Secretariat on this matter. Finally, the term *pest list* may be added by the SC to the List of Topics for IPPC Standards and sent to the TPG for consideration. The TPG had no comment.

3.3 Changes to the standard setting process and implications for TPG work

The Secretariat presented the changes to the standard setting process as adopted by CPM-7 (2012), and highlighted some implications for the TPG. Implementation was being phased in, and the implementation would be discussed by the SC in November 2012. In particular, it was noted that the 150-days MC in future years would be taking place from 1 July to the end of November. Because the review of draft ISPMs after MC, for consistency and to make recommendations in relation to member comments on terms, is a major task for the TPG, the TPG meetings would be moved to the beginning of the year (between the end of the MC and the SC meeting in May). The TPG discussed the timing of the development of ISPMs in the new procedure. It also discussed the implications of the new system for translation of draft ISPMs in FAO languages, and this is reported under agenda item 1.7. The Secretariat noted a few uncertainties which may have implications for TPG-related items:

- "Submissions [of topics] should be accompanied with a draft specification, a literature review and justification that the proposed topic meets the CPM-approved criteria for topics". It is assumed that terms would be accompanied by a simple justification, but this still had to be confirmed
- "The SC should be encouraged to assign a lead steward and one or two assistants for each topic." Would there be assistant stewards for the TPG?

³ <https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=1110712>

⁴ TPG_2012_Oct_21Rev.1

- “All draft ISPMs presented to the CPM are subject to a formal objection”. For individual terms and definitions assembled in the *Amendments to the Glossary*, it is not specified whether the whole document or individual terms and definitions will be subject to formal objections?

3.4 Current work plan

The Secretariat presented the 2011-2012 work plan⁵. The 2012-2013 work plan was discussed under agenda item 12.

4. Review relating to draft ISPMs sent for member consultation in 2012 (1 July-20 October): consistency in the use of terms

The TPG normally reviews member comments on terminology for all draft ISPMs sent for consultation and makes recommendations on consistency in the use of terms in those drafts. Because the MC in 2012 closes only on 20 October, and therefore member comments were not available at the time of this meeting, the steward noted that the detailed review of draft ISPMs in relation to member comments and consistency would be done at the next meeting in February 2013. He invited TPG members to discuss in general each draft to identify any major issues, if any.

4.1 Determination of host status of fruits and vegetables to fruit fly (*Tephritidae*) infestation (2006-031)⁶

The following issues were raised and will be reconsidered at the next TPG meeting when making recommendations on member comments on terminology and on consistency:

- The current title refers to “host status ...to fruit fly infestation”. *Host status* relates to the fruit fly and not to the infestation. One member noted that the current formulation is not correct in English, and that it would be better not to mention *infestation*. A possible alternative would be *Determination of host status of fruits and vegetables for fruit flies*. Similar adjustments would have to be made in the text, with regards to *host status to the infestation*, or *host status of the commodity*.
- *cultivar* is wrongly translated in the Spanish version of definitions.
- The definition of *host status* uses the wording *condition of a plant as a host*. *Suitability of a plant as a host* would express the concept better, because *condition* is very broad.
- The definitions of *natural host* and *non-natural host* refer to *plant species*. This is confusing because the draft relates to *fruits and vegetables*. One member recalled that, in SC discussions, *plant species* had been chosen because normally one refers to a *plant species as a host*, and not to individual parts of plants; i.e. the plant species is the host, but the pest may attack a specific part of the plant, such as the fruit. However, several members noted that, given that these definitions are intended to apply to this ISPM only and will not be transferred to ISPM 5, rewording of the definitions could be considered to refer to *fruits and vegetables* instead of *plant species*.
- The definition of *host status* is intended to have a broader application than fruit flies, and to be transferred to ISPM 5. The TPG noted that the current definition, which refers only to *plant*, may not be broad enough.

⁵ TPG_2012_Oct_34

⁶ 2006-031_fruitflyhoststatus;TPG_2012_Oct_32

4.2 Appendix 1 (*Electronic certification*) to ISPM 12:2011 (*Phytosanitary certificates*) (2006-003)⁷

The following issues were raised and will be reconsidered at the next TPG meeting when making recommendations on member comments on terminology and on consistency:

- The draft uses the wording *electronic certification*, which is confusing; it may be understood to refer to the process as being electronic, while it is the outcome which is important (i.e. *electronic phytosanitary certificates*). It should be clarified that the process described leads to the production of *electronic phytosanitary certificates*. In addition, the terms *electronic certification* or *electronic phytosanitary certificates* should be used in full where this is meant (and not the shortening *certification* or *phytosanitary certificates*).
- One member noted that the SC had proposed that the term *electronic phytosanitary certificate* should be used throughout the text, instead of *electronic certification*, but this had not been done. Although the term *electronic certification* appears in a few instances in ISPM 12:2011, this was thought to be a mistake.
- It should be clarified that an *electronic phytosanitary certificate* is either a *phytosanitary certificate* or a *phytosanitary certificate for re-export*, as described in ISPM 12:2011, but is not a third type of phytosanitary certificate.
- Some terms are translated differently into Spanish in this draft appendix and in ISPM 12:2011.

4.3 Draft Annex (*Establishment of fruit fly quarantine areas within a pest free area in the event of an outbreak*) to ISPM 26:2006 (*Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)*) (2009-007)⁸

The following issues were raised, and will be reconsidered at the TPG next meeting when making recommendations on member comments on terminology and on consistency:

- The use of the terms *phytosanitary action*, *phytosanitary measure* and *safeguarding measure* should be reviewed. It was generally thought that the draft should refer to *actions*, although one member favoured *measures*. If *safeguarding measures* is not intended to have a specific meaning, it should be replaced by the appropriate Glossary term (probably *phytosanitary action*).
- Derivatives of the term *safeguard* are used throughout the draft (*safeguarded conditions*, *safeguarding measures*, *the safeguarding* (noun), *safeguarded* (verb), *safeguarded material*). This is unclear and difficult to translate. If *safeguarding*, *safeguarded* and derived terms have a specific meaning in this draft, they should be explained; otherwise these terms should be avoided.
- The draft seemed to refer to quarantine pests only, especially as it uses the term *quarantine area*, *phytosanitary measures*, etc. which are defined in relation to quarantine pests. However, in many instances, the fruit flies concerned would not be quarantine pests in the country establishing the pest free area. The measures would not be *phytosanitary measures* if they are decided by the exporting country in order to meet certain requirements in relation to quarantine pests of other countries. One member wondered if the understanding of *phytosanitary measures* in this draft is extended to cover measures taken for pests that are regulated by the importing countries, and not by the country implementing the PFA. Note: under another agenda item, the term *official measures* was used (see agenda item 6.6).
- The meaning of *endemic* in the draft should be clarified. It seems to be used in its “medical” sense, i.e. endemic (or happening continuously) versus epidemic, and not in the usual plant protection sense, i.e. endemic as native.
- Some technical terms used in 2.1 (such as *netting* and *fruit stripping*) are difficult to understand. For example, is *fruit stripping* used in this context to narrow the window of infestation, or to

⁷ 2006-003_electroniccertification

⁸ 2009-007_fruitflyquarantineareas

have less fruits and protect the remainder better, or to remove all fruits in order to create a non-infested area? One member noted that the standard is intended for fruit fly experts, who will not need additional explanation. However, another member argued that the text will have to be adopted by CPM, and that such terms may need to be explained; the draft could include a table defining such “internal” terms (including *safeguarding*, if this term is retained, *netting*, *fruit stripping*, etc.).

- *removal of quarantine status* should rather be *withdrawal of quarantine status*, but what is the meaning of quarantine status here? Does it mean the status of the quarantine area?
- The reference to ISPM 34:2010 (*Design and operation of post-entry quarantine stations for plants*) does not seem appropriate as ISPM 34:2010 relates to the design and operation of post-entry quarantine stations for plants.

4.4 Draft Annex (Diagnostic protocol for *Guignardia citricarpa* Kiely) to ISPM 27:2006 (Diagnostic protocols for regulated pests) (2004-023)⁹

The draft will be discussed in details at the next meeting in relation to member comments on terminology and consistency. No general issues were raised.

4.5 Draft Annex (Diagnostic protocol for *Tilletia indica* Mitra) to ISPM 27:2006. (Diagnostic protocols for regulated pests) (2004-014)¹⁰

The following issue was raised and will be reconsidered at the next meeting when making recommendations on member comments on terminology and on consistency:

- The draft contains a footnote explaining that the term *seeds* is used in the diagnostic protocol, but that it also represents *grain* in case a sample of a commodity class for seeds intended for processing or consumption is involved. It was felt that both terms should be used in the text where they both apply.

5. Review relating to draft ISPMs under the substantial concerns commenting period (15 May-30 Sept.): member comments and consistency in the use of terms

The Secretariat recalled that these standards had been sent for consultation following the SC review of the SC-7 draft (new substantial concerns commenting period). There were no member comments related to terminology, and the TPG therefore reviewed the drafts only for consistency in the use of terms.

5.1 Draft revision of Annex 1 (Approved treatments associated with wood packaging material) of ISPM 15:2009 (Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade)¹¹

The TPG made one proposal for consistency (see Annex 4), which will be presented to the SC in November 2012. In addition to the points mentioned in the annex, the TPG discussed the following:

- the acronym DH is proposed for dielectric treatment, but Annex 2 of ISPM 15:2009 on *the mark and its application* only mentions HT and MB. For consistency with the rest of the standard, one member thought that Annex 1 could use HT for dielectric treatment. Others noted that it would be useful to have a specific acronym for dielectric treatment and each treatment to be added in the future to Annex 1, and it is rather Annex 2 that should be revised to mention DH.

⁹ 2004-023_DP_Guignardia_citricarpa

¹⁰ 2004-014_DP_Tilletia_indica

¹¹ 2005-001_PRAPplants_as_pests

5.2 Draft Annex 4 (*Pest risk analysis for plants as quarantine pests*) and core text changes to ISPM 11:2004 (*Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests*) (2005-001)¹²

There was no consistency comment for this draft Annex 4 (*Pest risk analysis for plants as quarantine pests*). The TPG discussed the following:

- One member proposed that the Secretariat adjust the cross-references to other ISPMs in the original ISPM 11:2004 (e.g. to ISPM 2:2007 (*Framework for pest risk analysis*)) in order to refer to the recent versions of ISPMs. The Secretariat noted that such changes cannot be automatic as it should be verified whether the new version refers to the old cross-references in ISPM 11:2004. Such adjustments have been considered so far by the TPG on a case-by-case basis when reviewing individual ISPMs for consistency.
- Revocation of ISPMs should be considered. The Secretariat noted that a review had started to determine where cross-references in current ISPMs contained a specific cross-reference to previous versions of ISPMs. Then a plan needs to be put in place to adjust these specific cross-references to more generic references so the previous version(s) could be revoked. In some cases where some specific cross-references to an old version of an ISPM cannot be changed (e.g. as the concept no longer exists in the revised ISPM), the previous version would have to remain in force until the former ISPM was revised. Revocation of individual ISPMs would have to be approved by CPM. It was noted that access to previous versions of ISPMs was important if they were referred to in other ISPMs.

6. Consideration of new or revised terms/definitions

6.1 Subjects on the TPG work programme

The TPG discussed working documents prepared by its members regarding individual terms on the List of Topics for IPPC Standards. Details of the original proposal and reviews of the use of the term in ISPMs can be found in the TPG working papers. When the TPG decided to propose a new or revised term or definition, or the deletion of a term, justifications are included in the *Amendments to the Glossary* (Annex 5).

The draft *Amendments to the Glossary* (Annex 5) will be reviewed and completed with other terms at the February 2013 TPG meeting and submitted to the SC in May 2013 where the SC will consider approving them for MC in 2013.

6.1.1 *phytosanitary status* (2010-004)¹³

The TPG discussed the following:

- The term *phytosanitary status* is used in ISPMs in many different contexts, for example in relation to: *country, area, pest, host plant, regulated article, plant, wood packaging material, commodity, consignment* etc. *Phytosanitary status* has different meanings in different contexts, and what is meant is currently left open to interpretation. In some cases the term is used in place of a defined term, such as *pest status* (e.g. when used for a country or an area) or *pest risk* (e.g. when used for a pest or host plant). Where *phytosanitary status* relates to plants, wood packaging material, commodity or consignment, it has a complex meaning, seemingly relating to at least 3 aspects (whether the “object” is free from the pest, which growing conditions are applied; which verifications are applied); only in this case may there be a need for a definition (one member suggested that *regulatory status* be defined for these cases), or alternatively the individual ISPMs should explain what is meant. Finally, in the definition of *mark*, *phytosanitary status* is used in association with *regulated articles*, and the definition is unclear at present.
- It was noted in passing that the term *phytosanitary status* causes translation problems in several FAO languages.

