



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



**International
Plant Protection
Convention**

Report

Technical Panel on Commodity Standards

22 & 27 January 2026

Virtual meeting

IPPC Secretariat

Required Citation:

IPPC Secretariat. 2026. *Report of the meeting of the Technical Panel on Commodity Standards, 22 & 27 January 2026*. FAO on behalf of the Secretariat of the International Plant Protection Convention.

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

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

© FAO, 2026



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

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

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

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

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

CONTENTS

| | | |
|-----|--|----|
| 1. | Opening of the meeting | 4 |
| 1.1 | Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat | 4 |
| 2. | Meeting arrangements | 4 |
| 2.1 | Selection of chairperson | 4 |
| 2.2 | Selection of the rapporteur | 4 |
| 2.3 | Adoption of the agenda | 4 |
| 3. | Administrative matters | 4 |
| 4. | Review of outstanding issues..... | 4 |
| 4.1 | Follow-up from TPCS face-to-face meeting in December 2025..... | 4 |
| 4.2 | Discussion of any challenges or issues arising during the revision of draft commodity standards..... | 6 |
| 5. | Review and finalization of draft commodity standards for first consultation in 2026 | 6 |
| 5.1 | International movement of fresh <i>Citrus</i> spp. fruit (2023-019), priority 1 | 7 |
| 5.2 | International movement of seeds of <i>Phaseolus vulgaris</i> (2023-008), priority 1 | 9 |
| 5.3 | International movement of fresh <i>Malus domestica</i> fruit for consumption (2023-024), priority 2..... | 11 |
| 6. | Any other business..... | 12 |
| 7. | Next TPCS meeting..... | 12 |
| 8. | Close of the meeting | 12 |
| | Appendix 1: Agenda..... | 13 |

1. Opening of the meeting

1.1 Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat

- [1] Avetik NERSISYAN, the IPPC Standard Setting Unit lead, opened the virtual meeting of the Technical Panel on Commodity Standards (TPCS) and welcomed all participants.
- [2] The IPPC Secretariat (hereafter referred to as “the secretariat”) explained that the main focus for the meeting was to review three of the draft annexes to ISPM 46 (*Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures*) – hereafter referred to as “commodity standards” (CSs) – that the panel had worked on during their meeting in December 2025 (see agenda item 5).
- [3] The stewards for the draft CSs considered under agenda item 5 joined the TPCS for the meeting. The new assistant TPCS steward, Nader ELBADRY (Egypt), attended the second session of the meeting and the secretariat introduced him to panel members.

2. Meeting arrangements

2.1 Selection of chairperson

- [4] As agreed at their meeting in June 2023,¹ the TPCS selected Lihong ZHU (New Zealand) as chairperson.

2.2 Selection of the rapporteur

- [5] The TPCS selected Adriana CERIANI CAMDESSUS (Argentina) as rapporteur, with Alfayo OMBUYA (Kenya) also serving as a rapporteur for the first session.

2.3 Adoption of the agenda

- [6] The TPCS adopted the agenda (Appendix 1).

3. Administrative matters

- [7] The TPCS membership list had been circulated before the meeting. The chairperson asked TPCS members to notify the secretariat if any changes were needed to their details in the membership list.
- [8] The TPCS noted the absence of Patrick Kwesi BESEH (Ghana), Alfayo OMBUYA (Kenya) and Sun SHUANGYAN (China) from the second session of the meeting.

4. Review of outstanding issues

4.1 Follow-up from TPCS face-to-face meeting in December 2025

- [9] The chairperson referred to the draft summary of conclusions from the TPCS December 2025 meeting, which had been prepared by the secretariat during the meeting.²

Further reading section

- [10] One of the stewards for the draft CSs (the “subject stewards”) sought clarification on the decision made by the TPCS in December regarding the inclusion of a Further reading section, as this was not mentioned in the summary of conclusions. The secretariat explained that the latter document was only a draft, pending approval of the meeting report, and it had been produced before the discussion on Further reading, which had been at the end of the meeting. The secretariat confirmed that the TPCS had agreed not to include a Further reading section in draft CSs, for consistency between CSs and because of some concerns about the inclusion of some pest risk analyses (PRAs). The chairperson explained that there was no value in including PRAs that were not publicly available.

