



Food and Agriculture
Organization of the
United Nations



International
Plant Protection
Convention

Report

Technical Panel on Commodity Standards

09-13 June 2025

Auckland, New Zealand

IPPC Secretariat

Required Citation:

IPPC Secretariat. 2025. *Report of the meeting of the Technical Panel on Commodity Standards, 09-13 June 2025*. 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, 2025



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 | Whakatau welcome | 4 |
| 1.2 | Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat | 4 |
| 1.3 | Welcome by the host: the national plant protection organization of New Zealand | 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. | TPCS introduction and working procedures..... | 5 |
| 4.1 | Presentation of the IPPC standard setting process | 5 |
| 4.2 | Review of the TPCS specification and IPPC technical panel working procedures..... | 5 |
| 4.3 | Updates from the IPPC Secretariat and the TPCS steward | 6 |
| 5. | Development of draft annexes to ISPM 46..... | 7 |
| 5.1 | Reference documents | 7 |
| 5.2 | International movement of <i>Citrus</i> fruit (2023-019), priority 1..... | 7 |
| 5.3 | International movement of seeds of <i>Phaseolus vulgaris</i> (2023-008), priority 1 | 11 |
| 6. | TPCS work programme | 15 |
| 6.1 | The process for footnote ink amendments in adopted commodity standards (from May 2025 Standards Committee meeting) | 15 |
| 6.2 | Potential reasons for “excluding a pest and a measure”: tracking sheet | 16 |
| 6.3 | Potential commodity standards side-session at CPM-20 (2026)..... | 18 |
| 6.4 | Brainstorming session/SWOT analysis of the TPCS | 18 |
| 6.5 | TPCS workplan | 18 |
| 7. | Any other business..... | 18 |
| 8. | Evaluation of the meeting | 18 |
| 9. | Recommendations to the Standards Committee or IPPC Secretariat | 19 |
| 10. | Next TPCS meeting | 19 |
| 11. | Close of the meeting | 19 |
| | Appendix 1: Agenda..... | 20 |
| | Appendix 2: Documents list | 23 |
| | Appendix 3: Participants list | 25 |

1. Opening of the meeting

1.1 Whakatau welcome

- [1] The Technical Panel on Commodity Standards (TPCS) joined the host organization in a traditional Whakatau welcome.

1.2 Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat

- [2] Adriana MOREIRA, IPPC Standard Setting Officer and Deputy Lead of the Standard Setting Unit, opened the third face-to-face meeting of the TPCS. She thanked the national plant protection organization (NPPO) of New Zealand (Ministry of Primary Industries) for hosting the meeting and for its deep and ongoing leadership in the development of commodity standards. She also expressed gratitude to the panel members and the stewards for their contributions to the commodity standards developed thus far and thanked the secretariat for their support. Finally, she welcomed the new members of the panel, including the stewards for the two new draft commodity standards (for *Phaseolus vulgaris* and *Citrus*), who were part of the meeting.

1.3 Welcome by the host: the national plant protection organization of New Zealand

- [3] Peter THOMSON (Chief Biosecurity Officer, Biosecurity, New Zealand) welcomed everyone on behalf of the NPPO of New Zealand. He emphasized the importance of trade to New Zealand, the need for biosecurity, and the potential contribution of commodity standards to global biosecurity, particularly for developing countries. He thanked the panel for their work and looked forward to the outcomes of the meeting.

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) and Alfayo OMBUYA (Kenya) as rapporteurs.

2.3 Adoption of the agenda

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

3. Administrative matters

- [7] The secretariat referred to the documents list (Appendix 2) and the participants list (Appendix 3), and invited participants to notify the secretariat of any information that required updating in the latter or was missing from it.
- [8] The TPCS noted the absence of Moshe VAKNIN (Israel) and that the invited expert, Adinda DERKX (Kingdom of the Netherlands), would be attending the last three days of the meeting for agenda item 5.3 (International movement of seeds of *Phaseolus vulgaris* (2023-008)).
- [9] The host organization outlined the local information for the meeting.²

¹ TPCS 2023-06, agenda item 2.1.

² 04_TPCS_2025_June.

4. TPCS introduction and working procedures

4.1 Presentation of the IPPC standard setting process

- [10] The secretariat gave a presentation summarizing the standard setting process.
- [11] In response to a question from the panel, the secretariat confirmed that no further communication had been received from the contracting party that had requested a cessation to the development of the draft annex *International movement of Citrus fruit* (2023-019) to ISPM 46 (*Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures*), and there had been no intervention regarding this matter at the Nineteenth Session of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM).

4.2 Review of the TPCS specification and IPPC technical panel working procedures

- [12] The TPCS Steward, Joanne WILSON (New Zealand), provided an overview of Specification TP 6 (*Technical Panel on Commodity Standards*).
- [13] The secretariat explained that each technical panel provides a report to the Standards Committee (SC) once a year, to update the SC on the panel's activities during the year.
- [14] **Liaison with technical panels.** The panel noted that one of the tasks in the specification was to liaise as needed with the other technical panels under the SC and that the Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments (TPPT) had offered to comment on draft commodity standards before they are submitted for consultation.³ The secretariat explained that draft standards developed by the TPCS were submitted to the SC for review and approval, so it would not be appropriate for drafts to be submitted to the TPPT before going to the SC. Furthermore, it was not within the scope of the TPPT to identify treatments to include or exclude from draft commodity standards. The chairperson suggested that the panel consider its approach to liaison with other technical panels at a future meeting.
- [15] **Submissions of treatments.** The TPCS steward confirmed that the only treatments included in draft commodity standards to date had either been submitted by countries or were annexes to ISPM 28 (*Phytosanitary treatments for regulated pests*). The TPCS noted the challenges of evaluating submissions by exporting countries relating to pests regulated by an importing country, as these lacked supporting scientific evidence from the importing country. The TPCS acknowledged that, when reviewing the template submission form for information materials, they needed to be more specific about the information required.

Call for information materials: review of form

- [16] The TPCS reviewed the submission form for information materials on the final day of the meeting.⁴ Based on the panel's experience of information submitted for draft commodity standards to date, the TPCS agreed to use a spreadsheet format for the submission form to make it easier to collate and analyse the data submitted. The TPCS agreed to include the following data-entry fields, with drop-down lists where appropriate:
- submitter;
 - pest group;
 - family;
 - species (scientific name and authority);
 - regulated for import or export?;
 - reference for the regulation of the pest;
 - pest risk analysis (PRA), or other technical justification, if available (e.g. link);
 - required measure (one measure per line);

³ SC 2024-11, agenda item 7.4; TPPT 2023-10, agenda item 5.2.

⁴ 09_TPCS_2025_June.

- description of measure (e.g. treatment schedule, independent measures in a systems approach);
- reference for the measure; and
- relevant ISPM (e.g. phytosanitary treatment (PT)).

[17] The TPCS noted that the submitter could be either an NPPO or a regional plant protection organization (RPPO).