¹² 2006-011_treatmentsISPM15

¹³ TPG_2012_Oct_13

- One member advocated a mechanism for making changes across all standards. In the case of *phytosanitary status*, depending on the context such cases could be: defining the term in some contexts; replacing it with relevant glossary terms in others; adjusting the text of ISPMs to explain what is meant. Several other members thought more important to establish guidance for future ISPMs, keeping in mind that it would not be possible in all cases to correct standards retrospectively for all terms that have been used wrongly in the past. The *general recommendations on consistency* (see agenda item 7.1) were being maintained in order to ensure correct use of terms in the future, and such cases could be added to them. However, others believed that, in cases such as *phytosanitary status*, where the use of the term presents a problem for the understanding of ISPMs, corrections should be made to adopted standards. This could be when a term leads to misunderstanding and confusion, is wrongly used across many ISPMs or covers different, unclear, concepts. One member noted that, instead of modifying adopted ISPMs, the specific problematic terms could be highlighted in the published ISPMs, with a cross-reference to an explanation provided in a separate document.
- There was no agreement on whether such cases should be considered only for future ISPMs or also for adopted ISPMs, and the steward suggested that a complete proposal giving options would be submitted to the SC in May 2013. The options could be: only making recommendations for the correct use of the term for future ISPMs; or also reviewing and adjusting adopted ISPMs in cases where the use of a term causes problems for the understanding of ISPMs and conflicts of meaning between ISPMs. In the latter case, a mechanism would be proposed.
- The case of *phytosanitary status* and possible solutions across ISPMs would be used as an example in the proposal to the SC. However, the working document on *phytosanitary status* was a preliminary analysis and will be adjusted before the next meeting in February 2013. In particular, a definition for *regulatory status* may be developed. Final proposals will then be integrated as examples in the proposal to the SC.
- The TPG agreed that definition of *mark* needs in any case to be clarified (irrespective of whether the SC agrees to a mechanism to make adjustments across standards), and *phytosanitary status* be replaced by what is meant.

The TPG:

- (4) *asked* the Secretariat and steward to draft a complete proposal and options for cases where the use of a term in ISPMs causes problems for the understanding of ISPMs and conflicts of meaning between ISPMs. The draft will be reviewed at the next meeting, to be presented to the SC in May 2013.
- (5) *asked* Mr Nordbo to adjust the paper on *phytosanitary status* for the February 2013 TPG meeting, and proposals will then be integrated as an example in the SC document above
- (6) *invited* the SC to add *mark* as a subject to the List of Topics for IPPC Standards.

6.1.2 occurrence (2010-026) and presence (2010-025)¹⁴

Following discussion, the term *occurrence* and its definition was proposed for deletion (see draft *Amendments to the Glossary* in Annex 5 for details). In addition to the points mentioned in the annex, the TPG discussed the following:

- One member thought that the current definition of *occurrence* implied a notion of establishment, and proposed that ISPMs should be reviewed in order to identify where the terms are used in relation to an established pest (i.e. where *occurrence* had been used) and other cases (i.e. where *presence* had been used). However, other members thought that this was not necessary as they believed there had been originally no intention to introduce a difference of meaning in the use of *presence* and *occurrence*. In English, *occurrence* implies a certain regularity, while *presence* implies a more long-term implication. When translated, at least into

¹⁴ TPG_2012_Oct_28; TPG_2012_Oct_29

- Spanish and French, they are both translated as *presence*, and this has apparently not caused difficulties. In addition, the expression *occurrence, outbreak and spread* was used in the IPPC.
- The use of *occurrence* nevertheless creates a problem as *occurrence* in everyday English language implies a one-off event, whereas *occurring* can be a long-term event. To avoid confusion, it would be preferable to not use the word *occurrence*. The TPG thought that this issue is not important enough to justify adjustments across standards (unlike as proposed in 6.2.1), but that the term *presence* should be preferred in the future. The TPG also supported that *presence* does not need to be defined.
 - The word *occurrence* is used in several glossary definitions. These would be reviewed at the next meeting to decide whether consequential changes to the proposed deletion of *occurrence* should be proposed as part of the *Amendments to the glossary*.
 - One member wondered whether the term *presence* could always be used instead of *occurrence*, especially in the case of a pest appearing in a PFA. Considering the pest as present would question the integrity of the PFA, while it was expected that the pest would be under contingency planning and would disappear again. In some cases, the pest would be *transient*, as not expected to establish. In other cases, it was not possible to say that the pest was not expected to establish (e.g. when it was originally present in the area, but was eliminated to create a PFA). One member noted that in that case the pest would be *present* again, until it is again eradicated. One member also noted that according to its definition, *transience* is a special case of non-permanent presence (i.e. not expected to establish), while ISPM 8:1998 (*Determination of pest status in an area*) describes categories of *transience* separately from *presence*. The TPG noted that ISPM 8:1998 was proposed for revision, and that the revised version should clearly describe the different categories of presence and absence.

The TPG:

- (7) *proposed* the deletion of *occurrence* in the *Amendments to the Glossary* to be presented to SC May 2013
- (8) *asked* that Mr Nordbo prepare proposals regarding other definitions containing the word *occurrence/occur* for the TPG February 2013 meeting to be considered as necessary as *consequential changes* to the proposed deletion of *occurrence*
- (9) *asked* the SC to *note* that the revised ISPM 8:1998 should include clear descriptions of the different pest status, including the concepts of *presence* and *absence*.
- (10) *decided* to note in the *general recommendations on consistency* that the use of *occurrence* should be avoided and the use of *presence* is preferred.

6.1.3 point of entry (2010-005)¹⁵

Following discussion, the definition of *point of entry* was proposed for revision (see draft *Amendments to the Glossary* in Annex 5 for details). In addition to the points mentioned in the annex, the TPG discussed the following:

- All instances of *point of entry* in ISPMs correspond to the definition of the term, except in ISPM 22:2005 (*Requirements for the establishment of areas of low pest prevalence*), ISPM 26:2006 (*Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)*) and ISPM 30:2008 (*Establishment of areas of low pest prevalence for fruit flies (Tephritidae)*). In these ISPMs, the term is used incorrectly and relates to entry points into an area of low pest prevalence (ALPP) or a PFA. It may be possible to use entrance to the area instead.
- The term *ports of entry* is sometimes used instead of *point of entry*. This is not important enough to justify adjustments across standards (unlike as proposed in 6.2.1), but the term *point of entry*, which is also used in the convention text, should be used correctly in the future.
- In relation to the two issues above, an item would be added to the *general recommendations on consistency*.

¹⁵ TPG_2012_Oct_14

- One member proposed the term *dry ports* to describe inland points of entry in the definition, but this was not retained.

The TPG:

- (11) *proposed* the revision of *point of entry* in the *Amendments to the Glossary* to be presented to SC May 2013
- (12) *asked* the SC to *note* that ISPM 22:2005 (*Requirements for the establishment of areas of low pest prevalence*), ISPM 26:2006 (*Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)*) and ISPM 30:2008 (*Establishment of areas of low pest prevalence for fruit flies (Tephritidae)*) need to be adjusted at a future revision to not use the term *point of entry*, where it relates to entry points into a PFA or an ALPP.
- (13) *decided* to note in the *general recommendation on consistency* to not use *port of entry* where point of entry is meant, and to not use point of entry for entrance points into a PFA or ALPP.

6.1.4 systems approach(es) (2010-002)¹⁶

Following discussion, the definition of *systems approach(es)* was proposed for revision (see draft *Amendments to the Glossary* in Annex 5 for details). In addition to the points mentioned in the annex, the TPG discussed the following:

- Although the term *systems approach* does not have a specific IPPC meaning, compared to other domains where the term is used, it is considered useful to have a definition because this concept is not always understood.
- The wording *achieve the appropriate level of protection against regulated pests* in the current definition presume the success of the systems approach. This is not part of the actual definition (see Annex 5) and was finally deleted. In any case the use of *appropriate level of protection* is to be avoided in ISPMs (see *General recommendations on consistency*). Prior to deleting the phrase, alternative wordings were considered, such as *meet phytosanitary import requirements*. However, a systems approach may be fixed by an importing country or proposed by the exporting country. Only in the first case would it aim at meeting phytosanitary import requirements; in the latter case it would be proposed as being equivalent to the phytosanitary import requirements.
- At its last meeting, the TPG had identified an inconsistency between the definition and the use of the term in ISPM 1:2006 (*Phytosanitary principles for the protection of plants and the application of phytosanitary measures in international trade*). It was noted that this was not really an inconsistency, but the definition in ISPM 5 was more detailed by stating that a systems approach is composed of at least two measures.
- The TPG discussed *integrated approach* versus *systems approach*, raised in particular in relation of ISPM 36:2012 (*Integrated measures for plants for planting*) on plants for planting. One member thought that a systems approach was used for categories of commodity that present low risk, such as fruits or cut flowers, but not for plants for planting, where additional procedures relating to the whole system are needed (i.e. integrated measures). Another member thought that integrated measures would be simpler than systems approaches, which could be very complex. However, it was finally concluded that the main difference between the two is that *integrated measures* may be dependant on each other, i.e. they may not have the necessary independence to be considered as systems approaches. There had been discussions previously on whether *integrated measures* should be defined in order to make a clear distinction between *systems approach* and *integrated measures*. However, the TPG believed that there is no need to define *integrated measures*, as it is described in details in ISPM 36:2012.

The TPG:

- (14) *proposed* the revision of *systems approach(es)* in the *Amendments to the Glossary* to be presented to SC May 2013.

¹⁶ TPG_2012_Oct_15

6.1.5 *identity* (2011-001)

The working document¹⁷ analysed the different uses of *identity* in ISPMs. The TPG discussed the following:

- *Identity* is used in many ISPMs in different contexts with its common English meaning, for example in relation to pests, pathways, stakeholders etc. and these uses do not cause difficulty. The meaning of *identity* is not clear in cases where it refers to a consignment. In some cases it seems to refer to the information on the phytosanitary certificate; in other cases it seems to overlap with *integrity* as defined (i.e. the composition of the consignment); in other cases, it seems to have a completely different meaning. The TPG discussed what is intended to be covered by the *identity* of a consignment.
- Could the *identity* of a consignment be the composition of the consignment (i.e. name, quantity) as described in the phytosanitary certificate? *Integrity* would then be the maintenance of the *identity* of the consignment. However, although the text of ISPM 12:2011 seems to refer only to the composition of the consignment when it relates to identity, this seems too restrictive. For example, if a consignment of pot plants is described as containing 200 chrysanthemum plants, and 100 are removed and replaced, the consignment has the same composition but a different *identity*. The *identity* would be the same if the consignment contains the original plants. *Identity* is therefore probably not limited to the composition of the consignment, although the *identity* of the plants (name) and the quantity are part of the consignment *identity*.
- The phytosanitary certificate includes other information in addition to the composition, such as the countries of origin and destination, additional declarations, various elements indicating that measures have been applied, phytosanitary certificate number.
- Could the *identity* of a consignment simply be the phytosanitary certificate number, which establishes a link between the consignment and all information on the phytosanitary certificate? However, if a consignment is re-exported with its original phytosanitary certificate, the identity of the consignment would change as the country of destination changes, but the phytosanitary certificate number would remain the same. It was felt that the country of destination is part of the consignment identity, which changes at re-export; the phytosanitary certificate number may therefore not be sufficient to describe the identity of the consignment.
- The TPG felt that the *identity* of the consignment probably includes the countries of origin and destination, as well as probably the exporter, consignee, number of original packages, distinguished marks, origin, conveyances etc. The *identity* would also include the phytosanitary conditions described on the phytosanitary certificate, i.e. information given on how the plants were grown, or treated and sent out to be accepted. It was noted that, with this understanding *identity* covered all information on the phytosanitary certificate (and country of destination), the term *identity* had been used wrongly in some ISPMs.
- A provisional definition could be *identity of the consignment. Description of the consignment specified on the phytosanitary certificate*, although this may not cover the case of re-export mentioned above.
- Would *integrity* be the maintenance of the composition of the consignment as in its current definition, or the maintenance of the *identity* of the consignment? The main purpose of *integrity* checks is to verify that the composition has not been changed, so the definition may be appropriate as it is. One member noted that *integrity* checks would not include phytosanitary conditions, unlike *identity* of the consignment. For example, if a consignment of plants for planting remains during six months in a glasshouse in the importing country, the *integrity* of the consignment is maintained, but its *identity* has changed, i.e. the consignment does not correspond to the phytosanitary certificate anymore. This gives another understanding of *identity*, and if so, the definition above may not be sufficient.
- In Russian, translating the word *identity* is very difficult. A better word should be found. However, it was noted that the terms is already used in many ISPMs.

¹⁷ TPG_2012_Oct_18

- The TPG concluded that one possibility was to consider *identity* as related to the information on the phytosanitary certificate. If *identity* was interpreted in this way, this may have consequences for ISPM 12:2011 and other ISPMs. ISPMs would first need to be reviewed with this understanding of *identity*, to see how it fits with the current uses of the term and possibly suggest another word or further explanations in certain ISPMs. Following this review, a definition may then be considered.

The TPG:

- (15) *invited* the SC to discuss the above, before pursuing it further, and validate the approach proposed, i.e. that the TPG:
- . reconsiders the use of *identity* (of a *consignment*) in ISPMs with the understanding that the *identity* of a *consignment* is equivalent to the information on the phytosanitary certificate
 - . envisages how to change the standards concerned to clarify instances of *identity*
 - . considers whether a definition of *identity* is needed.