¹ TPCS 2023-06, agenda item 2.1.

² 02_TPCS_2026_Jan.

- [11] Some TPCS members reaffirmed their agreement with the panel's decision in December.
- [12] Some subject stewards and one assistant TPCS steward supported the inclusion of a Further reading section, as this would help countries conduct their own PRAs, enhance the transparency of the standard setting process for CSs, and thereby partly address concerns expressed by contracting parties. They noted that some PRAs were in the public domain, so a link could be given, and for those that were not in the public domain, the entry in the Further reading section would serve to record the PRA as a source but the PRA itself would not be made available. One of the stewards also noted that, during the first consultation on the draft CS on the International movement of fresh *Musa* spp. fruit (2023-028), there had been no suggestions that the Further reading section be removed.
- [13] One TPCS member supported the inclusion of a Further reading section, provided the information to be included in it would be helpful, but some others preferred to omit it.
- [14] The TPCS noted that, if a Further reading section were to be included in CSs, there was a need to be clear about what could be included in it: for example, would it only be for sources that had been used to support inclusion of pests and measures in the draft CS; and would bilateral agreements be included? The TPCS recognized that they would need to evaluate all the potential entries in the Further reading section to verify that they were suitable for inclusion. They speculated that many contracting parties may not want to share bilateral agreements. Although sources not in the public domain could be referenced to show that they had been used, the panel questioned the value of this. The TPCS also noted that they would need to ensure that the countries concerned were comfortable with the reference being included.

How to address pest absence

- [15] The TPCS continued their discussion, which they had started in December 2025,³ about how to address submissions that relate to the import requirements of “pest absence” or “pest free country”.
- [16] **Revision of ISPM 46 (Option 2).** The TPCS agreed not to recommend the revision of ISPM 46 to include the following statement from ISPM 4 (*Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas*): “If an exporting country has declared a pest to be absent in an area in accordance with ISPM 8, then establishing a PFA in that area should not be required, unless there is technical justification by importing countries”.
- [17] **Omitting all reference to pest absence (Option 3).** Some TPCS members preferred to omit all references to pest absence and all pests for which pest absence is the only submitted measure, given that the Standards Committee (SC) had confirmed that pest absence is not a phytosanitary measure and the primary objective of CSs is to provide options for phytosanitary measures.
- [18] **Including pests for which pest absence is the only measure, but with a footnote (Option 4).** Some TPCS members expressed concern that Option 3 would result in the loss of valuable information, as this would be excluding some pests that countries considered to pose a sufficient pest risk to warrant regulation and there could be general measures in the standard that would be applicable to those pests and which other countries could consider when conducting their PRAs. They therefore were in favour of Option 4. In this option, pests for which pest absence is the only measure would be included in the list of pests, with a footnote to indicate the import requirements, but not included in the list of pest-specific measures.
- [19] The TPCS recalled that, of the submissions to date, all the submissions of “pest free country” or “pest absence” had been clarified as being considered a pest free area (PFA), so it was possible that Option 4 was not needed. However, they recognized that they could not automatically assume that any submission of “pest free country” or “pest absence” was a PFA, so they needed to exercise due diligence in seeking clarification from submitters where needed.

³ TPCS 2025-12, agenda item 4.1.

- [20] **Preferred approach.** Given the divergence of views, the TPCS agreed to propose two options to the SC, Option 3 being the first preference and Option 4 the second preference. The reason for the order of preference was because Option 4 would introduce inconsistency in terms of including pests for which there was no measure. The TPCS also reaffirmed that, if a submission was related to pest absence but the precise measure was not clear, they would need to check with the submitter.