[18] The TPCS considered whether to add a data-entry field asking whether the pest was a quarantine pest or a regulated non-quarantine pest (RNQP), as this distinction had important implications for contracting parties (in regard to seeds and plants for planting) and hence may be useful to include in commodity standards. However, the TPCS recalled that ISPM 46 only referred to regulated pests, not quarantine pests or RNQPs. The TPCS therefore omitted this data-entry field from the submission form for the time being, but they agreed to discuss the issue in more depth at a future TPCS meeting, with a view to submitting a paper to the SC if needed.

[19] The TPCS discussed whether to include a covering note for the submission form, listing the potential reasons for excluding pests and measures. However, they agreed that this would not be appropriate, as the list of potential reasons was an internal working procedure of the panel and had not yet been finalized. The panel noted that they could add columns for the reason a pest or measure has been excluded when collating and analysing the data after submission.

[20] The TPCS:

- (1) *approved* the submission form for information material on commodity standards as revised at this meeting, subject to refinement by Helen Mary ANDERSON (United Kingdom) and Donam KIM (Republic of Korea); and
- (2) *agreed* to discuss, at a future TPCS meeting, the panel's approach to liaison with other technical panels and whether commodity standards should distinguish between quarantine pests and RNQPs.

4.3 Updates from the IPPC Secretariat and the TPCS steward

[21] The secretariat and the TPCS steward updated the TPCS on recent activities relating to the work of the panel.⁵ At the SC meeting in May 2025, the SC had revised and approved the draft annexes *International movement of fresh Musa spp. fruit* (2023-028) and *International movement of fresh Colocasia esculenta corms* (2023-023) for first consultation. The SC had acknowledged the difficulty in presenting systems approaches in commodity standards when information on the component measures and the associated references were lacking. They had also recognized that the main implementation concern regarding commodity standards was the potential misuse of the list of pests. To help address this concern, preparations had begun for a side session on commodity standards at CPM-20 (2026), with consideration also being given to a workshop on commodity standards in the future.

[22] **Pathway-specific standards.** The secretariat clarified that, although the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030 referred to both commodity- and pathway-specific standards, the CPM had decided to focus on commodity-specific standards in the first instance, because of the potential complexity of pathway-specific standards. Hence, ISPM 46 and the TPCS focused solely on commodity-specific standards.

[23] **Invited experts.** The TPCS considered whether it would be beneficial to have formalized terms of reference or rules for the invitation of invited experts to TPCS meetings. The secretariat confirmed that no other technical panel has such terms of reference and that the panels consider the need to invite an expert on a case-by-case basis. The TPCS therefore agreed to continue without formalized rules, noting that this would also allow more flexibility.

[24] **Listing “pest free area” (PFA) for fruit flies in a pest list.** The TPCS steward confirmed that the SC had listed “PFA” for all fruit flies in the draft annex *International movement of fresh Musa spp. fruit*

⁵ 10_TPCS_2025_June.

(2023-028), as well as listing it in the table of general options, because “PFA” had been retained for one whitefly species that otherwise would have been removed if “PFA” was omitted from the table of pest-specific options. However, this did not necessarily mean that the same would have to be done in other commodity standards too. The steward also confirmed that the SC had decided to treat a PFA (in this case, ISPM 26 (*Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)*)) as a stand-alone measure.

5. Development of draft annexes to ISPM 46

5.1 Reference documents

[25] The secretariat introduced guidance on the editorial style used in ISPMs, including those aspects of style specific to commodity standards,⁶ and highlighted the changes made by the SC in May 2025 to the presentation of virus names and the footnote to the table of pests.

[26] **Species names.** The TPCS reviewed the approach they had agreed in February 2025 regarding which scientific names to use in commodity standards. This approach was to use the names as submitted by contracting parties, unless a different name is used in an annex to ISPM 27 (*Diagnostic protocols for regulated pests*) or ISPM 28 or unless there is a more recent, accepted scientific name; and where two names have been submitted, to use the most recent, accepted name of the two. The TPCS agreed that there was no need to consider the most recent, accepted scientific name (other than the more recent of those names submitted), as commodity standards were based on the submissions of contracting parties.

[27] The TPCS recognized that it might be challenging to apply the new IPPC style for viruses – virus name (acronym; species *Scientific name*) – and at the same time respect the names submitted by contracting parties, many of which may pre-date the change to binomial scientific names for viruses. However, the TPCS agreed to address this as and when the issue arose during the development of the draft commodity standards.

[28] The TPCS:

(3) *revised* its approach to scientific names of pests in commodity standards as follows:

Use the names as submitted by contracting parties, unless a different name is used in an annex to ISPM 27 (*Diagnostic protocols for regulated pests*) or ISPM 28 (*Phytosanitary treatments for regulated pests*); where two or more names have been submitted, use the most recent, accepted name of the submitted names.

5.2 International movement of *Citrus* fruit (2023-019), priority 1

[29] The Steward, André Felipe C.P. da SILVA (Brazil), presented the draft commodity standard as modified by the TPCS at its meeting in December 2024, together with the supporting documentation.⁷ He explained that the most important remaining issue to consider was whether to organize the table of cold treatments by fruit fly species or by *Citrus* species.

Development of the draft commodity standard

[30] The TPCS developed the draft further, both in plenary sessions and by working in groups to consider different groups of pests and then reporting back to the whole panel. The steward then continued to work on the draft standard while the panel considered agenda item 5.3, after which the panel returned to the *Citrus* standard to finalize it.

[31] **Pests associated with fresh *Citrus* fruit.** When considering whether to list *Citrus* species in the table of cold treatments, the TPCS modified the section on “Pests associated with fresh *Citrus* fruit” to refer to the regulation of a pest being on a specific *Citrus* species.

[32] **Table of pests.** The TPCS considered whether to include *Citrus* species in the table of pests but noted that some submissions neither specified the target *Citrus* species nor listed it as *Citrus* spp. The TPCS

⁶ 05_TPCS_2025_June.

⁷ 2023-019; 07_TPCS_2025_June.

recognized that this lack of information might have arisen from confusion during the call for submission of information materials, which was not specific about the scope of the standard. To provide clarity, the TPCS therefore modified the title of the table of pests to refer to some or all *Citrus* fruit and added a footnote to the table to explain that the submissions had not always specified the *Citrus* species.