6.1.6 *exclusion* (2010-008), *suppression* (2011-002), *eradication* (2011-003), *containment* (2011-004), *control* (2011-005)¹⁸

The terms *exclusion*, *suppression*, *eradication*, *containment*, *control* were discussed together as they are related. Following discussion, the definitions of *suppression*, *eradication*, *containment* and *control* were proposed for revision (see Annex 5 in the draft *Amendments to the Glossary* for details), and the definition of *exclusion* proposed for addition. In addition to the points mentioned in Annex 5, the TPG discussed the following:

Exclusion

- The definition of *phytosanitary measures* links these to *regulated pests* only. In relation to the use of *official measures* versus *phytosanitary measures* in the definitions under study, one member noted that the new strategic directions of the IPPC now include broad issues, such as food security. It was therefore positive to use terms that do not refer only to plant quarantine, although the IPPC still mostly deals with quarantine pests. In addition, the term *official measures* could be used more widely in ISPMs where there is no need to limit measures to regulated pests.
- Different alternative wordings to *prevent the introduction of a pest into an area* were envisaged. *To maintain pest freedom in an area* and *to prevent introduction into a pest free area* were felt to be too restrictive because exclusion also applies in situations of low pest prevalence, or for areas where the pest is not widely distributed and under official control.
- *To maintain the current pest status* was also discussed. *Introduction* in the current wording implies that the pest is not present in the area, while *maintaining pest status* would allow covering situations of low pest prevalence and not widely distributed under official control. However, it was noted that exclusion relates only to a limited number of the pest status described in ISPM 8:1998, i.e. only to absence, limited distribution or low prevalence. *Pest status* was therefore too broad, while *introduction* emphasized the main purpose of exclusion, i.e. to prevent the pest from entering an area. The wording *to prevent the introduction of a pest into an area* was maintained.
- The existing uses of *exclusion* in ISPMs are compatible with the definition proposed. There was a possible borderline case in section 2 of ISPM 10:1999 (*Requirements for the establishment of pest free places of production and pest free production sites*) where *exclusion measures* relates to a pest free place of production, which may not be an area in the strictest sense.

Containment and eradication: no additional points were discussed.

¹⁸ TPG_2012_Oct_19

Suppression: It had been proposed that the word *population* in the definition be substituted with *incidence* because *population* and *reducing pest populations* is unclear in this context. However, other members noted that *incidence*, as defined, refers to “items” on which the pest is found (sample, consignment, field or other defined population) and not to the pest itself. The objective of *suppression* was to reduce the populations, and not its incidence. The wording *reducing pest populations* was therefore maintained.

Control: It had been proposed that *exclusion* be mentioned in *control*. However, this was not retained as *exclusion* is not a form for *control* as defined. In the case of *suppression*, *eradication* or *containment*, the pest is present in the area, while it may not be present in the area under *exclusion*. It had been proposed that the definition of *official control* also mentions *exclusion*, but this was not retained. The need for the definition of *control* was questioned. Several members believed that this definition was useful as shorthand for the concepts of suppression, containment or eradication, and to be used mostly in relation to regulated non quarantine pests and buffer zones.

The TPG:

(16) *proposed* the addition of *exclusion* and the revision of *suppression*, *eradication*, *containment* and *control* in the Amendments to the Glossary to be presented to the SC May 2013.

6.1.7 *pest freedom* (2010-003)¹⁹

The term *pest freedom* is used in a number of standards and two definitions were proposed for *pest freedom* (of a *consignment*) and *pest freedom* (of an *area*, *place of production*, *production site*, *field*), considering also that the terms *find free* and *free from* (of a *consignment*, *field* or *place of production*) are already defined in the Glossary. The TPG discussed the following:

- The TPG acknowledged two situations of *pest freedom* as implied by the existing and proposed definitions, i.e. for consignments and for areas. *Free from* (of a *consignment*, *field* or *place of production*) covers phytosanitary procedures that are applied in both situations, and is correct as defined.
- One member noted that the proposed definitions of *pest freedom* do not bring new elements to the existing definitions of *find free* and *free from* (of a *consignment*, *field* or *place of production*). It would seem redundant to have both the existing definitions and the proposed definitions.
- *Find free* is linked to inspection and is instantaneous; the definition mentions both consignments and areas, but establishing pest freedom for an area, place of production or production site is not instantaneous. It relies on more than one inspection, involves surveys, and implies that the situation is maintained. Consequently, the definition of *find free* seemed incorrect and the term should relate only to consignment.
- It was noted that there are also separate definitions for *pest free area*, *pest-free place of production* and *pest free production site*.
- One solution envisaged was to delete the current definition of *find free* and *free from* (of a *consignment*, *field* or *place of production*) and replace them by a new definition for *pest freedom of a consignment* (to cover consignments), and appropriate adjustments to the definitions of *pest free area*, *pest-free place of production* and *pest free production site* (to cover areas). The current definitions of *pest free area*, *pest-free place of production* and *pest free production site* do not include the concepts expressed in the definition of *free from*, and part of the definition of *free from* could be integrated in these definitions. This solution would ensure that the term *pest freedom*, as used in standards in relation to consignments, is defined, and that the terms related to areas are clarified.
- However, some members noted that the definitions of *find free* and *free from* (of a *consignment*, *field* or *place of production*) are still broadly acceptable, and do not justify revision. It may be possible to retain these definitions, and not define *pest freedom of a consignment* (as it is

¹⁹ TPG_2012_Oct_20

- covered already in *find free* and *free from*), but to revise the definitions of *pest free area*, *pest-free place of production* and *pest free production site* in relation to freedom.
- These three definitions also use the word *occur*. This may need to be considered if the definitions are revised (see agenda item 6.1.2).
 - It was also noted that *pest freedom* is difficult to translate, at least in Spanish and French.
 - Note: a revision of *pest free production site* was proposed as an amendment to the glossary under agenda item 6.10. The final proposal for *pest free production site* should be consolidated at the next meeting considering discussions under 6.1.7 and 6.1.10.

No final proposal was made but the TPG will reconsider this issue at its next meeting.

6.1.8 *organism* (2010-021), *pest* (2010-022), *naturally occurring* (2010-023)²⁰

Following discussion, the definitions of *organism* and *naturally occurring* were proposed for deletion (see draft *Amendments to the Glossary* in Annex 5 for details), and the definition of *pest* would remain unchanged. In addition to the points mentioned in the Annex 5, the TPG discussed the following:

- In the IPPC, only *pest* was originally defined and referred clearly to species, biotypes or strains, i.e. the whole taxon; it is not intended to refer to individuals. *Organism* was included in the glossary in relation to ISPM 3:2005 (*Guidelines for the export, shipment, import and release of biological control agents and other beneficial organisms*), and intended to refer to individuals. It was used in the context of control methods, such as sterilization, where it is important to refer to individuals. ISPM 2:2007 uses *organism* and not making clear that it refers to a species, not an individual. Finally, the words *biotic entity* used in the definition of *organism* are not clearly defined as individual or species, and could mean either.
- A proposal was made to modify the definitions of *organism* and revise the definition of *pest* to refer to an organism. However, it was noted that *pest* is defined in the IPPC, and changes would need an agreed interpretation. It was felt that *pest* is an essential definition for the IPPC, and is suitable in its current state.
- It was noted that *naturally occurring* could be deleted in the definition of *organisms* (if that definition was to be retained despite the recommendation of TPG); for example, living modified organisms are organisms but not naturally occurring.

The TPG:

- (17) *proposed* the deletion of *organism* and *naturally occurring* in the *Amendments to the Glossary* to be presented to SC May 2013.

6.1.9 *restriction* (2010-027)²¹

Following discussion, the definition of *restriction* was proposed for deletion (see draft *Amendments to the Glossary* in Annex 5 for details). In addition to the points mentioned in the annex, the TPG discussed the following:

- *Restrictions* is used according to its definition in some cases, but also in other situations which do not fit the definition. In the former case, it would always be possible to reword the text by reference to *phytosanitary import requirements*. The approved Glossary term should be used. This was not important enough to adjust adopted standards, but a recommendation could be made for future ISPMs.
- As defined in the Glossary, prohibitions and restrictions are phytosanitary regulations, whereas requirements, as phytosanitary import requirements, are phytosanitary measures. However, the definition of *restriction* refers to specific requirements.

²⁰ TPG_2012_Oct_22

²¹ TPG_2012_Oct_23

The TPG:

- (18) *proposed* the deletion of *restriction* in the *Amendments to the Glossary* to be presented to SC May 2013.
- (19) *decided* to note in the *general recommendation on consistency* to use *phytosanitary import requirements* where it is meant, and not *restriction*.

6.1.10 production site (2012-004)²²

Following discussion, the definition of *production site* was proposed for addition and the definitions of *pest free production site* and *place of production* would be modified as consequential changes (see draft *Amendments to the Glossary* in Annex 5 for details). In addition to the points mentioned in Annex 5, the TPG discussed the following:

- the final proposal for *pest free production site* should be consolidated at the next meeting taking into account the discussion on pest freedom (see agenda item 6.1.7).

The TPG:

- (20) *proposed* the addition of *production site* and consequential changes to the definitions of *pest free production site* and *place of production* in the *Amendments to the Glossary* to be presented to SC May 2013.
- (21) *proposed* that *pest free production site* be consolidated at the next meeting based on discussions related to *pest freedom*.

6.1.11 endangered area (2012-002), protected area (2012-003), controlled area²³

Following discussion, the definitions of *protected area* was proposed for deletion (see draft *Amendments to the Glossary* in Annex 5 for details). As a consequential change, the definition of *controlled area* was also proposed for deletion. No change was proposed to the definition of *endangered area*. In addition to the points mentioned in the annex, the TPG discussed the following:

- In the case of a quarantine area (where the pest is present), or an endangered area (where the pest is not present), the area that is regulated is expected to be larger than the quarantine area or endangered area, and is usually delimited following clear borders facilitating the application of regulations (e.g. commune boundaries, roads, etc.). The term *protected area* was used to mean that larger area in the case of an endangered area. The conditions of such a larger area are described differently in several ISPMs as: 1) the minimum area for effective control, i.e. keeping it small (in the definition of *protected area*); 2) technically justified (i.e. not exactly the same as is minimum). 3) respecting the principle of discrimination (i.e. the size should depend on non-discrimination; again, not exactly the same as minimum). There is confusion on how this is applied. ISPM 2:2007 uses the term *regulated area* in relation to an endangered area, and not *protected area*, with only the last two constraints applying (technical justification and non-discrimination). The minimum area is only mentioned in the definition of *protected area*, but not in standards.
- *Regulated area* would be the best term to use in these cases, as defined (*an area into which, within which or from which plants, plant products and other regulated articles are subjected to phytosanitary measures*). Regulated area can apply either to keeping a pest in the quarantine area or keeping it out of an endangered area.
- One member noted that *protected area* was intended to refer specifically to an endangered area in the context of PRA, while *regulated area* is much broader. However ISPM 2:2007 uses *regulated area* instead of *protected area*. It was felt that the term *protected area* is not really used in practice in PRA and that the term *regulated area* can be used.
- One member noted the TPG October 2011 meeting report noted a contradiction between the definition of a *quarantine pest* and Supplement 1 of ISPM 5, and whether the concept of

²² TPG_2012_Oct_24

²³ TPG_2012_Oct_25

endangered area would apply to an area where a pest is present but not widely distributed. Revision of the definition of *endangered area* was envisaged. This issue was not dealt with in the working document, and not discussed. The TPG decided that no change was needed to the definition of an *endangered area*.

The TPG:

(22) *proposed* the deletion of *protected area* and *controlled area* in the *Amendments to the Glossary* to be presented to SC May 2013.

6.1.12 *re-export (of a consignment) (2010-024), consignment in transit (2010-039)*²⁴

Following discussion, the definition of *consignment in transit* was proposed for deletion (see draft *Amendments to the Glossary* in Annex 5 for details). The definition of *re-exported consignment* was also proposed for deletion, with an alternative proposal (replacing it with a definition for *phytosanitary certificate for re-export*), in case deletion was not acceptable. In addition to the points mentioned in the annex, the TPG discussed the following:

- It was felt that the concept of re-export in the phytosanitary context is specific. In normal trading situations, re-export is not subject to rules, while in phytosanitary terms, it implies a traceability of consignments and plants. This is a particular regulatory system for re-export of plants (and probably of animals). However, re-export in itself is not specific to the phytosanitary domain, and requirements for re-exported consignments are given in ISPM 12:2011.
- - There was some discussion on whether a definition was necessary in relation to re-export. As the concept of re-export is not specific, this definition could not be *re-export (of a consignment)*. A possible revision of the definition of *re-exported consignment* was discussed²⁵ It was concluded that re-exported consignments are sufficiently covered in ISPMs. However, a specific object linked to re-export in the phytosanitary domain is the phytosanitary certificate for re-export, and the current term *re-exported consignment* should be replaced by *phytosanitary certificate for re-export* if a term related to re-export was felt necessary.
- One member raised the case of imported consignments that are sent to another country where the pest present in the consignment can be accepted. Members noted that this would not be re-export, but refusal by the first importing country and reshipping. Re-export relates only to commodities regulated in the country of final destination.
- One member noted that in ISPM 7:2011 (*Phytosanitary certification system*) and ISPM 12:2011 the term *phytosanitary certificates* (in plural) covers both models, and that if the phytosanitary certificate re-export is defined, phytosanitary certificate for export should also be defined. It was, however, noted that the term phytosanitary certificate for export is not used; the IPPC and relevant ISPM use only the terms phytosanitary certificate and phytosanitary certificate for re-export.
- Some members favoured that phytosanitary certificate for re-export should not be defined, while others believed that it is a specific phytosanitary term, that needs to be defined. The TPG decided to propose the deletion of *re-exported consignment*, and propose the definition of *phytosanitary certificate for re-export* to substitute for *re-exported consignment* in case deletion was found problematic.