TPCS 2026 workplan

- [21] The secretariat presented the tentative TPCS workplan for 2026, which had been initially shared during the December 2025 meeting.⁴
- [22] The TPCS noted that a correction was needed to one of the assistant stewards for the draft CS on the International movement of seeds of *Phaseolus vulgaris* (2023-008).
- [23] The panel recognized that the timing of the face-to-face meeting was still tentative but noted that, if the draft CS on the International movement of *Vitis vinifera* fruit (2023-018) were to be submitted to first consultation in 2027, the meeting would need to take place in October or November 2026 as on the workplan. The chairperson, therefore, encouraged TPCS members to plan their schedules accordingly.
- [24] The TPCS:
- (1) *recalled* their recommendation in December 2025 that a Further reading section should not be included in CSs, *recognized* that this was a matter for SC decision, *acknowledged* that including a Further reading section would enhance transparency, and *noted* that, if a Further reading section were to be included, the wishes of countries to publicly share their material would need to be respected;
 - (2) *invited* the SC to *agree* to one of the following solutions for describing import requirements for “pest absence” and “pest free country” in CSs (*noting* that the TPCS would first clarify measures with submitters in cases of doubt):
 - TPCS first preference – omit all references to pest absence and pests for which pest absence is the only measure, or
 - TPCS second preference – include pests for which pest absence is the only measure in the list of pests, with a footnote to indicate the import requirements, but do not include them in the list of pest-specific measures; and
 - (3) *approved* the tentative TPCS workplan for 2026 and *invited* the SC to note it.

4.2 Discussion of any challenges or issues arising during the revision of draft commodity standards

- [25] Issues common to all draft CSs were discussed as they arose during consideration of the individual draft CSs in agenda item 5.

5. Review and finalization of draft commodity standards for first consultation in 2026

- [26] The TPCS reviewed the draft CSs that needed finalizing before submitting for first consultation. Since the panel’s face-to-face meeting in December 2025, the stewards had further refined the content of the draft standards and TPCS members had commented via e-fora on the amended drafts.⁵ For the draft CS on International movement of fresh *Citrus* spp. fruit (2023-019) and the draft CS for *P. vulgaris* seeds, the IPPC scientific copy-editor had also provided some initial feedback in the e-fora.
- [27] In-between the session on 22 January and the session on 27 January, the stewards for the draft CS for *Citrus* spp. and the draft CS for *P. vulgaris* seeds further refined the drafts and provided an updated draft for consideration by the TPCS on 27 January. This was not possible for the draft CS on the International

⁴ 03_TPCS_2026_Jan.

⁵ E-forum for *Citrus*, 2026_eTPCS_01; e-forum for *Phaseolus vulgaris* seeds, 2026_eTPCS_02; e-forum for *Malus domestica*, 2026_eTPCS_03.

movement of fresh *Malus domestica* fruit for consumption (2023-024), because this period coincided with the e-forum for that standard.

5.1 International movement of fresh *Citrus* spp. fruit (2023-019), priority 1

- [28] The Steward, André Felipe C.P. da SILVA (Brazil), confirmed that he had revised the draft to accommodate the changes assigned to him by the TPCS at its meeting in December 2025.
- [29] The TPCS reviewed the draft CS, including the comments made during the e-forum.⁶
- [30] **Scope.** The TPCS noted that there was an inconsistency between draft CSs as to whether the Scope section referred to the international “movement” of the commodity or the international “trade” of the commodity. The latter was used in the draft CS for *P. vulgaris* seeds, because the scope of ISPM 46 is trade and hence excludes movement of seeds for breeding or research purposes.⁷ However, the same change had not been made to the other draft CSs. As this issue affected all draft CSs, the TPCS agreed to leave it for the SC to consider in May 2026. They noted that that the issue may also arise when the SC Working Group (SC-7) considered the first consultation comments on the draft CS on the International movement of fresh *Colocasia esculenta* corms (2023-023) and the draft CS for *Musa* spp., but that would not be until the week after the SC’s May meeting at which the draft CSs recommended for first consultation would be considered.
- [31] **Pest absence.** Recalling their decision under agenda item 4.1 to recommend that pest absence be omitted from CSs, the TPCS agreed not to include the general statement from ISPM 4 (“If an exporting country has declared a pest to be absent in an area ...”) in the draft CS for *Citrus* spp.
- [32] **Low-mobility pests.** Recalling their agreement in December 2025 that pests with a low probability of transfer could be indicated with a footnote in the table of pests, the TPCS agreed to proceed with applying this approach. The TPCS considered whether the footnote should be below the table of measures or the table of pests but agreed to leave this to the subject steward to decide. The TPCS reversed their decision to cite a reference by the Comité de Sanidad Vegetal del Cono Sur (COSAVE) on low probability of transfer, because this was specific to the COSAVE region.
- [33] **Order of listing in the table of pests.** The TPCS agreed that Chromista should be listed separately to Fungi, even though the former included genera that formerly had been considered Fungi (e.g. *Phytophthora*), as the Chromista and Fungi were separate kingdoms. The order of listing of these two kingdoms could not be based on taxonomic complexity, as neither was universally more complex than the other, so the TPCS agreed to list Chromista first as in the Catalogue of Life (which applied alphabetical order).⁸
- [34] **Extra heading for viruses and viroids in the table of pests.** In the table of pests, the TPCS agreed that a heading row would need to be inserted above the rows for virus and viroid names, explaining the contents of the virus or viroid name column, because the latter gave the virus name, acronym and species name rather than the scientific name and authority.
- [35] **Synonyms.** The TPCS recalled that the style applied to date, as agreed by the TPCS and the SC, was not to include synonyms: where more than one name for a pest had been submitted, only the most recent, accepted scientific name of the names submitted would be included. However, the TPCS noted that the inclusion of synonyms may enhance transparency, as without the synonyms it might not be clear to submitting countries that the pests they had submitted had been included. The TPCS recognized that the approach could not be changed without the agreement of the SC, as it had been endorsed by the SC, but the stewards could raise it in their steward’s notes. In the meantime, the IPPC scientific copy-editor and