- [33] **Genus vs species.** The TPCS noted that, where a contracting party regulated at the level of genus (e.g. *Anastrepha* spp., *Bactrocera* spp.), the genus should be listed in the table of pests and the table of pest-specific options for phytosanitary measures, as well as any individual species that were regulated individually. The TPCS recognized that the options for phytosanitary measures might differ between these individual species, hence the importance of listing them separately.
- [34] ***Bactrocera (Zeugodacus) cucurbitae*.** The TPCS agreed to use the name *Zeugodacus cucurbitae* rather than *Bactrocera cucurbitae* or *Bactrocera (Zeugodacus) cucurbitae*, as both *Zeugodacus cucurbitae* and *Bactrocera cucurbitae* had been submitted but *Z. cucurbitae* was the more recent name and had been used in Commodity Standard (CS) No. 1 (International movement of fresh *Mangifera indica* fruit).
- [35] **Fruit flies.** The TPCS noted that the information submitted by one contracting party did not appear to support an association between some of the fruit flies and *Citrus* fruit. The TPCS agreed to seek clarification from the submitter, noting that if this did not yield sufficient information to demonstrate a pest association, the panel would remove those pests in accordance with its list of potential reasons for excluding a pest.
- [36] **Vectors of *Xylella fastidiosa*.** As agreed by the TPCS in December 2024, the TPCS moved the list of vectors of *Xylella fastidiosa* from below the table of pests to form a new appendix. The steward confirmed that the names of the vectors and the families had been maintained as submitted.
- [37] **Options for phytosanitary measures.** The TPCS recognized the inevitable inconsistencies between the content of submissions from different contracting parties and acknowledged that the only way to achieve a consistent approach was therefore to respect the submitted information and not to mix measures when presenting options.
- [38] **Table of general options for phytosanitary measures.** The TPCS considered the inclusion of ISPM 37 (*Determination of host status of fruit to fruit flies (Tephritidae)*) in this table to prompt contracting parties to consider host status, but they decided against it as it had not been submitted as a measure.
- [39] **Pest absence.** The TPCS recalled that “pest absence” had been included in the table of general options to cover those situations where an importing country requires an exporting country to be free from the regulated pest. The TPCS failed to reach consensus on whether “pest absence” was a measure. Some TPCS members considered it to be a status rather than a measure and noted that it was the outcome of other measures. However, other TPCS members considered it a measure, as the term “phytosanitary measure” according to ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*) included legislation and regulations as well as procedures, so a regulation requiring pest freedom would constitute a phytosanitary measure.
- [40] The TPCS considered whether “pest absence” or “pest free country” best described the concept. They noted that “pest absence” could be interpreted as referring either to pest status according to ISPM 8 (*Determination of pest status in an area*) or the outcome of an inspection. Furthermore, “pest free country” was not an established term in ISPMs and hence it would not be clear whether this referred to a PFA established in accordance with ISPM 4 (*Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas*) or a pest status of “absent” according to ISPM 8. The TPCS steward explained that the SC, at its meeting in May 2025, had formed a small working group to consider the ambiguity in the definition of “pest free area” in ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*), which could be interpreted to mean either an area in which the pest is absent according to ISPM 8 or an area established in accordance with ISPM 4. Given this terminological uncertainty, the TPCS therefore agreed to omit “pest absence” from the table of general options for phytosanitary measures but to include “pest free country” in the table of pest-specific options, together with a footnote referring to the corresponding regulation, as this was the term used in the pertinent submission. They noted that this approach could be reviewed in future, pending the outcome of the SC’s review of the ISPM 5 definition of “pest free area”. However, during agenda

item 5.3, the TPCS revisited the approach to the table of pest-specific options and agreed to use “pest free area” with a footnote to explain that this included the concept of a pest free country.

- [41] **Table of pest-specific options for phytosanitary measures.** The steward recalled that, at its meeting in December 2024, the TPCS had discussed having a combined entry for *Bactrocera*, *Anastrepha* and other Tephritidae relating to one submission that listed 78 species of fruit flies that all had the same set of measures. The TPCS did not discuss this further.
- [42] **Table of cold treatments.** The TPCS considered whether to include a column for fruit fly species. However, they agreed to omit this to avoid duplication with the table of pest-specific options for phytosanitary measures (and the potential for accidental discrepancies between the tables) and because if it were to be included in this table it would also need to be included in all the other tables of measures for consistency. The secretariat advised that it was not currently feasible to insert hyperlinks from one table to another because this would cause complications when the draft standard was being translated.
- [43] The TPCS agreed to add a column for the host, noting that in some cases this was *Citrus* spp. whereas in other cases it was one or more individual species.
- [44] The TPCS agreed to refer to the “fruit core temperature” as in ISPM 37, rather than simply “temperature”.
- [45] The TPCS agreed to omit cold treatments for which no schedule parameters had been provided.
- [46] The TPCS recalled that, according to the approach they had agreed previously, if an option for a phytosanitary measure had multiple references including a PT (annex to ISPM 28), then only the latter would be included. However, the TPCS recognized that this only applied if the scope of the measure (target pest, host and schedule parameters) exactly matched the scope of the PT.
- [47] **Table of chemical treatments.** The steward recalled that, at its meeting in December 2024, the TPCS had agreed to omit the table of chemical treatments, as these treatments were covered by the systems approaches in the standard. However, the steward confirmed that one contracting party had submitted chemical treatment before export as a stand-alone measure. The TPCS therefore agreed to retain the table of chemical treatments.
- [48] **Table of systems approaches.** The TPCS considered whether to merge some of the systems approaches that were similar, to avoid a lengthy list, but agreed to keep them separate for consistency with the submissions and because contracting parties would have evaluated the effectiveness of the individual systems approaches, not a merged version of them.
- [49] The TPCS revised the entry for ISPM 35 (*Systems approach for pest risk management of fruit flies (Tephritidae)*) to remove the component measures and instead simply cross-reference ISPM 35, for consistency with the same change made by the SC to the draft commodity standard for *Musa* spp. at its meeting in May 2025.
- [50] The TPCS agreed to omit systems approaches for which no component measures had been provided and not to extrapolate the detail of one systems approach to another.
- [51] **Late submission.** The secretariat informed the TPCS that another submission had been received from one contracting party shortly before the meeting. The steward reviewed the information submitted but advised the panel that, as there were several inconsistencies in the information that would need resolving, it was not feasible to incorporate the information in the draft at this meeting. The TPCS therefore agreed that the submitter should be invited to resubmit their information during the consultation on the draft standard, so it could be considered by the steward at that time instead.
- [52] **Abbreviations.** The TPCS agreed to add a box of the abbreviations used in the tables of measures, together with a corresponding cross-reference in the body text, for consistency with CS 1.

- [53] **References.** The TPCS agreed that, as per their practice in previous draft commodity standards, they would not list the countries that required particular measures but would instead give the relevant references (e.g. the regulations specifying the measure).

Potential reasons for excluding a pest

- [54] During the drafting of the standard, the TPCS referred to the list of potential reasons for excluding a pest that they had agreed at their meeting in December 2024.⁸ The TPCS acknowledged that the second reason on the list (clarifications for species (e.g. banana *vs* *Musa* spp.)) concerned the scope of the standard in terms of the commodity rather than a reason for excluding a pest, and the pest association with the host or commodity was already covered by two other reasons on the list. The TPCS therefore agreed to delete the second reason on the list (see agenda item 6.2).

Concerns about the inclusion of some pests in commodity standards

- [55] The TPCS discussed their generic concerns about the association of some pests with the commodity and the technical justifications for regulating some pests. The panel acknowledged the need to respect the sovereign rights of countries to regulate pests and require phytosanitary measures in relation to imports. However, they also recognized the reputational risk for the international standing of ISPMs if pests that were not associated with the commodity were included in commodity standards because the panel was not allowed to base their decisions on scientific evidence. The secretariat suggested that one way to protect against such reputational risk would be to omit pests where there was doubt, given that the lists of pests in commodity standards are not exhaustive, and to seek advice from the SC. Furthermore, the secretariat confirmed that concerns about the potential misuse of commodity standards had already been raised at the recent meeting of the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee.