The TPG:

(23) *proposed* the deletion of *consignment in transit* and *re-exported consignment* in the *Amendments to the Glossary* to be presented to SC May 2013, with an alternative definition for *phytosanitary certificate for re-export*.

²⁴ TPG_2012_Oct_35

²⁵ The revised definition is reported here only for the purpose of archiving, as the proposal is now to delete the terms re-exported consignment and its definition: “Consignment that has been imported into a country from which, partly or in its entirety, it is then exported. ~~The consignment may be stored, split up, combined with other consignments or have its packaging changed~~”.

6.1.13 *quarantine station*²⁶

Following discussion, the definition of *quarantine station* was proposed for revision (see draft *Amendments to the Glossary* in Annex 5 for details). In addition to the points mentioned in the annex, the TPG discussed the following:

- Regarding the inclusion of beneficial organisms in the definition, one member noted that beneficial control agents are kept in confinement after import, but he was not sure that the confinement conditions would be similar to those in a quarantine station. In addition, quarantine stations used for beneficial organisms are probably separate from those of other regulated articles in most countries. One member noted that beneficial organism may be regulated articles because they may be capable of harbouring pests, but they are not quarantined mainly for this reason, but to make sure that they do not present a pest risk in themselves. However, it was concluded that, although there is an ambiguity as to whether beneficial organisms are regulated articles, it would be preferable to mention them to indicate clearly that they may be brought into quarantine stations.
- One member proposed that the definition could relate only to regulated articles (*official station for holding regulated articles in quarantine*) and not list individual items. However, other members supported that the most important regulated articles concerned (i.e. plants, plants products and beneficial organisms) also be listed in the definition.
- One member noted that an alternative to a definition of *quarantine station* would be to amend the definition of *quarantine* to state that it is the *official confinement of regulated articles in a designated station for observation and research or for further inspection, testing or treatment*. This proposal was not pursued.

The TPG:

- (24) *proposed* the revision of *quarantine station* in the *Amendments to the Glossary* to be presented to SC May 2013.

6.1.14 *tolerance level (2012-005)*²⁷

A revision of the definition of *tolerance level* had been proposed by the TPF in relation to the draft ISPM on *Systems approaches for pest risk management of fruit flies* (2004-022). The TPF had discussed and concluded that *tolerance level* was the right term to use in that standard, but that the definition of *tolerance level* needed to be revised, as the current definition was closer to the practical concept of *threshold for action* than of *tolerance level*. The TPF had proposed to revise the definition of tolerance level as: *a specified incidence of a pest above which an action to control that pest or to prevent its spread or introduction is taken*. The TPG discussed the proposal and the following items were raised:

- The TPG agreed that the word *threshold* should be avoided.
- The definition of tolerance level needs to apply to many circumstances, and not only to the case of fruit flies. It needs to apply in relation to consignments or areas (for example for RNQPs or areas of low pest prevalence).
- Both the current and proposed definitions are ambiguous, as they imply that action is taken only above the tolerance level. In phytosanitary systems, actions may also be taken on the pest below the tolerance level, in the form of phytosanitary measures, etc. The tolerance level should refer to “other” action taken when exceeded. The wording *specified particular actions* was used to imply that it comes in addition to the actions that may be applied below the tolerance level.
- The concept of tolerance level applies to situations beyond plant quarantine, in relation to crops and cultivation, such as in integrated pest management. In this case the tolerance level is the limit above which measures are taken. It was felt that the proposed definition also applies to this context.

²⁶ TPG_2012_Oct_38

²⁷ TPG_2012_Oct_39

- Action is not necessarily taken if the tolerance level is reached, and the wording *may be taken* was preferred to *are taken*.
- One member suggested the term as *tolerance level (of a regulated pest)*. Another member noted that tolerance levels do not apply to quarantine pests, but others noted that there could be a tolerance level established for a quarantine pest in a buffer zone around an ALPP. However, it was concluded that restricting the term to regulated pests would be too restrictive, as fruit flies, in the case of the ISPM above, would generally not be regulated pests for the country implementing the systems approach.
- The word *spread* could be deleted as preventing the spread is implied by the use of *control*.

Based on the above, the following revised definition was developed:

tolerance level (of a pest)	<u>The incidence of a pest specified as a threshold for above which specified particular actions may be taken to control that pest or to prevent its spread or introduction.</u>
------------------------------------	--

Several members noted that the definition of *tolerance level* had been adopted in 2009, and that this was a developing field. They believed that the definition should not yet be modified. The SC should decide whether to include the draft revised definition above in the *Amendments to the glossary*.

The TPG:

- (25) *invited* the SC to decide whether to propose a revised definition for *tolerance level (of a pest)* and, if so, to review and finalize the justifications and proposal above for the *Amendments to the glossary* to be presented to SC May 2013.

6.1.15 quarantine area (2012-006)²⁸

The TPF had proposed a revision of the definition of *quarantine area* in relation to the draft ISPM on *Establishment and maintenance of fruit fly quarantine areas within a pest free area in the event of outbreak detection* (2009-007). The SC had introduced the word *quarantine area* for this ISPM. The TPF noted that the draft ISPM should also cover transient pests, and it should be clarified that quarantine areas also apply to transient pests. The following revised definition was proposed for *quarantine area*: *An area within which a quarantine pest is present or transient and is being officially controlled*. The TPG discussed the following:

- There are currently three categories of transience in ISPM 8:1998: non-actionable; *actionable, under surveillance*; and *actionable, under eradication*. Only the third category would apply to the areas dealt with in the draft fruit fly standard.
- *Present*, as used in the current definition, is a neutral term, which does not imply established *presence* or *transience*. There was however an ambiguity as ISPM 8:1998 separates categories of *presence* and *transience*, while in ISPM 5 *transience* is defined as *presence of a pest that is not expected to lead to establishment*.
- ISPM 8:1998 is proposed for revision with the main aim of revising the categories of pest status and clarify differences between them. In particular, one member noted that the categories in ISPM 8:1998 were entirely country-based originally because the concept of areas, especially PFA, had not been fully developed at that time. If changes are made to the categories of *transience* or *presence* in ISPM 8:1998, the proposed revised definition may not be suitable.

The TPG concluded that the need to revise the definition of *quarantine area* would depend on the content of the revised ISPM 8:1998.

The TPG:

- (26) *invited* the SC to agree to delaying the consideration of *quarantine area* until after the revision of ISPM 8:1998.

²⁸ TPG_2012_Oct_39

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

This point relates to draft terms and definitions proposed by expert drafting groups in new draft standards to be presented to the SC in May 2013. No such standard were available at the time of the meeting, but it was expected that some would be by the next meeting in February 2013.

7. Review of ISPMs for Consistency of Terms and Style

Consistency amendments for individual standards were agreed to by CPM in March 2010 and for ISPM 5 in March 2011. The SC had requested the TPG to continue work and had agreed to a number of decisions. Tables were presented in the meeting for all individual standards remaining to be examined under the consistency review.

7.1 Background documents

The consistency amendments agreed to by CPM-5 and CPM-6²⁹ were presented for information, as well as the general rules and process applied in 2012³⁰.

The *general recommendations on consistency* as developed in 2010 were also presented for information³¹. These general recommendations are important to ensure that the correct terms are used in future ISPMs. Additions to the *general recommendations on consistency* were decided under several agenda items. A revised version will be prepared, further reviewed by the TPG in February 2013, and presented to the SC in May 2013.

7.2 Draft consistency tables

For each ISPM, the TPG reviewed the tables and separated ink amendments from obvious errors and ambiguities. Ink amendments and errors would be presented to the SC in separate tables. The SC would be asked to approve ink amendments for presentation to CPM for noting, and archive errors and ambiguities until the standard concerned is revised. The tables will be assembled by the Secretariat and steward after the meeting, and prepared for the SC in November 2013, with a view that ink amendments could be noted by CPM-8 in 2013. The sections below mention specific issues that were not covered in the tables³².

Consistency in languages

It was noted that the ink amendments already noted for English versions could not be transferred directly into other language versions. The issue of consistency of ISPMs in languages was under discussion in the SC (see below). The Secretariat noted that the Chinese versions of ISPMs had been reformatted recently. The English ink amendments applying to references had been made (i.e. references deleted or updated as done for the English ink amendments). In addition, the following adjustments were made: sections on adoption and definitions aligned on English versions; ISPMs referred to in the current way (with number and year); publication history added to each ISPM. Apart from references, none of the other ink amendments agreed for the English versions had been made. The reformatting of ISPMs in Arabic was planned and the Secretariat wondered whether the same approach should be followed.

The steward noted that, before applying ink amendments to languages, there should be a system in place to identify all necessary ink amendments. The review of ISPMs in languages was an issue that had not been decided upon yet, and it would require more than implementing the English ink amendments. He was concerned that changes would be made bit-by-bit.

²⁹ TPG_2012_Oct_06

³⁰ TPG_2012_Oct_07

³¹ TPG_2012_Oct_08

³² Due to the size of the document, it is not attached to the report but will be posted in the TPG work area on the IPP. The final agreed text will be presented to CPM.

However, this had already been done and the Secretariat should at least mention in the publication history of each ISPM in Chinese (or Arabic) which changes had been made when reformatting the standards. For ISPMs for which English ink amendments had been made, the publication history of the Chinese (Arabic) versions should indicate that only the English ink amendments applying to the references had been applied.

One member noted that the consistency review should be done for other languages. The steward and Secretariat noted that this was under discussion in the SC. It would be a long and resource-intensive process, which would need to involve different groups. The process would probably need similar steps as for the English, i.e. consultant review, a group identifying which ISPMs should be especially reviewed and preparing proposals for each standard, the SC and CPM reviewing the proposals. The review of consistency in languages may also identify problems of translation. In answer to a question from the TPG member for the Russian language, the Secretariat noted that the Russian versions of ISPMs that will be presented for adoption should have been translated according to the newest versions of ISPM 5 and ISPMs in English; hopefully, there would not be problems of consistency in the Russian versions of the ISPMs.

One member suggested that FAO translators should be invited to take part in the TPG in order to understand issues, especially when changes to the Glossary are discussed. This was not discussed further, but the TPG noted that according to the proposal under agenda item 1.7, guidance would be provided to translators regarding the translation of draft terms and definitions.

7.2.1 ISPM 23:2005 (*Guidelines for inspection*) and 7.2.2 ISPM 25:2006 (*Consignments in transit*)

No additional issues were discussed.

7.2.3 ISPM 5

Four proposed ink amendments had been returned by the SC in November 2010 regarding the removal of *and/or* in definitions. An additional proposal had been made regarding *release (into the environment)*, and a change to *corrective action plan (in an area)* had been proposed under agenda item 7.3. In addition, the TPG believed that cross-references to Glossary supplements should not be included in definitions, and proposed that they be removed. In addition to the issues discussed in the SC document, the TPG discussed the issues below.

Kiln-drying

Following discussion, the definition of *kiln-drying* was proposed for deletion (see Annex 5 for details), with an alternative proposal that it should be revised if deletion was not acceptable. In addition to the points mentioned in Annex 5, the TPG discussed the following:

- *Kiln-drying* does not necessarily include heat control. It can be performed with or without heat, but always includes humidity control. It is therefore not possible to modify the current definition by only remove *and/or*. *Heat and/or humidity control* cannot be modified to *heat or humidity control* because humidity control would always be used, but not heat control. This would require rewriting, for example: *A process in which wood is dried in a closed chamber using ~~heat and/or~~ humidity control with or without heat control to achieve a required moisture content.*
- Use of the word *control* in the definition is ambiguous. It is not clear whether it refers to measurement or to the process of modifying (heat or humidity).

The TPG:

- (27) *proposed* the deletion of *kiln-drying* in the *Amendments to the Glossary* to be presented to SC May 2013, with an alternative that *kiln-drying* be added as a subject to the List of Topics for IPPC Standards.