⁶ 2023-019.

⁷ TPCS 2025-06, agenda item 5.3.

⁸ Catalogue of Life: <https://www.catalogueoflife.org/>

the subject steward for *Citrus* spp. would address any entries for which there was a query about which name to use.

[36] **Footnotes to the table of pests.** The TPCS agreed that the footnotes should be consistent with those of other draft CSs, pending the text that is eventually adopted for the draft CS for *C. esculenta* (taro) corms and the draft CS for *Musa* spp.

[37] **Box of abbreviations.** The TPCS recalled that the box of abbreviations in CS 1 (International movement of fresh *Mangifera indica* fruit) had been added in response to a consultation comment seeking more prominence for the abbreviations. However, during the first consultation on the draft CS for taro and the draft CS for *Musa* spp., two regions had suggested deleting the box to avoid repeating information that was provided in table footnotes. The TPCS agreed to retain the box of abbreviations, as it had already been included in the draft CS for *Citrus* spp., and leave it to the SC to decide whether to remove it.

[38] **Footnotes to tables of pest-specific measures.** The TPCS recalled that the following statement had been included by the SC as a footnote to tables of measures to distinguish between phytosanitary treatments (PTs) that had been adopted by the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) and other measures that had not been adopted by the CPM:

Options in bold are annexes to ISPM 28 (*Phytosanitary treatments for regulated pests*); these annexes are adopted by the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM); other treatments included in the table meet the criteria in ISPM 46 (*Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures*) but are not adopted by the CPM.

[39] The TPCS considered whether to include the second part of the statement as a footnote to tables that did not list any PTs. The subject steward suggested that it be included, so that it was clear that the methyl bromide treatments listed were not adopted by the CPM. However, the TPCS agreed that it was not necessary to do this, as all measures listed in CSs meet the criteria in ISPM 46.

[40] **Table of methyl bromide treatments.** The subject steward referred to one query raised during the e-forum seeking clarification on the terminology to use (“dosage” vs “dose”) and how to present the units (whether concentration should be presented per unit volume). The TPCS agreed to seek advice from the Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments.

[41] The TPCS agreed to refer to the CPM recommendation on the *Replacement or reduction of the use of methyl bromide as a phytosanitary measure* (R-03) in a footnote to the table, as well as in the body text, for consistency across all draft CSs and because tables are stand-alone elements. The TPCS asked the IPPC scientific copy-editor to ensure that this was applied across all draft CSs.

[42] **Codes for measures.** The TPCS considered a query raised during the e-forum about whether the use of both lower- and upper-case letters in a code would present problems in some FAO languages. The TPCS agreed to leave this for the Technical Panel for the Glossary to comment upon, as it included experts in all the FAO languages.

[43] **Systems approaches.** Following their decision in December 2025 to include some explanatory text about systems approaches,⁹ the TPCS clarified that this text would not be included in those draft CSs for which no systems approaches had been submitted. So, it would be included in the draft CS for *Citrus* spp. but not for the draft CS for *P. vulgaris* seeds. The TPCS reaffirmed that their recommended approach to systems approaches need not apply to those draft CSs that had already been submitted to first consultation.