- [56] The TPCS:

- (4) *requested* that the secretariat, in liaison with Helen ANDERSON (United Kingdom) and copying the steward and assistant steward into correspondence, contact the submitter from whom further supporting information was needed on the association between Tephritidae and *Citrus* fruit;
- (5) *agreed* that TPCS members from countries that had not provided references with their submissions of measures would assist the steward and assistant steward in finding the relevant references;
- (6) *requested* that the secretariat contact the late submitter of information to invite them to resubmit during consultation;
- (7) *agreed* that the steward of the draft annex *International movement of Citrus fruit* (2023-019) would refine the draft, which would then be edited and shared with the TPCS for final review;
- (8) *recommended* the draft annex *International movement of Citrus fruit* (2023-019) to ISPM 46, subject to final review by the TPCS via an e-forum, to the SC for approval for first consultation in July 2026;
- (9) *invited* the SC to advise how the TPCS should approach cases where there is doubt about the association of a pest with the commodity or the technical justification for regulating a pest and whether Specification TP 6 (*Technical Panel on Commodity Standards*) or the TPCS working procedures need to be revised accordingly; and
- (10) *agreed* that Joanne WILSON (New Zealand) would prepare an initial draft of a short paper on the panel's concerns about the inclusion of some pests in commodity standards by 15 September, to be circulated to the TPCS for comment, for subsequent submission to the November 2025 meeting of the SC.

⁸ 11_TPCS_2025_June.

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

- [57] The Steward, Stavroula IOANNIDOU (Greece), referred the TPCS to the spreadsheet in which she had collated the submitted pests and measures for this draft commodity standard.⁹ She noted that, in some submissions, the measure for a specific pest was not clear but information on measures was available in other submissions for the same pest. Also, in some cases the reference was not clear. Most contracting parties had submitted information on seeds for propagation but one had submitted information on seeds (i.e. grain) for consumption.
- [58] **Intended use.** The TPCS steward confirmed that the intended use of the commodity, as defined in the draft specification submitted with the original topic proposal, was propagation. Seeds for consumption were therefore outside the scope of the standard.
- [59] **Submissions from bodies other than NPPOs.** The TPCS agreed that the submission from the International Seed Federation may be used to support development of the standard but, as it had not been submitted by an NPPO, there was no guarantee that the pests listed in it were regulated and that the measures listed were specified in phytosanitary import requirements. The pests and measures listed in the submission could therefore only be included in the draft standard if also listed in another submission.
- [60] **Synonyms.** The steward commented that multiple names had been submitted for bacterial pests, but one of the submissions had provided a useful analysis of synonyms. The TPCS recalled that they had agreed earlier in the meeting that, if multiple names had been submitted for the same pest, the TPCS would use the most recent accepted name of those submitted.

Presentation on international movement of seeds, with a focus on Phaseolus vulgaris

- [61] Adinda DERKX, an invited expert from the NPPO of the Kingdom of the Netherlands, gave a presentation on the international movement of seeds, with a focus on *Phaseolus vulgaris*. She highlighted the differences between seeds and other commodities in relation to the variety of uses, the extent of re-export, the longer periods in storage and the invisibility of pests. She also explained that, according to ISPM 38 (*International movement of seeds*), PRAs for seeds needed to determine whether the seed was a pathway for the pest: an association between the pest and the seed was not a sufficient criterion.
- [62] Ms DERKX gave an overview of a project undertaken by the NPPO of the Kingdom of the Netherlands to systematically review the country's export guarantees for seeds, with the aim of defining phytosanitary measures that gave good guarantees of meeting generic import requirements. By conducting a review of the scientific literature, the NPPO had compiled a datasheet for each pest, which focused solely on the biology of the pest (not the likelihood of establishment or the impact in the destination country) and was qualitative not quantitative. The NPPO had completed over 2 800 datasheets to date.
- [63] Ms DERKX summarized the most important or common phytosanitary measures for export or re-export of seeds according to the database compiled during the project. These were: testing of seeds; pest free areas, places of production or production sites; field inspection of mother plants; inspection of seeds; and seed treatment. Less common measures were: testing of mother plants; resistant plant varieties; and systems approaches. She explained that one of the challenges for seed companies is that they may not know the destination countries at the outset of the seed production process.
- [64] Ms DERKX confirmed that the submission from the Kingdom of the Netherlands for the draft annex *International movement of seeds of Phaseolus vulgaris* (2023-008) included the information from all their datasheets on *P. vulgaris* seeds and was intended for use as a resource to support the development

⁹ CRP_05_TPCS_2025_June; 08_TPCS_2025_June.

of the draft standard. She clarified that, with the exception of the pests regulated by the European Union, the pests in the submission were not regulated by the Kingdom of the Netherlands.

[65] The chairperson thanked Ms DERKX for her presentation.

[66] In answer to questions from the panel, Ms DERKX clarified that the export guarantee database did not list the regulatory status of pests and that if phytosanitary import requirements simply specified that the country was free from a pest, it was up to the exporting country to determine the measure.

[67] The TPCS noted that the list of pests submitted by the Kingdom of the Netherlands included weeds, which were contaminating pests in the context of *P. vulgaris* seeds and so were outside the scope of the standard.

Development of the draft commodity standard

[68] The steward explained that she had prepared an initial template for the draft standard based on other draft commodity standards developed to date.¹⁰ She confirmed that no clear component measures had been submitted for the systems approaches and therefore she had omitted these from the draft standard.

[69] The TPCS developed the draft annex, both in plenary sessions and by working in groups to consider different groups of pests and then reporting back to the whole panel.

[70] **Scope.** The secretariat reported that the draft specification submitted as part of the original topic proposal had defined the scope of the standard as “seeds of *P. vulgaris* and not seeds for consumption, green beans (fresh pods) or other parts of *P. vulgaris*” and the purpose as providing “guidance on options for phytosanitary measures for NPPOs of the countries who currently, or intend to, import or export seeds for sowing of *P. vulgaris*”. The secretariat also confirmed that there had been no change of scope discussed or agreed by the CPM. The TPCS agreed, therefore, that the intended use of the commodity was for planting and not for consumption.

[71] The TPCS recalled that the ISPM 5 definition of “seeds” was “seeds (in the botanical sense) for planting” and that the definition of “grain” was “seeds (in the botanical sense) for processing or consumption”. It was therefore sufficient simply to refer to “seeds” without also specifying that these were for planting.

[72] The TPCS considered intended uses such as research or breeding purposes, noting that the ISPM 5 definition of “commodity” included movement for “trade or other purpose”. However, as the Scope section of ISPM 46 referred to “commodities being moved in international trade”, the TPCS agreed that such intended uses were outside the scope of the standard. The TPCS agreed not to list intended uses that were excluded from the standard, as it would not be possible to provide an exhaustive list.