Phytosanitary measure, phytosanitary regulations and plant quarantine

The SC had rejected the TPG proposal made to remove the *and/or* in the expression *introduction and/or spread*. One argument was that this expression was used in the IPPC, another that this may have implications for languages. Following discussions, the TPG maintained that it would be preferable to remove *and/or* in these definitions: the wording *introduction and/or spread* is not clear, and the definitions need to be rewritten in a way that is helpful for readers, even if *and/or* is the wording used in the IPPC. The issue of translation should also not interfere with reaching a clear definition in English. If the solution proposed as ink amendments was not acceptable, a more extensive rewording of the definitions clarifying the definition could be proposed to the SC in May 2013 as part of the *Amendments to the Glossary*. In addition to the points mentioned in the SC document, the TPG discussed the following:

- If the SC favours that definitions are revised, the TPG envisaged the following rewording (e.g. for *phytosanitary measure*):

Any legislation, regulation or official procedure having the purpose to prevent the introduction ~~and/or spread~~ of quarantine pests, to prevent the spread of quarantine pests, or to limit the economic impact of regulated non-quarantine pests.

7.2.4 ISPM 20:2004 (*Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system*)

The TPG discussed the issues below, in addition to those included in the document to the SC:

- One member noted that the text uses the word *authorized* while this is normally reserved to authorized by the NPPO. Other members noted that authorization is a good and established English word, which needs to be used in many contexts. It should not be limited to cases where the NPPO delegates its authority. In the case of ISPM 20:2004, the term was used in association to import, and the full term *import authorization* could be used as necessary.
- The TPG noted that the term *security* referring to the *phytosanitary security of a consignment* may have been used wrongly in some ISPMs (including in ISPM 20:2004). Its use in ISPMs should be reviewed and the need for revision of the definition considered.
- One member noted that the standard mentions the IPP and a URL. This may be too specific because both are likely to change over time.

The TPG:

- (28) *invited* the SC to add the term *phytosanitary security of a consignment* to the List of Topics for IPPC Standards.

7.2.5 ISPM 16:2002 (*Regulated non-quarantine pests: concept and application*)

No additional issues were discussed.

7.2.6 ISPM 9:1998 (*Guidelines for pest eradication programmes*)

The TPG discussed the issues below, in addition to those included in the document to the SC:

- Established pests are by nature exotic, and an *exotic established pest* is redundant.
- The TPG proposed to modify the wording *by a management authority (normally the NPPO)* and use the word *official*, which is defined as *established, authorized or performed by a national plant protection organization*. One member noted that eradication in some countries is not under the control of the NPPO, and is done by the government and industry, without involvement of the NPPO. The original text reflected that situation, while using *official* would imply that the NPPO is always involved. The TPG noted that this issue was broader than for eradication. If this was the case, the definition of *official* may have to be modified. No specific decision was taken at this stage.

7.2.7 ISPM 17:2002 (*Pest reporting*)

The TPG discussed the issues below, in addition to those included in the document to the SC:

- The TPG member for the Spanish language had done the review, and also identified inconsistencies in translation into Spanish. The TPG agreed that comments regarding the Spanish version of ISPM 17:2002 would be presented to the SC in a separate table.
- The standard uses the term *trading partners*. This is unclear because it could be a company, while in ISPMs it normally means a country. The term may need a definition for the IPPC context.
- Use of *country* versus *contracting parties*. The TPG proposed that *contracting parties* should be used where the ISPM refers to obligations under the IPPC, even if the standard was written at a time when it might have been implied that non-contracting parties could also apply the standard.

The TPG:

(29) *invited* the SC to add *trading partners* as a subject to the List of Topics for IPPC Standards.

7.2.8 Supplement 2 to ISPM 5 (*Guidelines on the understanding of potential economic importance and related terms including reference to environmental considerations*)

The TPG discussed the issues below, in addition to those included in the document to the SC:

- In the IPPC, ISPMs and in Glossary definitions, the following terms are used synonymously: *impact, consequence, effect, importance, damage, harm*. This should be discussed to see if this issue should be pursued, or not. This was one of the two remaining points in the TPG working paper³³, which will be reviewed at the next meeting (see agenda item 7.3).
- It was noted that in the context of Glossary definitions of terms *parasite* and *parasitoid*, it is clear that Supplement 2 meant *parasitoids* and not *parasites*: the *release of parasites* (which are not able to active natural spread) has no sense whereas *parasitoids* are released in the adult stage and are able to find their hosts (like predators). However, the TPG thought that the term *parasite* was appropriate. Firstly, *parasitoids* are covered in the definition of *parasites*; secondly, *parasites* allows covering fungi, which may also be released.
- One member noted that the individual ISPMs should specify that they are standards under the IPPC. The Secretariat mentioned that the IPPC was mentioned on the cover page of individual ISPMs.

7.3 Additional proposals

One member had submitted additional proposals for consistency³⁴. Some of the proposals were discussed, and reported below. Two specific issues relating to consistency across standards will be considered at the next meeting, taking into account the proposal to be made to the SC regarding consistency across standards (see agenda item 6.1.1).

Contamination versus contaminant. The suggestion was to use the defined term *contamination* and not *contaminant* where the word is used in the sense of the Glossary definition of *contamination*. It was noted that this is not always grammatically possible, and *contaminant* needs to be used in some cases. In addition, *contaminant* and *contamination* are both normal English words, which need to be used in other contexts than the Glossary definition (which is limited to the presence of pests or regulated articles in a commodity). One member proposed that the qualifier (of a commodity) could be added to the term *contamination*. The TPG finally decided that an addition would be made to the *general recommendations on consistency*. No other changes would be proposed.

Shipment. The word *shipment* is sometimes used in ISPMs to mean *consignment* or *dispatch*, and is also needed for other contexts. Avoiding shipment also facilitates translation into Russian and Chinese

³³ TPG_2012_Oct_27

³⁴ TPG_2012_Oct_27

where *shipment* is only for transport by ship. The TPG agreed that the use of *shipment* should be avoided when what is meant is consignment or dispatch.

Area of low pest prevalence. A modification to the definition of *area of low pest prevalence* was proposed to replace the wording *surveillance, control or eradication measures* by *surveillance, control or eradication* as measures was redundant. However, this is an IPPC definition, and such a change would require an agreed interpretation, agreed as an *Amendment to the glossary*. The TPG concluded that this issue was not important enough to propose the change.

Release (of a consignment). It was proposed that this definition be reviewed to reconsider the word *authorization*. This issue would not be pursued at this stage, but a proposal across standards would be reconsidered at the next meeting.

Corrective action plan. A change was proposed to replace *specified pest level* by *tolerance level* in the definition. The TPG agreed to add this change to the ink amendments proposed for ISPM 5 (developed under agenda item 7.2.3).

Visual examination. A proposal was made to use *contamination* instead of *contaminant* in the definition of *visual examination*. This was not accepted, but one member noted that the current definition of *visual examination* is not correct. It refers to *detection of pests or other contaminants*, while *contamination* refers to both pest and regulated articles. The intent of the definition was probably to refer to *infestation or contamination*. The current definition may need to be revised.

The TPG:

- (30) *decided* to add the following to the *general recommendations on consistency*: (i) *shipment* should be avoided when what is meant is *dispatch* or *consignment* and (ii) when *contamination* is meant in the sense of the Glossary, this term should preferably be used.
- (31) *decided* to reconsider two specific proposals for adjustments across ISPMs at its February 2013 meeting
- (32) *invited* the SC to add *visual examination* to the List of Topics for IPPC Standards in order to revise the definition.

8. Annotated Glossary: 2011 and 2012 Amendments

The Secretariat recalled that the last version (version 2) of the Annotated Glossary was updated by the TPG in 2010 and subsequently published on the IPP in 2011. As the Annotated Glossary is planned to be published every three years, the next version should be updated in 2013. Normally the TPG reviews at every meeting the intermediate amendments, based on what happened since the last meeting (e.g. new or revised terms etc.). Mr Smith had prepared intermediate amendments for 2011 and 2012 and would prepare a more complete updated version for the next TPG meeting.

The TPG:

- (33) *asked* Mr Smith to prepare a draft of the updated Annotated Glossary for the next meeting.

9. Explanation of Glossary Terms³⁵

This issue will be discussed at the next TPG meeting, based on document TPG_2012_Oct_26 and on any other issues identified by other TPG members in the meantime (deadline for submitting issues as in work plan in Annex 6).

10. Review of Durations of Record Keeping in ISPMs

The document³⁶ will be discussed at the next TPG meeting.

³⁵ TPG_2012_Oct_26

³⁶ TPG_2012_Oct_33

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

The SC in May 2011 agreed that the TPG develop brief guidance on the use of *should*, *shall*, *must* and *may* for the IPPC Style Guide. The Secretariat introduced brief guidance³⁷ based on a previous version prepared with the IPPC editor. It took into account the decisions at CPM-1 (2006), further discussion and views at CPM-3 (2008) and gave examples in standards adopted since CPM-1. It was noted that the issue of the translation of *should* into French might be discussed at CPM-8 (2013).

The TPG reviewed the document and agreed that it could be proposed to the SC, at its November 2012 meeting, as brief guidance to be included in the IPPC Style Guide. This guidance could be made available to expert drafting groups and the SC when developing standards. The following items were discussed:

- One member noted that *should* is conditional, but another member noted that the conditionality applies to the standard, not to the individual actions. Another member believed that the CPM decisions tried to introduce different levels of obligations, while, if one applies to a standard, all actions have to be taken.
- The member also noted some occurrences of *must* in a draft for consultation, and noted that the “force” of the obligations in an ISPM depends on the purpose of the standard. For example PRA is conducted by countries in their own interest, and in such cases only *should* is to be used, while explaining how to deal with heat treatment of wood to be exported may require stronger terms. The IPPC has tied itself with strict rules on the use of *should*, *shall* and *must* in ISPMs, leading to a situation where it will be difficult to write standards if every sentence is to be written so precisely. He felt that *must* might apply to a specific procedure where it is vitally important but not to obligations for NPPOs or their agents. *Shall* is not appropriate for standards but only in relation to the Convention, so that the valid options are *should* and *may*. The CPM decision that the present tense should not be used to reflect an obligation is difficult to apply: diagnostic protocols contain a number of actions in present or imperative tenses, and it was not clear that they are not obligations.
- However, the member understood that, due to the complexity of terms and obligations in English and other languages, it may be useful to limit the number of terms and define the context in which they are used, and define the corresponding term for other languages using the correct level of obligation and the word used that expresses this appropriately (i.e. the word *should* should not be translated literally, but the appropriate equivalent tense for the specific level of obligation in standards should be used).
- Several TPG members intervened regarding their language:
 - . In French, the corresponding word for *should* in the context of standards in general is *doit*, and not *devrait* as currently agreed by CPM for use in ISPMs. If the level of obligation is stronger, expressions such as *il est indispensable que* or *on doit impérativement* could be used (for example for *must*). There are also higher levels of obligations, which could be expressed by the present or future tense in rules, but which would not be used in standards.
 - . In Russian, *should* and *must* are the same word and, to express a higher obligation, *obligatory* needed to be added. *Shall* is translated by using the future tense.
 - . In Chinese, *must* and *should* are translated by two words, and while *must* is an obligation, the literal translation of *should* is the conditional.
 - . In Spanish, the literal translation of *should* is the conditional.
- The TPG proposed to include a note to state that the guidance gives examples of correct use, but that adopted ISPMs may still contain incorrect uses of the terms.

³⁷ TPG_2012_Oct_40

The TPG:

(34) *decided* to present the brief guidance on *should, shall, must* and *may* to the SC.

12. TPG Work Plan, Medium Term Plan and Specifications

12.1 TPG work plan

The TPG reviewed and updated its work plan based on discussions at the present meeting. Volunteers and deadlines were identified for most tasks. The Secretariat requested feedback and whether it was useful that the work plan was revised regularly, and the TPG agreed. The 2012-2013 work plan is presented as Annex 6. It will be regularly updated until the next meeting, and updated versions posted on the TPG restricted work area of the IPP. The next meeting of the TPG will develop the 2013-2014 work plan, for presentation to the SC in May 2013.

12.2 Medium term plan³⁸

The TPG will review its medium term plan at its next meeting, to present updates as necessary to the SC in My 2013.

12.3 Specification TP5:2006 (TPG) and Specification 1:2001 (*Review and updating of ISPM 5*)

The steward and Secretariat had proposed a revised TPG specification to align it with its current tasks and add details to the expertise section³⁹. The steward noted that it was also proposed that Specification 1 should be withdrawn, as it is now obsolete and covered by Specification TP5. The TPG revised its specification. It was agreed that TPG members should have a broad expertise in several areas of plant protection and plant quarantine. Finally, several members noted that the working knowledge of English was very important in the TPG, which drafts definitions in English. However, not all members agreed that this be added to the specification.

The TPG:

(35) *proposed* a revised Specification TP5 to be presented to the SC in November 2012, and suggested that Specification 1 be withdrawn as it is obsolete and the tasks would be covered in the proposed revision to specification TP5.