[44] **Combinations of measures.** The TPCS recognized that, where a combination of measures is submitted for a pest but the submitter does not specify that it is a systems approach, the panel should not assume it is a systems approach. Instead, the measures should be listed in the format “measure 1 and measure 2” in the table of pest-specific measures (using “and” to denote a combination), with an explanatory footnote if required.

⁹ TPCS 2025-12, agenda item 6.2.

- [45] The TPCS noted that some of the combinations of measures in the draft CS for *Citrus* spp., which listed a PFA and a systems approach, might be a misrepresentation of the relevant regulations, which provided options. A TPCS member from the submitting region offered to liaise with the subject steward to address these entries.
- [46] **Imbalances between measures listed for similar pests.** The TPCS noted that one of the common issues encountered in draft CSs was an imbalance in the measures listed for similar pests: for example, one pest that was very difficult to spot had export inspection listed as a measure, whereas another pest that was very easy to spot had only a pest free place of production listed, with no mention of export inspection. The TPCS acknowledged that the measures listed were those submitted by contracting parties, so some imbalance was perhaps inevitable as the submissions depended on what measures countries included in their phytosanitary import requirements and which countries submitted information. However, the panel noted that the table of general measures included measures such as inspection; during consultation, contracting parties could add additional pest-specific measures that met the criteria in ISPM 46; and there was precedence for the TPCS adding a measure that had not been submitted by a contracting party but met the criteria in ISPM 46 (in CS 1).
- [47] This completed the review of the draft standard by the TPCS. The TPCS chairperson thanked the steward for his work on the draft standard.
- [48] The TPCS:
- (4) *requested* that the secretariat reach out to the Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments for advice on how to present the information (terminology and units) on methyl bromide treatments;
 - (5) *agreed* that José María GUTIAN CASTRILLON would liaise with the subject steward to resolve queries regarding combinations of measures, as discussed in this meeting;
 - (6) *recalled* their decision in June 2025 to *recommend* the draft CS on the International movement of *Citrus* fruit (2023-019), subject to final review by the TPCS via an e-forum, to the SC for approval for first consultation in July 2026;
 - (7) *agreed* that the draft standard, once finalized by the steward as discussed this meeting, was ready to proceed to the SC; and
 - (8) *suggested* that the SC consider seeking advice from the Technical Panel for the Glossary on whether the use of both lower- and upper-case letters in a code for a measure would present a problem in any FAO language.

5.2 International movement of seeds of *Phaseolus vulgaris* (2023-008), priority 1

- [49] The TPCS reviewed the draft CS, including the comments made during the e-forum.¹⁰ The Steward, Stavroula IOANNIDOU (Greece), highlighted the issues requiring TPCS consideration.
- [50] **Scope.** The TPCS agreed to leave it to the SC to decide whether to refer to “movement” or “trade” of the commodity. This also applied to text in the section on Options for phytosanitary measures.
- [51] **Technical justification.** In the section on Pests associated with seeds of *Phaseolus vulgaris*, the TPCS considered a suggestion made during the e-forum to amend the final phrase of the following text:
- When determining whether to regulate a pest listed in this commodity standard, an importing country should base its decision on technical justification using either a pest risk analysis or, where applicable, another comparable examination and evaluation of available scientific information.
- [52] The secretariat advised that this phrase was derived from the convention text itself and the definition of “technically justified” in ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*). The TPCS agreed to retain the wording for consistency with CS 1 and other draft CSs.
- [53] **Table of pests.** The subject steward sought advice on a beetle that she had listed in the table of pests as “*Bruchus* spp.” but in the table of pest-specific measures as “*Bruchus* spp. (except *B. pisorum* and

¹⁰ 2023-027.

B. rufimanus)”. She recalled that the TPCS had previously agreed to exclude pests from the table of pests if only the genus name had been submitted but that genus entries were acceptable in the table of measures. The TPCS considered whether to omit the pest from the table of pests and retain it in the table of measures but recognized that this would introduce inconsistency. They therefore asked the secretariat to clarify with the submitter which species were regulated and which measures related to which species.