[73] The TPCS therefore agreed that, to align with the scope of ISPM 46, the scope of the standard should be the international trade of seeds. It was not necessary to refer to movement, as movement was inherent in the international trade of seeds.

[74] The TPCS considered whether to emphasize that the scope did not include contaminating pests, but decided against this to avoid duplication with the core text of ISPM 46.

[75] Further to the panel’s discussion on the scope of the standard, one TPCS member submitted a revised list of pests and measures on behalf of their country.¹¹

[76] **Seed-borne and seed-transmitted pests.** Noting that the scope of ISPM 46 was pests “associated with” the commodity, the TPCS considered whether “associated with” referred to seed-borne pests or just to seed-transmitted pests in the context of *P. vulgaris* seeds. The TPCS concluded, however, that there was

¹⁰ 2023-008.

¹¹ CRP_06_TPCS_2025_June.

no need for the panel to distinguish between transmitted and non-transmitted seed-borne pests, as the criterion for inclusion in the standard was simply whether the pest was regulated or not.

- [77] Further to this discussion, the invited expert submitted a revised list of pests and measures on behalf of the Kingdom of the Netherlands, including only seed-transmitted pests.¹²
- [78] **Description of the commodity and its intended use.** Recalling their discussion about the Scope section, the TPCS referred to “grain” not “seeds” in the context of consumption. The panel also agreed that it was sufficient to say that the standard applied to seeds of *P. vulgaris*, without referring to “all varieties” of *P. vulgaris*, to avoid redundancy.
- [79] The TPCS agreed to use “seeds” (plural) not “seed” (singular) throughout the standard for consistency with ISPM 38, subject to review by the IPPC scientific copy-editor. The panel also noted that the editor would ensure that the species name rather than the genus was used for the commodity, both in the text and in the title of the table of pests.
- [80] **Bacteria.** In the genus *Xanthomonas*, the TPCS agreed to include only *X. phaseoli* pv. *phaseoli* and *X. citri* pv. *fuscans*, considering all the other names submitted to be synonyms. The panel noted the comprehensive analysis of this issue provided by the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the invited expert provided references to the original articles for the IPPC scientific copy-editor to check.
- [81] *Ralstonia solanacearum* – The TPCS confirmed that both submissions related to the species rather than the species complex.
- [82] **Viruses.** Broad bean wilt virus – The TPCS noted that this virus had been split into two species and it was not clear to which of these species the submission referred. The TPCS therefore excluded the pest, pending clarification being submitted during consultation.
- [83] Bean yellow mosaic virus – The TPCS noted that this pest may be seed-borne but not seed-transmitted for *P. vulgaris*. However, as the panel had agreed earlier not to distinguish between transmitted and non-transmitted pests, they agreed to include the pest in the standard because two contracting parties had submitted it, so presumably regulated it.
- [84] Bean common mosaic virus – The TPCS noted that both the species and one strain had been submitted. As the measures were the same for the species and the strain, the TPCS agreed to omit the strain.
- [85] **Insects.** The TPCS agreed to exclude two species (in the family Pyralidae), as the submission referred to grain and hence the commodity was outside the scope of the standard.
- [86] **Storage pests.** The TPCS noted that although *Trogoderma* could be a contaminating pest during storage, it could also infest the seed and hence was within the scope of the standard.
- [87] **Weeds.** The TPCS agreed to remove weeds, as they were contaminating pests and therefore outside the scope of the standard.
- [88] **Regulated non-quarantine pests.** The TPCS noted that some pests listed in the draft standard were RNQPs. The panel recognized that, although the tolerance level for an RNQP may be zero on a specific commodity, in other cases it may be above zero. It would therefore be useful for contracting parties to know which of the pests listed are RNQPs. The TPCS considered whether to achieve this by including a footnote for the pests that were RNQPs but decided against this after agreeing not to distinguish between quarantine pests and RNQPs in the submission form (see agenda item 4.2).
- [89] **Species authorities and dates.** The TPCS confirmed that, although the names of pests in commodity standards should be based on the submissions received (as agreed in agenda item 5.1), it was acceptable

¹² CRP_07_TPCS_2025_June.

for the IPPC scientific copy-editor to continue to correct inaccuracies and add missing information regarding species authorities and dates, for approval by the relevant steward.

- [90] **Options for phytosanitary measures.** The TPCS agreed to omit the text on PTs adopted by the CPM, which had been included in other draft commodity standards, because the draft standard did not list any PTs. The TPCS agreed to include the text on integrated measures, which had been included in other draft commodity standards, because although the draft standard for *P. vulgaris* did not list any systems approaches, this text was generic and just indicated that the measures listed could be used alone or integrated in a systems approach.
- [91] **General options for phytosanitary measures.** The TPCS agreed to omit ISPM 26 and ISPM 28 from the table of general options for phytosanitary measures, because neither ISPM 26 nor the annexes of ISPM 28 were relevant to *P. vulgaris* seeds. The TPCS added “phytosanitary measures, including chemical seed treatments” to the table, with ISPM 38 as the reference, to refer the reader to the “Phytosanitary measures” section of ISPM 38.
- [92] **Use of consistent terms for measures.** The TPCS recognized that different submitters had used different wording to describe the same measures. In some cases, this wording was lengthy and resembled the wording used for an additional declaration on a phytosanitary certificate. The TPCS agreed to use consistent terms for the same measure. For example, instead of “mother plant has undergone inspection and testing during active growth to confirm the absence of the pest”, the panel used “field inspection and parent-plant testing”, referring to “parent plant” instead of “mother plant” for consistency with ISPM 38 and because some countries did not use the term “mother plant”. The TPCS noted that, typically, if there is a requirement for inspection or testing in the field, the field is excluded from export if a regulated pest is found. The TPCS also replaced “visual inspection” with “field inspection” or “export inspection” depending on where the inspection was conducted, noting that “visual” was redundant as it was included in the ISPM 5 definition of “inspection”. The TPCS used “seed testing” instead of “laboratory analysis”, for consistency with the terms used in ISPM 38, and “seed testing” instead of “sampling and testing of seeds” to avoid redundancy. The TPCS agreed that fumigation was not a seed treatment, as it was not included in the list of seed treatments provided in ISPM 38.
- [93] **Seed treatments.** The TPCS recalled their approach to cold treatments and systems approaches in the draft *Citrus* standard (agenda item 5.1), where they had omitted entries for which no further detail had been provided by the submitter. The panel recognized that, for some seed treatments in the draft *P. vulgaris* standard, the lack of detail was because phytosanitary import requirements did not specify which chemical products should be used for seed treatments, as the treatment used would depend on its regulatory approval in the exporting country. The TPCS therefore agreed to omit entries for which there was no detail, with an explanatory footnote, and to include a generic statement about seed treatments in the body text, explaining that the treatment used would depend not only on its effectiveness but also on its regulatory approval in the exporting country. For the latter, the TPCS agreed that it was more appropriate to refer to seed treatment as reducing pest risk, rather than eliminating infestation by pests (the wording used in the section on seed treatment in ISPM 38), as the risk can be reduced but not eliminated.
- [94] The TPCS categorized fungicide treatment as “chemical seed treatment” rather than “chemical treatment” to make it clear that it was not referring to chemical treatment of the plants in the field.
- [95] **Seed testing.** The TPCS noted that the submission for *Curtobacterium flaccumfaciens* pv. *flaccumfaciens* referred to seed testing of consignments. Recognizing that seed testing can be conducted at various stages of the production process and that further detail of the testing may be useful, the TPCS agreed to include a table providing further detail if possible.
- [96] **Pest absence.** The TPCS returned to the issue of pest absence, recalling the approach they had taken in agenda item 5.2, where they had omitted it from the table of general options and included “pest free country” in the table of pest-specific options, with a footnote to the relevant regulation. The TPCS noted that “pest absence” could be omitted for bean common mosaic virus, as the contracting party that had