13. Membership of the TPG

The Secretariat recalled the current composition of the TPG, including languages and end of terms. A strategy for membership of TPs was proposed to the SC in November 2011 because the terms of many members expire in 2013; it aimed at ensuring some continuity of membership and some renewal. Mr John Hedley (New Zealand) would be renewed as a member for the English language for an additional term (2013-2018); Mr Ian Smith (EPPO) would end his term in 2013, but would have the possibility to continue as invited expert subject to SC approval. Renewal would be facilitated by calling for new members with expertise in Arabic (to replace Mr Mohammad Katbeh Bader (Jordan) at the end of his term in 2013), French (to replace Mr Ian Smith (EPPO) at the end of his term in 2013) and Chinese (as the previous member resigned in August 2011). In addition, the SC decided to call for an additional member for the English language. In 2012, calls were made for Arabic, Chinese, French and English. The call for Arabic and French experts had to be made twice as no nominations were received in the first call. As a result of the calls, the SC selected members for Chinese and Arabic. No member was selected for French due to lack of nominations with the appropriate expertise. For English, four nominations were received, but the SC was unable to select an expert due to differences of opinion on which of the top two candidates was the most qualified. The SC in November will discuss this matter further.

³⁸ TPG_2012_Oct_12

³⁹ TPG_2012_Oct_36

Under that agenda item, members are also requested to notify in advance, as much as possible, of their future plans in regards to membership, so that calls can be organized in advance to allow for some overlap. No such change was notified.

14. Other issues

14.1 ISO standard on definitions⁴⁰

This item will be discussed at the TPG next meeting.

14.2 ISPM 5 on FAO terminology system

The FAO Terminology Unit presented the Online Glossary (i.e. online version of ISPM 5 terms and definitions), which is part of the FAO Term Portal fao.org/termportal/en. The Term Portal contains 75 000 terms from different domains in official FAO languages, organised in thematic collections developed by technical divisions; the Glossary of Phytosanitary Terms is one of the thematic collections. The system is public and allows searches across all domains or in a specific domain, for example the Glossary. The online Glossary contains all terms in all languages, including bolding and derived terms. Old terms and definitions are also included but marked as obsolete. The source of each term and definition is provided, as in ISPM 5. It was envisaged that versions of ISPM 5 in non-FAO languages, provided under co-publishing agreement (e.g. Portuguese), could also be added to the system. The programmers are working on making bold terms clickable to be able to cross-refer easily to the definition of bolded terms.

In the future, it would also be possible to include a search tool that can easily search non-structured text; this could allow searches across all ISPMs. The Secretariat noted that it was using a searchable PDF database, which had been made available to the TPG.

The following comments were provided to the terminology group:

- The Annotated Glossary is also published and could be linked to the online Glossary. This would require an explanation because it is not published every year, i.e. the current version may not always be in line with the latest version of the Glossary. The Annotated Glossary should also be made available to FAO translators.
- When searching for a term whose definition was revised, the latest term and definition should appear first in the list, above the obsolete ones.
- The supplements were mentioned on the home page of online Glossary. One member doubted of the use to have the supplements in the online Glossary, even if they are part of the standard. The two supplements could in fact be stand-alone standards as they are not related to the Glossary but to concepts.
- The publication history is different in all languages, and should be included for each language.

The online Glossary should be advertised, also to other conventions. Before such advertising is made, the Secretariat invited TPG members to start using the system and provide feedback.

15. Date and Venue of the Next Meeting

Following email consultations with TPG members, the Secretariat had informed the TPG that the meeting was planned on 4-8 February 2013, FAO, Rome, Italy. Due to the outcome of the present meeting, the meeting will take place on 4-7 February 2013. The Secretariat is in the process of planning meetings for the following years. Provisional dates for the 2014 meeting will be included on the Secretariat's meeting plan, and will be discussed at the next meeting.

⁴⁰ TPG_2012_Oct_30 (under ISO copyright, do not distribute or copy)

16. Other business

The IPPC Secretariat had recently attended the Sixth Meeting Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity serving as the meeting of the parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (COP-MOP-6) (1-5 October 2012, Hyderabad, India). The CBD had encouraged the IPPC to broaden IPPC measures for the protection of plants in marine and aquatic environments, and to include the health of bryophytes, algae species and fungi. This resulted in some discussion and in the end the request was withdrawn because it is believed the IPPC covers algae and bryophytes and if needed, the protection of fungi could be protected by measures put in place that are technically justified and covered under the SPS agreement. As the IPPC covers pests of *plants* it might be helpful to have some clarity on exactly what is covered, considering plants are not defined in the glossary.

It was noted that, when the IPPC was written, there was a clear concept that organisms belonged either to the “plant” kingdom or the “animal” kingdom. While this underlying idea has remained, seven separate kingdoms have appeared in the past 15 years, including bacteria, fungi and chromista (the latter including, among others, algae, and *Phytophthora* and *Pythium* that used to be fungi). Codes and nomenclatures for animals are agreed by the international congress on zoology, while the international congress on botany agrees codes and nomenclature for algae, fungi and plants. Regarding other kingdoms, bacteria have their own code, and some other kingdoms are in an unclear situation. The IPPC deals with pests of plants and, if it is intended that other groups such as chromista (which include algae) and fungi are also covered, an agreed interpretation of the meaning of *plants* in the IPPC may be needed. However, several members also noted that the coverage of *plants* and its implications would have to be discussed in the IPPC framework, before such an interpretation can be agreed. The Secretariat would like the TPG to consider this matter further and draft a paper for the SC on the classification of organisms and the coverage of plants. This would be proposed to the SC in November 2012, and the issue reported to the TPG in February 2013.

In the discussion, individual members raised the following points:

- Since the IPPC covers cultivated and not-cultivated plants, its scope may be quite broadened if it also covers fungi and algae. The potential consequences of a broad scope should be considered, as well as interaction with other conventions.
- It may be difficult to fix the limit of what is covered by *plant*; for example, if fungi were included, would that be all fungi or only macrofungi (which are regulated in some countries).
- It was noted that a similar evaluation of what is covered under *plants* is being done in the EU.

17. Close

The Chair closed the meeting and thanked the members for their active and effective participation in the meeting and thanked the Secretariat for the preparation of the working papers in a timely manner and for the detailed reports. The Secretariat also thanked the TPG members for their cooperation and preparation.

Annex 1: Agenda**MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL PANEL FOR THE GLOSSARY****15-19 October 2012****FAO headquarters, Espace Gabon Room (A024)****Start Monday 15 October at 10.00, coffee served outside the room at 9.30.****AGENDA***Updated 2012-10-09*

AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER
1. Opening of the meeting		
1.1 Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat	-	IPPC Secretariat
1.2 Introductions	-	-
1.3 Brief presentation on the IPPC, TPG and roles of participants (IPPC Secretariat, steward, rapporteur, chairperson, members)	-	IPPC Secretariat
1.4 Selection of the Chair and Rapporteur	-	-
1.5 Review and adoption of the agenda	TPG_2012_Oct_01	Chair
1.6 Current specifications: TP5 (TPG) (2006) and Specification 1 (Review and updating of ISPM 5) (2001)	TPG_2012_Oct_05	Steward
1.7 TPG activities in relation to languages (for information)	TPG_2012_Oct_31	IPPC Secretariat
2. Administrative Matters		
2.1 Local information	TPG_2012_Oct_04 (https://www.ippc.int/file_upload_ed/1336745175_LocalInformation_2012-05-11.pdf)	IPPC Secretariat
2.2 Documents list	TPG_2012_Oct_02	IPPC Secretariat
2.3 Participants list	TPG_2012_Oct_03Rev	IPPC Secretariat
3. Reports		
3.1 Previous meetings of the TPG (Oct. 2010 and Nov. 2011)	Download from: https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=1110712	Steward
3.2 Extracts from other meeting reports of relevance to the TPG (SC Nov 2010, CPM-6, SC May 2011, SC Nov 2011; CPM-7, SC May 2012)	TPG_2012_Oct_21Rev.1	IPPC Secretariat
3.4 Changes to the standard setting process and implications for TPG work	-	IPPC Secretariat
3.5 Current work plan The work plan was decided by the TPG 2011 but changes made based on decisions of the SC and CPM after the TPG meeting. Changes will be outlined. The Secretariat will seek feedback on the work plan. The work plan will be updated during the meeting (agenda item 12.1)	TPG_2012_Oct_34	IPPC Secretariat
4. Review relating to draft ISPMs sent for member consultation in 2012 (1 July-20 October): consistency in the use of terms Normally the TPG reviews member comments on terms and definitions, and reviews the drafts for consistency in the use of terms. Because the consultation finishes after the meeting, the TPG may only review the consistency of drafts. Recommendations will be transmitted to stewards and the SC-7 (May 2013 as appropriate). 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) • Translations of terms and definitions in draft ISPM under MC 2012	2006-031_fruitflyhoststatus TPG_2012_Oct_32	

AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER
4.2 Appendix 1 to ISPM 12:2011. Electronic certification (2006-003)	2006-003_electroniccertification	
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)	2009-007_fruitflyquarantineareas	
4.4 Annex to ISPM 27:2006. Diagnostic protocol for Guignardia citricarpa Kiely (2004-023)	2004-023_DP_Guignardia_citricarpa	
4.5 Annex to ISPM 27:2006. Diagnostic protocol for Tilletia indica Mitra (2004-014)	2004-014_DP_Tilletia_indica	
<p>5. Review relating to draft ISPMs under the substantial concerns commenting period (15 May-30 Sept.): member comments and consistency in the use of terms</p> <p>The TPG will review member comments made on terms and definitions, and consistency in the use of terms. Recommendations will be transmitted to stewards and the SC (November 2012). The deadline for country comments is 30 September and the comments will be made available to the TPG only in October (or just before the meeting).</p> <p>Note - 2 October: There were no member comments related to terms and definitions. The TPG will review the drafts for consistency in the use of terms.</p>	-	
5.1 ISPM 15:2009 draft revision of Annex 1: Approved treatments associated with wood packaging material	2005-001_PRAPplants_as_pests	
5.2 Draft Annex 4: Pest risk analysis for plants as quarantine pests, ISPM 11:2004, and core text changes to ISPM 11:2004: Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests (2005-001). Note: only the text in black is open for commenting	2006-011_treatmentsISPM15	
6. Consideration of new or revised terms/definitions		
6.1 Subjects on the TPG work programme Volunteers are identified on the work plan (Table 3) to prepare discussion papers for the meeting. Other terms still needing volunteers will be discussed as part of the revised work plan.	TPG_2012_Oct_13 to 15, 18 to 20, 22 to 25, 28 and 29, 35, 38, 39	
6.2 Advice on new or revised terms in other recent draft standards i.e. those going out for consultation next year This point relates to draft terms and definitions proposed by expert drafting groups in new draft standards to be presented to the SC in May 2013. The Secretariat will compile those already available (if any).	No document	-
<p>7. Review of ISPMs for consistency of terms and style</p> <p>The first batch of consistency amendments was agreed to by CPM in March 2010 and to ISPM 5 in March 2011. The SC requested the TPG to continue work and agreed to a number of decisions. The ISPMs identified below on the list result from SC decisions. Material for all remaining standards should be ready for the 2012 TPG</p>	-	
7.1 Background documents - consistency amendments agreed to by CPM-5 and CPM-6 (for information) - general rules and process applied in 2012 (for information) - general consistency changes (for information and to be completed as needed) - additional proposals	TPG_2012_Oct_06 TPG_2012_Oct_07 TPG_2012_Oct_08 TPG_2012_Oct_27	
7.2 Draft consistency tables (in the appropriate format to go to SC)		
7.2.1 ISPM 23	TPG_2012_Oct_09	Ebbe Nordbo
7.2.2 ISPM 25	TPG_2012_Oct_10	Ian Smith
7.2.3 ISPM 5	TPG_2012_Oct_11	Secretariat
7.2.4 ISPM 20		John Hedley
7.2.5 ISPM 16		John Hedley
7.2.6 ISPM 9	TPG_2012_Oct_37	M. Katbeh-Bader
7.2.7 ISPM 17	TPG_2012_Oct_16	Beatriz Melcho

AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER
7.2.8 Supplement 2 to ISPM 5	TPG_2012_Oct_17	Andrei Orlinski
8. Annotated glossary: 2011 and 2012 amendments 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.		Ian Smith
9. Explanation of glossary terms Standing agenda item for TPG meetings. 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. In order to leave enough time for long-term members to think about explanations, members are required to send suggestions for terms to be explained by 30 July (with a short statement on what is the issue with the definition). Depending on what is received, the Secretariat will discuss with the steward how to deal with this point.	TPG_2012_Oct_26	IPPC Secretariat
10. 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.	TPG_2012_Oct_33	IPPC Secretariat
11. Development of brief guidance on the use of “should”, “shall”, “must” and “may” for the IPPC Style Guide for ISPMs The SC May 2011 agreed that the TPG develop brief guidance on the use of “should”, “shall”, “must” and “may” for the IPPC Style Guide for ISPMs. Note: this discussion will relate to the use of these terms in English. The issue of the translation of “should” in French was postponed to CPM-8		IPPC Secretariat
12. TPG work plan, medium term plan and specifications	-	
12.1 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 May 2013 SC.	To be prepared during the meeting	
12.2 Medium term plan The TPG will review and update its medium term plan, to be presented to the SC	TPG_2012_Oct_12	
12.3 TP5 (TPG) (2006) and Specification 1 (Review and updating of ISPM 5) (2001) To consider the need for revision	TPG_2012_Oct_36	
13. Membership of the TPG Under that agenda item, members are also expected to notify any expected change in membership, so that calls can be organized in good time. The situation at the time of the meeting and changes in 2013 will be detailed.	See 2012_TPG_03 agenda item 1.1	
14. Other issues	-	
14.1 ISO standard on definitions NB: Do not distribute or copy. This version is protected by copyright and the IPPC Secretariat has bought copies only for TPG members.	TPG_2012_Oct_30	
14.2 ISPM 5 on FAO terminology system	Presentation scheduled Thursday	
15. Date and venue of the next meeting 4-8 February 2013, FAO, Rome, Italy	-	
16. Other business	-	
17. Close	-	