- [54] **Footnote to the table of pests.** The secretariat recalled a consultation comment on the draft CSs submitted for first consultation in July 2025, which suggested that text referring to virus and viroid names be deleted from the footnote below the table of pests. The secretariat explained that the text was needed because viruses and viroids were presented as virus or viroid names and species names, rather than “scientific names”, and because contracting parties may have submitted virus or viroid names rather than species names. The TPCS agreed to include the relevant text.
- [55] **Options for phytosanitary measures.** The TPCS noted that a requirement for national plant protection organizations to consider the parameters or procedures for the successful application of phytosanitary measures appeared twice in the draft CS. They deleted one instance to avoid redundancy.
- [56] **Level of obligation in commodity standards.** The TPCS agreed to rephrase the final paragraph of the section on Options for phytosanitary measures. The new wording used the usual terminology for levels of obligation in ISPMs and avoided introducing any new requirements, as it is a basic principle of CSs that they do not impose additional obligations on importing countries.¹¹
- [57] **Box of abbreviations.** The TPCS agreed to retain the box of abbreviations, for the SC to consider whether to keep it or remove it.
- [58] **Methyl bromide fumigation.** The subject steward explained that clarification from technical experts in phytosanitary treatments was needed to clarify how to present the information from one submission, including the units to use. The TPCS agreed to seek advice from the Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments.
- [59] The TPCS agreed that, where a single source included multiple methyl bromide schedules, these would be presented as a single treatment with four options for schedules, rather than as multiple treatments.
- [60] The TPCS agreed to keep methyl bromide fumigation as a separate table rather than combining with other chemical treatments, as there may be additional methyl bromide treatments to add to the draft CS in future.
- [61] **Phosphine fumigation.** The TPCS agreed to present the phosphine fumigation treatment in a separate table.
- [62] **Fungicides.** The TPCS agreed to use the code “FNG” for fungicide treatments, rather than the generic “ChT” which had been proposed for chemical treatments.
- [63] **Codes for measures.** As with the draft CS for *Citrus* spp., the TPCS agreed that the Technical Panel for the Glossary was in a better position to advise on any likely problems with the use of both lower- and upper-case letters in codes for measures.
- [64] **Seed testing.** The subject steward recalled that, in June 2025, the TPCS had agreed to include a table providing further detail of seed testing, if possible.¹² However, she had subsequently realized that seed testing was an overall approach rather than an individual measure, consisting of sampling followed by a range of diagnostic tests, which may vary between countries, with subsequent storage and re-export. She therefore suggested that she could raise the question with the SC in her steward’s notes. The TPCS recognized that including a Further reading section may be beneficial in this context, as relevant sources on seed testing could be included in that instead of providing the information itself in the standard. The

¹¹ ISPM 46, section on Principles in relation to commodity standards.

¹² TPCS 2025-06, agenda item 5.3.

TPCS also noted that extra information on other general measures, such as export inspection, is not provided in CSs. The TPCS agreed to leave the matter to the discretion of the subject steward.

[65] This completed the review of the draft standard by the TPCS. The TPCS chairperson thanked the steward for her work on the draft standard.

[66] The TPCS:

- (9) *requested* that the secretariat clarify with the submitter of the *Bruchus* spp. submission which species were regulated and which measures related to which species;
- (10) *requested* that the secretariat liaise with the subject steward to clarify the advice needed on how to present the information on methyl bromide treatments and then to reach out to the Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments for advice;
- (11) *recalled* their decision in June 2025 to *recommend* the draft CS on the International movement of seeds of *Phaseolus vulgaris* (2023-008), subject to final review by the TPCS via an e-forum, to the SC for approval for first consultation in July 2026; and
- (12) *agreed* that the draft standard, once finalized by the steward as discussed this meeting, was ready to proceed to the SC.

5.3 International movement of fresh *Malus domestica* fruit for consumption (2023-024), priority 2

[67] The TPCS reviewed the draft CS, including the comments made during the e-forum.¹³ The Steward, Joanne WILSON (New Zealand), highlighted the issues requiring TPCS consideration.

[68] **Scope.** The TPCS agreed to leave it to the SC to decide whether to refer to “movement” or “trade” of the commodity.