submitted this pest required either pest absence or a PFA, so it was acceptable to just list a PFA. However, for other pests, this was not necessarily the case, with submissions listing “pest absence according to ISPM 8”, “pest free country” or “pest free area”. The TPCS failed to reach consensus on whether a “pest free area” referred only to areas officially maintained in accordance with ISPM 4 or also to areas where the pest status had been declared as absent according to ISPM 8; they therefore concluded that further guidance from the SC was needed. In the meantime, the TPCS agreed to use “pest free area” with a footnote, where applicable, to explain that this included the concept of a pest free country.

[97] **Resistant varieties.** The TPCS agreed that resistant varieties were not a phytosanitary measure and so should not be included in the draft standard.

[98] **Table of methyl bromide treatments.** The TPCS agreed that this table, which included one methyl bromide treatment, should be presented in a format that was consistent with CS 1, to the extent that was possible.

[99] **Table footnotes.** The TPCS acknowledged that the footnotes would need to be reviewed once the contents of the tables had been finalized.

[100] **Abbreviations.** The TPCS agreed to add a box of the abbreviations used in the tables of measures, together with a corresponding cross-reference in the body text, for consistency with CS 1.

Potential reasons for excluding a pest

[101] During the drafting of the standard, the TPCS referred to the list of potential reasons for excluding a pest that had been agreed at its meeting in December 2024.¹³ The TPCS agreed to add an extra reason: the pest is a contaminating pest (see agenda item 6.2).

[102] The TPCS:

- (11) *selected* Sun SHUANGYAN (China) as an assistant steward for the draft annex *International movement of seeds of Phaseolus vulgaris* (2023-008) to ISPM 46;
- (12) *invited* the SC to:
 - note that different contracting parties use different terms to describe an entire country that is free from a particular pest (e.g. pest free area, pest free country, pest absence),
 - advise on the appropriate terminology to use in commodity standards when describing a phytosanitary import requirement for a country to be free from a particular pest, and
 - advise on whether, in the context of a commodity standard, the absence of a pest from an entire country can be considered a phytosanitary measure or whether it is a status; and
- (13) *agreed* that the steward of the draft annex *International movement of seeds of Phaseolus vulgaris* (2023-008) would refine the draft, which would then be edited and shared with the TPCS for final review; and
- (14) *recommended* the draft annex *International movement of seeds of Phaseolus vulgaris* (2023-008) to ISPM 46, subject to final review by the TPCS via an e-forum, to the SC for approval for first consultation in July 2026.

6. TPCS work programme

6.1 The process for footnote ink amendments in adopted commodity standards (from May 2025 Standards Committee meeting)

[103] The TPCS steward outlined the mechanism for footnote ink amendments in commodity standards, which had been approved by the SC as part of the TPCS working procedures in May 2024.¹⁴ This allowed for a footnote to be added to adopted commodity standards when evidence suggested that a phytosanitary

¹³ 11_TPCS_2025_June.

¹⁴ 13_TPCS_2025_June.

measure was no longer effective or when there was a change in pest taxonomy that did not affect the options for phytosanitary measures. The addition of the footnote would be considered an ink amendment and would be an interim solution until the standard could be revised in the normal way. When an additional pest or measure was proposed by an NPPO or RPPO for inclusion in an adopted standard, the normal revision procedure would apply.

[104] The steward explained that the SC had deferred discussion about the detailed process for these types of ink amendments, including the process for triggering an amendment and whether requests for amendments would go directly to the TPCS or pass first through the SC.

[105] The TPCS was invited to discuss and put forward proposals on the process for these footnote ink amendments, as a contribution towards the SC's discussion. The secretariat suggested that this could be included in the TPCS update to the May 2026 meeting of the SC.

[106] **Triggering a footnote ink amendment about a measure.** The TPCS noted that ink amendments about ineffective measures were likely to be triggered by contracting parties alerting the secretariat or IPPC bodies. The secretariat confirmed that this is what happens with other standards. However, TPCS members had diverging views on which contracting parties should be allowed to trigger a footnote.

- One TPCS member felt that any contracting party should be able to propose a footnote, as annexes to ISPM 46 are international standards adopted by all contracting parties.
- Some TPCS members felt that only those contracting parties that had submitted the measure for inclusion in the standard should be able to propose a footnote, otherwise it risked challenging a contracting party's sovereign rights to require phytosanitary measures; also, as commodity standards did not specify the effectiveness of each measure, it would not be possible to say that a measure is no longer effective. The secretariat commented that, as measures included in annexes to ISPM 46 were used in trade, it was assumed they were effective.
- One TPCS member commented that the footnote was simply highlighting that there was uncertainty about a measure; the measure would only be withdrawn after the standard had gone through the usual revision process, including consultation. The secretariat added that, regardless of who proposed a footnote, the proposed footnote would be considered by the SC and TPCS.

[107] The chairperson suggested that one solution would be to amend the working procedures so that issues about ineffective measures were only addressed through the usual revision process, with no footnotes about such measures added as ink amendments.

[108] However, recognizing that the issue was not urgent, the TPCS agreed to await the outcome of the SC's discussion before considering the matter further.

[109] The TPCS:

- (15) *noted* the paper on footnote ink amendments in commodity standards; and
- (16) *deferred* any further discussion about the process for footnote ink amendments in adopted commodity standards until after the SC had considered the issue.

6.2 Potential reasons for “excluding a pest and a measure”: tracking sheet

[110] The TPCS reviewed the draft list of potential reasons for exclusion of a pest from a draft commodity standard.¹⁵

[111] The TPCS added some text as a preamble.

[112] **Changes made earlier in the meeting.** The TPCS recalled that, earlier in the meeting (agenda items 5.2 and 5.3), they had made two changes to the list:

- DELETION: clarifications for species (e.g. banana vs *Musa* spp.); and

¹⁵ 11_TPCS_2025_June.

- **ADDITION:** pest is a contaminating pest (and so outside the scope according to ISPM 46).