Annex 2: Documents list**DOCUMENTS LIST**

DOCUMENT NO.	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE	DATE POSTED / DISTRIBUTED
2004-014	4.5	Draft Annex to ISPM 27:2006 - <i>Tilletia indica</i> Mitra	17 Aug. 2012
2004-023	4.4	Draft Annex to ISPM 27:2006 - <i>Guignardia citricarpa</i> Kiely on fruit	17 Aug. 2012
2005-001	5.2	PRA for Plants - proposed Annex to ISPM 11	22 June 2012
2006-003	4.2	Electronic Certification - Draft appendix to ISPM 12:2011	17 Aug. 2012
2006-011	5.1	Treatments for wood packaging material - revised Annex to ISPM 15	22 June 2012
2006-031	4.1	Draft ISPM: Fruit fly host status	17 Aug. 2012
2009-007	4.3	Fruit fly quarantine areas - Annex to ISPM 26:2006	17 Aug. 2012
TPG_2012_Oct_01	1.5	Annotated agenda	9 October 2012
TPG_2012_Oct_02	2.2	Documents list	9 October 2012
TPG_2012_Oct_03	2.3	Participants list (with membership information)	9 October 2012
TPG_2012_Oct_04	2.1	Local information (https://www.ippc.int/file_uploaded/1336745175_LocalInformation_2012-05-11.pdf)	
TPG_2012_Oct_05	1.6	Specifications (TP and ISPM 5)	22 June 2012
TPG_2012_Oct_06	7.1	Consistency changes noted by CPM-5 and CPM-6	22 June 2012
TPG_2012_Oct_07	7.1	Consistency – procedure followed in 2012	22 June 2012
TPG_2012_Oct_08	7.1	General recommendations on consistency	22 June 2012
TPG_2012_Oct_09	7.2.1	Review of adopted ISPMs for consistency: ISPM 23 (<i>Guidelines for inspection</i>)	22 June 2012
TPG_2012_Oct_10	7.2.2	Review of adopted ISPMs for consistency: ISPM 25 (<i>Consignments in transit</i>)	22 June 2012
TPG_2012_Oct_11	7.2.3	Review of adopted ISPMs for consistency: ISPM 5	22 June 2012
TPG_2012_Oct_12	12.2	Review of work programme and medium term plan	22 June 2012
TPG_2012_Oct_13	6.1	Subjects on the TPG work programme: phytosanitary status	22 June 2012
TPG_2012_Oct_14	6.1	Subjects on the TPG work programme: revision of point of entry	9 Aug. 2012
TPG_2012_Oct_15	6.1	Subjects on the TPG work programme: revision of systems approach	9 Aug. 2012
TPG_2012_Oct_16	7.2.7	Review of adopted ISPMs for consistency: ISPM 17 (<i>Pest reporting</i>)	9 Aug. 2012
TPG_2012_Oct_17	7.2.8	Review of adopted ISPMs for consistency: Supplement 2 to ISPM 5	17 Aug. 2012
TPG_2012_Oct_18	6.1	Subjects on the TPG work programme: identity	17 Aug. 2012
TPG_2012_Oct_19	6.1	Subjects on the TPG work programme: exclusion, suppression, etc.	17 Aug. 2012
TPG_2012_Oct_20	6.1	Subjects on the TPG work programme: pest freedom	17 Aug. 2012
TPG_2012_Oct_21Rev. 1	3.2	Extracts from meeting reports	12 Sep. 2012
TPG_2012_Oct_22	6.1	Subjects on the TPG work programme: organism, pest, naturally occurring	21 Aug. 2012
TPG_2012_Oct_23	6.1	Subjects on the TPG work programme: restriction	20 Aug. 2012
TPG_2012_Oct_24	6.1	Subjects on the TPG work programme: production site	20 Aug. 2012
TPG_2012_Oct_25	6.1	Subjects on the TPG work programme: endangered area, protected area	20 Aug. 2012
TPG_2012_Oct_26	9	Explanation of glossary terms	20 Aug. 2012
TPG_2012_Oct_27	7.1	Various other proposals related to the review of ISPMs for consistency of terms and style	20 Aug. 2012
TPG_2012_Oct_28	6.1	Subjects on the TPG work programme: Uses and future fate of the glossary term 'occurrence' and the word 'presence' (NORDBO)	12 Sept. 2012
TPG_2012_Oct_29	6.1	Subjects on the TPG work programme: presence (2010-025) and occurrence (2010-026) (SMITH)	12 Sept. 2012

DOCUMENT NO.	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE	DATE POSTED / DISTRIBUTED
TPG_2012_Oct_30	14.1	ISO Standard 704 (Do not distribute or copy. This version is protected by copyright and the IPPC Secretariat has bought copies only for TPG members.) The document number is not listed on the PDF file	12 Sept. 2012
TPG_2012_Oct_31	1.7	TPG activities in relation to languages	12 Sept. 2012
TPG_2012_Oct_32	4.1	Translations of terms and definitions in draft ISPM under MC 2012	3 Oct. 2012
TPG_2012_Oct_33	10	Review of durations of record keeping in ISPMs	3 Oct. 2012
TPG_2012_Oct_34	3.5	Current TPG work plan	3 Oct. 2012
TPG_2012_Oct_35	6.1	Subjects: re-export and consignment in transit	3 Oct. 2012
TPG_2012_Oct_36	12.3	Specification for TPG (draft revision)	3 Oct. 2012
TPG_2012_Oct_37	7.2.6	Review of adopted ISPMs for consistency: ISPM 9	9 October 2012
TPG_2012_Oct_38	6.1	Subjects on the work programme: quarantine station	9 October 2012
TPG_2012_Oct_39	6.1	Subjects on the work programme, from TPFF: tolerance level, quarantine area	9 October 2012

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	John.Hedley@mpi.govt.nz	2008 (CPM-3)	2013 (2 nd term 2013-2018)
	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	katbehbader@moa.gov.jo	2008 (CPM-3)	2013
✓	Ms Beatriz MELCHO Ministry of Livestock, Agriculture and Fisheries, General Direction of Agricultural Services, Plant Protection Division Avda. Millan 4703 CP 12900 Montevideo, Uruguay Tel: (+598) 2 309 8410 ext 267	Spanish	bmelcho@mgap.gub.uy ; bemelcho@hotmail.com	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	ninghong2006@yahoo.com.cn	September 2012	2017

	Participants details			TPG member's term	
	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Participant role	Email address	begins	ends
✓	Mr Ebbe NORDBO Danish AgriFish Agency Nyropsgade DK - 1780 Copenhagen V, Denmark Tel: (+45) 45 263 891 Fax: (+45) 45 263 613	English	eno@naturerhverv.dk	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	shaza.roshdy@gmail.com	October 2012	2017
✓	Mr Andrei ORLINSKI European Plant Protection Organization 21 bd. Richard Lenoir 75011 Paris, France Tel: (+33) 1 45 20 77 94 ; (+33) 1 45207809 Fax: (+33) 1 70 76 65 47	Russian	Orlinski@eppo.int	November 2010	2015
✓	Mr Ian SMITH c/o European Plant Protection Organization 21 bd. Richard Lenoir 75011 Paris, France	French	ian@ianclaresmith.com	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	Fabienne.Grousset@fao.org		
✓	Ms Eva MOLLER Standard Setting IPPC Secretariat FAO, Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00153 Rome, Italy Tel: +390657052855	IPPC Secretariat	Eva.Moller@fao.org		

Annex 4: TPG Consistency Suggestions

**TPG CONSISTENCY SUGGESTIONS:
DRAFT REVISION OF ANNEX 1 (APPROVED TREATMENTS ASSOCIATED WITH WOOD
PACKAGING MATERIAL) TO ISPM 15:2009 (2006-011)**

The TPG reviews draft International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPMs) under consultation with regards to member comments on terminology, and to consistency in the use of terms within and between standards. At its meeting in October 2012, the TPG reviewed the following draft ISPMs recently subject to the Substantial concerns commenting period (SCCP):

- 2006-011: Draft revision of Annex 1 (Approved treatments associated with wood packaging material) to ISPM 15:2009;
- 2005-001: Draft Annex on *Pest risk analysis for plants as quarantine pests* to ISPM 11:2004, and core text consequential changes to ISPM 11:2004.

No member comments had been made on terminology for these two draft ISPMs. Regarding consistency, the TPG had one comment in relation to the draft 2006-011: Draft revision of Annex 1 (*Approved treatments associated with wood packaging material*) to ISPM 15:2009.

	Para grap h no.	Comments	Explanation	
1.	[18]	Treatment providers must should be approved by the NPPO. The following factors should be considered by the NPPO w When evaluating the capability of a heat chamber to meet the heat treatment requirements, <u>the NPPO should consider whether the following factors apply:</u>	The current wording gives a wrong impression. While treatment providers must be approved by the NPPO, the factors indicated below are examples of factors that may be used to evaluate the heat chamber, hence the proposed use of 'whether'.	TPG

Annex 5: Draft Amendments to the Glossary

(to be reviewed and completed at the February 2013 TPG meeting before being presented to the SC at its May 2013 meeting)

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

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. This paper was drafted by the Secretariat based on TPG discussions, and reviewed and finalized by TPG members at its February meeting and by email when finalizing the February 2013 meeting report. The proposals refer to individual terms on the work programme, to consequential changes arising from the changes proposed, or to the review of ISPM 5 for consistency (the modification to *kiln-drying* identified during the consistency review is substantive and therefore presented as an amendment to the glossary). This paper is presented to the May 2013 SC for review and modification prior to member consultation

1. ADDITIONS

1.1 EXCLUSION (2010-008) TPG report 6.1.6

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 work programme – 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

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

1.2 PRODUCTION SITE (2012-004) TPG report 6.1.10

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 definition of *place of production* and *pest-free production site* needs to be adjusted (see section 2.4).

Proposed addition

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

2. REVISIONS

2.1 POINT OF ENTRY (2010-005) TPG report 6.1.3

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.
- 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

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

Proposed revision

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

2.2 SYSTEMS APPROACH(ES) (2010-002) TPG report 6.1.4

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 the correct glossary term *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 prejudge 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

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

Proposed revision

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

2.3 SUPPRESSION (2011-002), ERADICATION (2011-003), CONTAINMENT (2011-004), CONTROL (2011-005) TPG report 6.1.6

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 (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

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

Proposed revisions

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

2.4 PLACE OF PRODUCTION AND PEST-FREE PRODUCTION SITE TPG report 6.1.10

Background

Consequential change to the definition of *place of production* and *pest-free production site* are needed due to the proposed new definition for *production site* (see section X.X). 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 in view of the proposed new definition of a *production site*.

[Note to the TPG: The proposed definition for pest free production site needs to be reconsidered at the February 2013 meeting (and justification added as needed) based on the discussions on pest freedom and on the definitions that use “occurrence”/“occur”.]

Original definitions

place of production	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]
pest free production site	A defined portion of a place of production in which a specific pest does not occur as demonstrated by scientific evidence and in which, where appropriate, this condition is being officially maintained for a defined period and that is managed as a separate unit in the same way as a pest free place of production [ISPM 10:1999]

Proposed revisions

place of production	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
pest free production site <i>[to be rediscussed, see above]</i>	A production site defined portion of a place of production in which a specific pest [does not occur] as demonstrated by scientific evidence and in which, where appropriate, this condition is being officially maintained for a defined period and that is managed as a separate unit in the same way as a pest free place of production

2.5 QUARANTINE STATION (2010-013) TPG report 6.1.13

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 tanks 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

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

Proposed revision

quarantine station	Official station for holding plants, plants products or other regulated articles, including beneficial organisms, in quarantine
---------------------------	--

3. DELETIONS

3.1 OCCURRENCE (2010-026) TPG report 6.1.2

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* 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.

Proposed deletion

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

[Note to the TPG: definitions containing *occurrence* will be reviewed and changes consequential to the proposed deletion of *occurrence* may be added to the amendments in February]

3.2 ORGANISM (2010-021), NATURALLY OCCURRING (2010-023) TPG report 6.1.8

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.
- The definition includes requirements “capable of reproduction or replication”, i.e. implicitly not sterile and not dead, which should not appear in a definition.

Proposed deletions

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

3.3 RESTRICTION (2010-027) TPG report 6.1.9

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

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

3.4 PROTECTED AREA (2012-003), CONTROLLED AREA TPG report 6.1.11

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

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

3.5 RE-EXPORTED CONSIGNMENT (2010-024), CONSIGNMENT IN TRANSIT (2010-039) TPG report 6.1.12

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.