[69] **Synonyms.** The TPCS agreed to leave synonyms in the table of pests for the SC to reconsider whether to include synonyms for reasons of transparency. The subject steward confirmed that she would raise the matter in her steward’s notes.

[70] **Table of cold treatments.** The subject steward explained that she had included a column for the target pest because the references were specific to particular pests, so if the target pest was not mentioned it was not clear which reference related to which pest. The TPCS agreed to omit the column, however, for consistency with the draft CS for *Citrus* spp., where the panel had decided to delete the column for the target pest because the target pest was already included in the table of pests.

[71] **Bilateral agreements.** The TPCS considered how to reference bilateral agreements that were not in the public domain. The panel reaffirmed that it was not appropriate to mention individual countries (for reasons discussed previously) but that the references could be listed as “bilateral agreement” or similar, with a footnote to the table to explain that information was available from the secretariat on request. The TPCS noted that it would be up to the parties that were signatories to the bilateral agreement to decide whether to share it.

[72] **Table of systems approaches.** The subject steward explained that she had applied the recommended approach agreed by the TPCS at its meeting in December 2025, including some explanatory text about systems approaches as well as a general list of component measures (the latter with the code “SA G”).

[73] The subject steward explained that she had included two levels of headings for component measures in the table: italicized headings for SA G to indicate the expected objective of the measures to reduce pest risk and underlined headings to indicate the category of measure. The TPCS agreed to retain this approach to enhance clarity.

¹³ 2023-024.

[74] **Explanatory text on systems approaches.** The TPCS considered where best to place the explanatory text about systems approaches. They agreed that it was better to place it close to the table of systems approaches to aid understanding of the table. However, if it were treated as body text here, this would be inconsistent with the rest of the body text in the section on Options for phytosanitary measures, which was located before the tables of measures. They therefore agreed to present the explanatory text in a text box above the table of systems approaches, with a cross-reference to both the text box and the table to be included in the body text of the section on Options for phytosanitary measures.

[75] This completed the review of the draft standard by the TPCS. The TPCS chairperson thanked the steward for her work on the draft standard.

[76] The TPCS:

- (13) *recommended* the draft CS on the International movement of fresh *Malus domestica* fruit for consumption (2023-024), subject to modifications by the steward as agreed at this meeting, to the SC for approval for first consultation in July 2026.

6. Any other business

[77] There was no other business.

7. Next TPCS meeting

[78] The dates and venue of the next meeting will be confirmed by the secretariat after this meeting.

8. Close of the meeting

[79] The chairperson thanked the participants and closed the meeting.

Appendix 1: Agenda

| Agenda Item | | Document No. | Presenter |
|-------------|--|---|---|
| 1. | Opening of the Meeting | | |
| 1.1 | Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat | -- | NERSISYAN/ PEROTTI |
| 2. | Meeting Arrangements | | |
| 2.1 | Selection of Chairperson | -- | |
| 2.2 | Selection of the Rapporteur | -- | Chairperson |
| 2.3 | Adoption of the Agenda | 01_TPCS_2025_Dec | Chairperson |
| 3. | Administrative Matters | | |
| 3.1 | Documents List | 02_TPCS_2025_Dec | KRAH |
| 3.2 | Participants List / membership list | TPCS membership list 03_TPCS_2025_Dec | |
| 3.3 | Local Information - Local information | 04_TPCS_2025_Dec | |
| 4. | Updates | | |
| 4.1 | <p>Updates from the November Standards Committee meeting - from IPPC Secretariat and TPCS Steward</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> COSAVE paper: COSAVE proposal to review the criteria for the inclusion of pests in the draft annexes to ISPM 46 APPPC paper: APPPC Considerations and Recommendations on Commodity Standards | <p>15_TPCS_2025_Dec</p> <p>18_TPCS_2025_Dec</p> <p>19_TPCS_2025_Dec</p> | WILSON/ MARTINO |
| 4.2 | <p>Updates on draft annexes to ISPM 46 after first consultation in July 2025</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> International movement of fresh taro (<i>Colocasia esculenta</i>) corm for consumption, priority 1 TPG recommendations International movement of fresh <i>Musa</i> spp. fruit, priority 1 Compiled comments for draft annex International movement of fresh <i>Musa</i> spp. fruit to ISPM 46 (2023-028) – Steward's Response Issues raised from the first consultation period and SC considerations Comunidad Andina paper: First consultation: 2023-028 - Draft annex international movement of fresh <i>Musa</i> spp. fruit to ISPM 46 TPG recommendations | <p>2023-023</p> <p>11_TPCS_2025_Dec</p> <p>2023-028_REV</p> <p>12_TPCS_2025_Dec_REV</p> <p>14_TPCS_2025_Dec_REV</p> <p>17_TPCS_2025_Dec</p> <p>16_TPCS_2025_Dec</p> | <p>PETERSON/ ALL</p> <p>DA SILVA/ ALL</p> |