[113] **Genus entries.** The TPCS considered whether “lack of certainty of species identity” covered not only uncertainty about the identity of pests submitted with species names but also the lack of species names for entries submitted at the genus level. The TPCS recalled that, in CS 1, the panel had used only species names, but subsequently the panel had used genus level (spp.) in some cases, for instance for fruit flies. The TPCS therefore agreed to retain this potential reason on the list. The TPCS considered whether referring to “pest” rather than “species” would incorporate both genera and species, but the secretariat pointed out that the definition of “pest” in ISPM 5 referred to a species, strain or biotype. The chairperson suggested that perhaps “pest” might be preferable regardless, but the TPCS did not make any changes to the wording.

[114] **Submission outside the scope.** The TPCS added a further potential reason to the list of potential reasons:

- whole, or part of, the submission is outside the scope of the commodity standard (e.g. intended use not in scope, host species not in scope).

[115] **Insufficient information.** The TPCS recognized that there were many pests that could potentially be excluded from commodity standards because of insufficient information on the pest association with the host or commodity. However, the panel’s evaluation of the association was based solely on the information submitted by contracting parties, which often lacked supporting evidence, and challenging the technical justifications of contracting parties was outside the scope of the panel. The TPCS was therefore excluding pests if the information provided did not support an association, but it was not excluding pests solely on the basis of insufficient information. The TPCS therefore amended the wording of two of the potential reasons for exclusion to reflect this:

- information provided by the submitter does not support pest–host association; and
- information provided by the submitter does not support pest–commodity association.

[116] The TPCS and subject stewards recognized that this approach could be viewed as being prejudiced against those submitters who submit supporting evidence. However, the chairperson confirmed that the panel had to work within the scope of their specification and the scope of ISPM 46 and therefore could not exclude a submission because it did not include supporting evidence.

[117] **Lack of clarity about species names.** The TPCS recalled that they had omitted broad bean wilt virus from the *P. vulgaris* standard because, following taxonomical changes that had split one species into two, it was not clear from the submission which of the two species the submitter regulated. The TPCS added this type of situation to the list of potential reasons for exclusion of a pest; however, the panel recognized that it may need some further refinement.

[118] **Lack of confidence in the measure when only one measure.** The TPCS acknowledged that it was not clear how the panel would determine whether they lacked confidence in a measure, given that they were not assessing the effectiveness of the measures. They therefore changed the wording to:

- lack of details in the measure provided when there is only one measure.

[119] **Transfer to host on pathway.** The TPCS reviewed the potential reason “material submitted indicates no transfer to host on pathway”. The secretariat recalled that, in CS 1, there had been some submissions for the whole plant rather than for the fruit. For seeds, the TPCS recalled that they had decided not to distinguish whether pests were seed-transmitted or not. However, the chairperson suggested that, if the submitted information had sufficient evidence that a pest was not transmitted and would not be transferred to the host on the pathway, then the pest could be excluded from the draft standard.

[120] The TPCS:

- (17) *agreed* that Alfayo OMBUYA (Kenya) and the IPPC scientific copy-editor would review the draft wording of the potential reason for exclusion regarding clarity of species names, and suggest improvements if needed; and

- (18) *deferred*, to a future TPCS meeting, discussion on the tracking sheet for recording the reasons individual pests and measures have been excluded from draft commodity standards and discussion on the potential database that will follow this.

6.3 Potential commodity standards side-session at CPM-20 (2026)

[121] The secretariat presented a draft concept note for a potential side-session on commodity standards at CPM-20 (2026).¹⁶

[122] The TPCS:

- (19) *supported* the proposal to hold a side-session on commodity standards at CPM-20 (2026); and
(20) *agreed* that TPCS members who had comments on the draft concept note would send them to the secretariat by 15 September 2025.

6.4 Brainstorming session/SWOT analysis of the TPCS

[123] The TPCS:

- (21) *deferred* this item to a future TPCS meeting.

6.5 TPCS workplan

[124] The secretariat confirmed that there were two subjects on the TPCS work programme that were yet to be drafted:

- International movement of *Malus domestica* fruit for consumption (2023-024), priority 2; and
- International movement of *Vitis vinifera* fruit (2023-018), priority 2.

[125] The secretariat clarified that any priority 1 subjects added to the work programme by CPM-20 (2026) would take precedence over any priority 2 subjects that had not been started.

[126] The TPCS recognized the need to fast-track the development of commodity standards to fulfil the objectives of the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030. However, they also acknowledged the potential difficulties in ensuring the attendance of stewards at face-to-face meetings if the development of the first draft for consultation extends to more than one meeting. They therefore agreed to focus on one draft commodity standard at their next face-to-face meeting, rather than two.

[127] The TPCS:

- (22) *agreed* to draft the annex *International movement of Malus domestica fruit for consumption* (2023-024) to ISPM 46 at the next face-to-face TPCS meeting and *requested* that the secretariat open a call for information material for this annex;
- (23) *selected* Patrick Kwesi BESEH (Ghana) and Tiago Rodrigo LOHMANN (Brazil) as assistant stewards for the draft annex *International movement of Malus domestica fruit for consumption* (2023-024) to ISPM 46; and
- (24) *selected* Helen Mary ANDERSON (United Kingdom) and Jose Maria GUITIAN CASTRILLON (Spain) as assistant stewards for the draft annex *International movement of Vitis vinifera fruit* (2023-018) to ISPM 46.

7. Any other business

[128] There was no other business.

8. Evaluation of the meeting

[129] A link to a survey had been provided in the agenda for this meeting, for participants to provide feedback on the meeting.

¹⁶ 12_TPCS_2025_June.

9. Recommendations to the Standards Committee or IPPC Secretariat

[130] Recommendations to the SC or the secretariat are described in previous sections of this report. To facilitate reference, they are also compiled below.

[131] The TPCS *recommended* the following draft annexes to ISPM 46 to the SC for approval for first consultation in July 2026, subject to final review by the TPCS via an e-forum:

- International movement of *Citrus* fruit (2023-019) (see agenda item 5.2); and
- International movement of seeds of *Phaseolus vulgaris* (2023-008) (see agenda item 5.3).

[132] The TPCS *invited* the SC to:

- *advise* how the TPCS should approach cases where there is doubt about the association of a pest with the commodity or the technical justification for regulating a pest and whether Specification TP 6 (*Technical Panel on Commodity Standards*) or the TPCS working procedures need to be revised accordingly (see agenda item 5.2, including the decision to prepare a paper for the SC);
- *note* that different contracting parties use different terms to describe an entire country that is free from a particular pest (e.g. pest free area, pest free country, pest absence) and *advise* on appropriate terminology and whether the absence of a pest from an entire country can be considered a phytosanitary measure (see the decisions in agenda item 5.3 for further detail).

[133] The TPCS *requested* that the secretariat:

- *contact* the submitter from whom further supporting information was needed on the association between Tephritidae and *Citrus* fruit (in liaison with one TPCS member: see agenda item 5.2);
- *contact* the late submitter of information for the draft annex *International movement of Citrus fruit* (2023-019) to invite them to resubmit during consultation; and
- *open* a call for information material for the draft annex *International movement of Malus domestica fruit for consumption* (2023-024) to ISPM 46.

10. Next TPCS meeting

[134] The next face-to-face meeting is tentatively scheduled for 8–12 December 2025, with the venue to be confirmed.