- 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

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

Note to the SC: alternative proposal if deletion of *re-exported consignment* is not accepted:

Re-export of consignments is of particular concern in the phytosanitary context and is a specific concept. In phytosanitary terms, it requires traceability of re-exported consignments. However, it is not *re-export* in itself that can be defined, and requirements for *re-exported consignments* are explained in ISPM 12: 2011. The very specific item for phytosanitary purposes in relation to re-export is the PC for re-export, which may therefore be defined. The following points may be considered:

- A PC for re-export always relate to a consignment that has been imported and then re-exported, while a *re-exported consignment* is not necessarily accompanied by a PC for re-export, but may be accompanied by the original certificate or by a new PC for export, hence “*where applicable*”.
- A PC is already defined, and the model certificates of the IPPC do not need to be mentioned.
- The second sentence of the current definition (*The consignment may be stored, split up, combined with other consignments or have its packaging changed*) was deleted as it does not belong in a definition. It gives a specification of the circumstances in which re-export is possible and relates to phytosanitary certification. These considerations are explained in ISPM 12:2011. Definitions in general should not include requirements, and would in any case not be able to capture the complexity of alternative re-export certification in a concise manner.
- *In whole or in part* was added to respond to the SC concern that the consignment may not be re-exported as a whole, and this should be clear in the definition.

Original definition

re-exported consignment	Consignment that has been imported into a country from which it is then exported. The consignment may be stored, split up, combined with other consignments or have its packaging changed [FAO, 1990; revised CEPM, 1996; CEPM, 1999; ICPM, 2001; ICPM, 2002; formerly country of re-export]
--------------------------------	--

Proposed alternative (replacing re-exported consignment)

phytosanitary certificate for re-export	A specific phytosanitary certificate , which is specified in the IPPC , accompanying, where applicable, a consignment that has been imported into a country from which it is <u>then</u> exported, in whole or in part.
--	---

3.6 KILN-DRYING TPG report 7.2.3**Background**

The TPG in October 2011 when reviewing ISPM 5 for the consistency in the use of terms, proposed an ink amendment to the definition of kiln-drying in order to remove and/or. The November 2011 SC returned this term to the TPG for further consideration. Deletion of the term was proposed by the TPG in October 2012, and reviewed by the SC in May 2013. The following may be considered:

- the term *kiln-drying* has no specific phytosanitary meaning and is used in other domains.

- this term is used only once in ISPMs (in Annex 1 of ISPM 15 among other examples of heat treatment).

Proposed deletion

kiln-drying	A process in which wood is dried in a closed chamber using heat and/or humidity control to achieve a required moisture content [ISPM 15:2002]
--------------------	--

Note to the SC: alternative proposal if the deletion cannot be accepted. The TPG suggests that deletion would be the best solution. If the SC does not accept this solution, the TPG invites the SC to add this term to the *List of topics for IPPC standards* to be revised, as the definition is currently incorrect (see report of the October 2012 TPG).

Annex 6: TPG Work Plan 2012-2013**TPG WORK PLAN 2012-2013 (at October 2012)**Table 1: regular tasksTable 2: one-off tasksTable 3: terms on the TPG work programme as subjects**Table 1 - Regular tasks**

Regular tasks	Detailed task		Responsible	Deadline	Comments
1-Report Oct 2012 meeting	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	20-12-2012	
	TPG review report		All	10-01-2013	
	Final report		Secretariat with steward/rapporteur	15-01-2013	
1- Report Feb 2013 meeting	Draft report to Steward and rapporteur		Secretariat	20-02-2013	
	Steward and rapporteur send back draft report		Steward & rapporteur	10-03-2013	
	Secretariat finalizes report and sends to TPG		Secretariat	20-03-2013	
	TPG review report		All	05-04-2013	
	Final report		Secretariat with steward/rapporteur	10-04-2013	
1- Reporting to SC	Prepare executive summary of Oct 2012 and Feb 2013 meetings for SC May		Secretariat with steward	10-04-2013	
2- Draft ISPMs in member consultation	2012 MC	check accuracy of translation of definitions in draft ISPMs. Members receive draft definitions for their language (document from TPG October)	members for French, Spanish	04-02-2013	TPG 2013
		Proposals of translations for Chinese, Arabic and Russian	Members for Russian, Chinese, Arabic	15-01-2013	TPG 2013
		Review for possible inconsistencies and consideration of comments	All prior to meeting	04-02-2013	
		Terms and consistency comments extracted	Secretariat	10-11-2012	
		Reactions to comments/consistency review integrated in tables: all drafts, and sent to stewards via Secretariat	Secretariat with steward	25-02-2013	
		Reactions on translation of terms sent to Secretariat for consideration at	Secretariat	25-02-2013	

		next translation phase			
3- Annotated glossary – (to be published every 3 years)	2010 (publication)	Publication of revised annotated Glossary 2010	Secretariat	2012	Done
	2012 (intermediate)	Document for TPG taking account of adoptions etc since TPG 2010	Ian Smith	20-12-2012	TPG 2013
4- Review of membership	Annual review of membership to make recommendations to SC on new members needed		All during TPG 2013	04-02-2013	TPG 2013
5- Explanation of glossary terms	Members to identify before the meeting some glossary terms/definitions requiring further explanations (and not already explained in other places, such as the annotated glossary).		All to send to Secretariat	31-12-2012 + doc Oct 26	TPG 2013

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

One-off tasks	Detailed task	Responsible	Deadline	Comments	
6- Individual terms	Volunteers to be identified	All during TPG 2012			
	Draft "Amendments to the glossary 2013" (based on TPG 2012) Secretariat to steward	Secretariat	10-11-2012		
	Draft "Amendments to the glossary 2013" (based on TPG 2012) back from steward	Steward	31-12-2012		
	Draft "Amendments to the glossary 2013" (based on TPG 2012) to TPG 2013	Sect, Steward, Rapp, all	15-01-2013	In report	
	Volunteer sends draft meeting paper to Secretariat	As allocated in Table 3	15-01-2013	TPG 2013	
	Draft amendments 2013 completed based on discussions at Feb 2013, to SC	Secretariat, Steward	10-04-2013	To SC May 2013	
7- Review of adopted ISPMs for consistency and style	General recommendations on consistency: yearly updates 2012 as needed (based on TPG 2012)	All prior to meeting	14-10-2012	TPG 2012	
		Secretariat and steward	15-01-2013	TPG 2013	
	General recommendations on consistency: yearly updates 2013 as needed	All prior to meeting	04-02-2013	TPG 2013	
		Secretariat and steward to SC	10-04-2013	in TPG report	
	Procedure for consistency changes across standards, mechanisms, examples etc.		Secretariat, steward	15-01-2013	TPG 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 2013		TPG 2013
8- Brief guidance for style guide on use of the terms "should", "shall" and "must"	Paper to SC		Secretariat	25-10-2012	To SC Nov 2012
9. Review of duration of record keeping in ISPMs	Working document (doc TPG_2012_Oct_33 to be reviewed and recommendations developed)		All during TPG 2013		TPG 2013
10- Drafts in 2012 Substantial concerns commenting period (ISPM 15 treatments + PRA for plants as pests)	Drafts to be reviewed for possible inconsistencies		All prior to meeting	14-10-2012	TPG 2012
	Terms and consistency comments extracted		Secretariat	10-10-2012	TPG 2012
	Consistency suggestions to SC (1 for the draft on ISPM 15 treatments)		Secretariat/steward	25-10-2012	To SC Nov 2012

Table 3 - Terms on the TPG work programme as subjects

Deadline for preparation of papers for TPG 2013 is 15 January 2013 for all terms

		Source of the proposal	volunteer for preparation	Comments	Summary outcome of TPG 2012 and next step
	To be prepared for TPG 2012 meeting				
1.	additional declaration (2010-006)	SC November 2010	John Hedley	In relation to soil. SC November 2010 - Deletion of "soil or other" was proposed, as the definition for additional declaration includes the wording "in relation to regulated pests". On the other hand it was noted that the additional declaration is the only place on the phytosanitary certificate where statements for specific situations, such as soil freedom, can be made. Additional declarations for soil freedom are common practice. Soil is included in Article 1 of the IPPC and is a major pathway. The SC decided to leave soil as an example and request the TPG to consider revision of the definition of <i>additional declaration</i> .	Paper to be prepared To be discussed at TPG 2013
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, and seek guidance on whether to proceed

		Source of the proposal	volunteer for preparation	Comments	Summary outcome of TPG 2012 and next step
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"> - Report to SC May 2013: no change to pest - Deletion of organism and naturally occurring in <i>Amendments to the glossary 2013</i>
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"> - Reconsider in Feb 2013 based on Oct 2012 report (+ pfa, pfpp, pfps)
5.	phytosanitary status (2010-004)	TPG discussion 2010 Added SC November 2010	Ebbe Nordbo	To review the use in ISPMs and consider if the term needs to be clarified. Raised in TPG 2010 in relation to the draft ISPM on plants for planting. The term is used in many contexts, in relation to e.g. area, pest. Use in standards should be reviewed and used considered. Term might need to be clarified.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Paper to be revised for Feb 2013 meeting - Add as example to paper on consistency across standards - add general consistency recommendation
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 points of entry inside countries.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Revised def in Amendments 2013 - Inform SC May 2013 that revision needed in 3 ISPMs. - add to general consistency recommendations
7.	presence (2010-025), occurrence (2010-026)	TPG discussion 2009	Ebbe Nordbo and Ian Smith	To review the use in English ISPMs and in languages to make sure consistent. TPG 2010 discussed. Outcome detailed in the 2010 report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Deletion of occurrence in amendments to the glossary 2013 - consequential adjustments to other definitions to be prepared by Ebbe Nordbo for February meeting - leave in other stds) - add general consistency recommendation
8.	re-export (of a consignment) (2010-024) consignment in	TPG discussion 2009 Back to TPG from SC May	Andrei Orlinski	TPG 2010 revised definition of <i>re-export of a consignment</i>) and proposed consequential change to the definition of <i>consignment in transit</i> . SC May 2011: "For several members, the proposed definition implied that the consignment had to be re-exported as a whole. The SC discussed whether the	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consignment in transit: deletion (Amendments 2013) Re-export of a consignment - Deletion (Amendments 2013).

		Source of the proposal	volunteer for preparation	Comments	Summary outcome of TPG 2012 and next step
	transit (2010-039)	2011		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> .	- If absolutely needed propose to rather define PC for re-export
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 2010	Beatriz Melcho	To consider the pros and cons of redefining/revising. Need to review use in standards and consider whether to revise. Two issues to be considered for possible revision of the definition: "risk management measures" (should it be "pest risk management measures") meeting "appropriate level of protection" ("should it be "phytosanitary import requirements") [Note: a third issue may be raised by SC in May 2012 based on a suggestion by the SC-7 in May 2011]	- Revision in amendments 2013 - TPG agree that not needed to 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 Amendemnts 2013 (as sent for MC in 2011)

		Source of the proposal	volunteer for preparation	Comments	Summary outcome of TPG 2012 and next step
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)	Paper to be prepared To be discussed at TPG 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 (Amendments 2013)
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 (Amendments 2013) - consequential: change to place of production and pest-free production site (both in Amendments 2013) - pest free prod site to be reconsider at TPG 2013 in relation with pest freedom issues
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; -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	Paper to be prepared To be discussed at TPG 2013
Terms to be proposed to the SC in May 2013, for addition to the <i>List of topics for IPPC standards</i>					
19.	regulatory status	Pending addition to the List of topics –	Ian Smith	Details in Oct 2012 TPG report	- draft def to be included in relation to the proposal on phytosanitary status - Ask SC May 2013 to add to the list of

		Source of the proposal	volunteer for preparation	Comments	Summary outcome of TPG 2012 and next step
		no action needed for Feb 2013 meeting			topics for new definition - Add to amendments 2013 as worked on already
20.	kiln-drying	Pending SC May 2013– no action needed for Feb 2013 meeting	Andrei Orlinski (if added by SC May 2013)	Details in Oct 2012 TPG report	- deletion (Amendments 2013) or if not acceptable, Ask SC May 2013 to add to the list of topics for revision
21.	trading partners	Pending SC May 2013– no action needed for Feb 2013 meeting	Ian Smith (if added by SC May 2013)	Details in Oct 2012 TPG report	Ask SC May 2013 to add to the list of topics for new definition
22.	phytosanitary security (of a consignment)	Pending SC May 2013– no action needed for Feb 2013 meeting	Ebbe Nordbo (if added by SC May 2013)	Details in Oct 2012 TPG report	Ask SC May 2013 to add to the list of topics for new definition
23.	visual examination	Pending SC May 2013– no action needed for Feb 2013 meeting	Andrei Orlinski (if added by SC May 2013)	Details in Oct 2012 TPG report	Ask SC May 2013 to add to the list of topics for new definition
Terms related to consistency					
24.	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	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

		Source of the proposal	volunteer for preparation	Comments	Summary outcome of TPG 2012 and next step
			returned by SC Nov. 2010		
25.	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	