| Agenda Item | | Document No. | Presenter |
|-------------|---|---|--|
| 4.3 | Updates on draft annexes to ISPM 46 – for first consultation in July 2026 | 2023-019 13_TPCS_2025_Dec | DA SILVA / All |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> International movement of <i>Citrus</i> fruit, priority 1 International movement of seeds of <i>Phaseolus vulgaris</i>, priority 1 | 2023-027 XX_TPCS_2025_Dec | IOANNIDOU/ All |
| 5. | TPCS specification and working procedures | | |
| 5.1 | <p>Review of the TPCS Specification and IPPC Technical Panels working procedures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> TPCS Liaison with other Technical Panels Distinction between quarantine pests or a regulated non-quarantine pest (RNQP) | Link to TPCS Specification – TP 06 Link to IPPC procedure manual for standard setting Link to ISPM 46 (Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures) Link to the IPPC List of topics for IPPC standards | WILSON (TPCS Steward) / IPPC Secretariat |
| 6. | Development of draft annexes to ISPM 46 | | |
| 6.1. | <p>Reference documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> IPPC Style Guide and annotated templates (particularly Part 1, sections 2, 3 and 5) FAO Style Guide ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms) | Link to the IPPC Style Guide Link to FAOSTYLE Link to ISPM 5 | ROUEN |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Editorial style for commodity standards | 07_TPCS_2025_Dec Link to the IPPC Procedure Manual for Standard Setting (2023-2024) Link to the Annotated template for draft ISPMs | |
| 6.2 | <p>Development of the text of the draft International movement of <i>Malus domestica</i> fruit for consumption, priority 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Steward: Ms Joanne WILSON Assistant stewards: Mr Patrick Kwesi BESEH and Mr Tiago Rodrigo LOHMANN Excel: Information material submissions Iraq information material submission Steward's notes | 2023-024 05_TPCS_2025_Dec 06_TPCS_2025_Dec 21_TPCS_2025_Dec | WILSON / All |
| 7. | TPCS work programme | | |

| Agenda Item | | Document No. | Presenter |
|-------------|---|---|---|
| 7.1 | Potential reasons for “excluding a pest and a measure” <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Review of the criteria for inclusion and exclusion of pests - Amendments to the list of potential reasons for excluding a pest - Discussions on potential database | 08_TPCS_2025_Dec | WILSON/ ROUEN/ LOHMANN/ ALL |
| 7.2 | Review of the ‘information materials’ spreadsheet’ | 20_TPCS_2025_Dec | WILSON |
| 7.3 | Commodity standards side-session at CPM-20 (2026) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Organization, content and logistics | 09_TPCS_2025_Dec | MOREIRA/ WILSON/ ALL |
| 7.4 | Brainstorming session/SWOT analysis of the TPCS | 10_TPCS_2025_Dec | TPCS Steward / All |
| 7.5 | TPCS work plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 2026 work plan - Call for information material - Call for commodity standards and IPPC call for topics | <i>(to be developed during the meeting)</i> | Chair/ IPPC secretariat / WILSON / |
| 8. | Any Other Business | – | Chairperson |
| 9. | Evaluation of the meeting | Meeting survey link | KRAH |
| 10. | Recommendations to the Standards Committee (SC) or IPPC Secretariat | <i>(to be captured in the meeting report)</i> | TPCS Steward / Chairperson |
| 11. | Next TPCS meetings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Virtual meeting(s) - Face to face meeting: September/October 2026 (date and venue TBD) | -- | IPPC Secretariat / TPCS Steward / Chairperson |
| 12. | Closing of the meeting | -- | IPPC Secretariat / Chairperson |