11. Close of the meeting

[135] The secretariat, TPCS steward and chairperson thanked the participants, and the chairperson closed the meeting.

Appendix 1: Agenda

(Meeting documents are available only to TPCS members)

| Agenda Item | | Document No. | Presenter |
|-------------|--|--|---|
| 1. | Opening of the Meeting | | |
| 1.1 | Whakatau welcome | -- | Kapiera PEITA |
| 1.2 | Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat | -- | MOREIRA |
| 1.3 | Welcome by the host National Plant Protection Organization (NPPO) of New Zealand | -- | Peter THOMSON |
| 2. | Meeting Arrangements | | |
| 2.1 | Selection of Chairperson | -- | |
| 2.2 | Selection of the Rapporteur | -- | Chairperson |
| 2.3 | Adoption of the Agenda | 01_TPCS_2025_June | Chairperson |
| 3. | Administrative Matters | | |
| 3.1 | Documents List | 02_TPCS_2025_June | MOREIRA |
| 3.2 | Participants List / membership list | TPCS membership list 03_TPCS_2025_June | |
| 3.3 | Local Information - Local information | 04_TPCS_2025_June | ZHU |
| 4. | TPCS introduction and working procedures | | |
| 4.1 | Presentation of the IPPC standard setting process | Link to video (PPT link) | MOREIRA |
| 4.2 | Review of the TPCS Specification and IPPC Technical Panels working procedures - Call for information materials (review of form) | 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 09_TPCS_2025_June | WILSON (TPCS Steward) / MOREIRA (IPPC Secretariat) |

| Agenda Item | | Document No. | Presenter |
|-------------|---|---|-------------------------------|
| 4.3 | Updates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Updates from IPPC Secretariat and TPCS Steward | 10_TPCS_2025_June | MOREIRA/ WILSON |
| 5. | Development of draft annexes to ISPM 46 | | |
| 5.1. | <i>Reference documents:</i> <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 Guidelines for a consistent ISPM terminology (Section 3.3.2 of the IPPC Procedure Manual for Standard Setting) Annotated template for draft ISPMs | 05_TPCS_2025_June Link to the IPPC Procedure Manual for Standard Setting (2023-2024) Link to the Annotated template for draft ISPMs | |
| 5.2 | Development of the text of the draft International movement of Citrus fruit (2023-019), priority 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Steward: Mr André Felipe C. P. da SILVA Assistant stewards: Tiago Rodrigo LOHMANN and Lihong ZHU Steward's notes Excel: Revised submissions: Follow-up from submitters (see link – restricted access - log in required) | 2023-019 07_TPCS_2025_June 08_TPCS_2025_June Link | da SILVA / All |
| 5.3 | Development of the text of the draft International movement seeds of <i>Phaseolus vulgaris</i> (2023-008), priority 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Steward: Stavroula IOANNIDOU Assistant steward: Alfayo OMBUYA Steward's notes Excel: Submissions (information material – see link – restricted access - log in required) | 2023-008 XX_TPCS_2025_June 08_TPCS_2025_June Link Reference only: Link to ISPM 38 (International movement of seeds) | IOANNIDOU / All |
| 5.3.1 | Presentation on International Movement of Seeds, with a focus on <i>Phaseolus vulgaris</i> | - | Adinda DERKX (invited expert) |
| 6. | TPCS work programme | | |

| Agenda Item | | Document No. | Presenter |
|-------------|---|---|---|
| 6.1 | The process for footnote ink amendments in adopted commodity standards (from SC May 2025 meeting) | 13_TPCS_2025_June | WILSON |
| 6.2 | Potential reasons for “excluding a pest and a measure”: tracking sheet - Discussions on potential database | 11_TPCS_2025_June XX_TPCS_2025_June | LOHMANN/ All ALL |
| 6.3 | Potential commodity standards side-session at CPM-20 (2026) | 12_TPCS_2025_June | MOREIRA/ WILSON/ (ALL) |
| 6.4 | Brainstorming session/SWOT analysis of the TPCS | 06_TPCS_2025_June | TPCS Steward / All |
| 6.5 | TPCS work plan - 2025-2026 work plan - Call for information material - Call for commodity standards and IPPC call for topics - 2025 IPPC Regional Workshops - Template for draft annexes | <i>(to be developed during the meeting)</i> | Chair/ IPPC secretariat / WILSON / |
| 7. | Any Other Business | – | Chairperson |
| 8. | Evaluation of the meeting | Meeting survey link | IPPC Secretariat |
| 9. | Recommendations to the Standards Committee (SC) or IPPC Secretariat | <i>(to be captured in the meeting report)</i> | TPCS Steward / Chairperson |
| 10. | Next TPCS meetings: - Virtual meeting(s) - Face to face meeting New proposed dates: • [08-12 December 2025] • 19-23 January 2026 • 26-30 January 2026 | -- | IPPC Secretariat / TPCS Steward / Chairperson |
| 11. | Closing of the meeting | -- | IPPC Secretariat / NPPO of New Zealand/ Chairperson |

Appendix 2: Documents list

| DOCUMENT NO. | AGEND A ITEM | DOCUMENT TITLE | POSTED |
|----------------------|-----------------|--|------------|
| 2023-019 | 5.2 | Draft International movement of Citrus fruit (2023-019), priority 1 | 2025-06-02 |
| 01_TPCS_2025_Jun | 2.3 | Agenda | 2025-05-26 |
| 02_TPCS_2025_Jun | 3.1 | Documents list | 2025-06-03 |
| 03_TPCS_2025_Jun | 3.2 | Participants list | 2025-05-30 |
| 04_TPCS_2025_Jun | 3.3 | Local information | 2025-05-08 |
| 05_TPCS_2025_Jun | 5.1 | Editorial style for commodity standards | 2025-05-08 |
| 06_TPCS_2025_Jun | 6.4 | Brainstorming session/SWOT analysis of the TPCS | 2025-06-02 |
| 07_TPCS_2025_Jun | 5.2 | Steward's notes International movement of Citrus fruit (2023-019) | 2025-06-02 |
| 08_TPCS_2025_Jun | 5.2/5.3 | Excel file: Revised submissions | 2025-06-02 |
| 09_TPCS_2025_Jun | 4.2 | Call for information materials (review of form) | 2025-06-02 |
| 10_TPCS_2025_Jun_REV | 4.3 | Updates from IPPC Secretariat and TPCS steward | 2025-06-03 |
| 11_TPCS_2025_Jun | 6.2 | Potential criteria for excluding a pest and a measure | 2025-06-02 |
| 12_TPCS_2025_Jun | 6.3 | Concept note for potential CPM-20 (2026) side session on IPPC commodity specific standards | 2025-06-03 |
| 13_TPCS_2025_Jun | 6.1 | The process for footnote ink amendments in adopted commodity standards | 2025-06-03 |

Documents links (presented in the order of the agenda items)

| Links | AGENDA ITEM | DOCUMENT LINK |
|--|-------------|--|
| TPCS Membership list | 3.2 | TPCS membership list |
| Video: IPPC standard setting procedure | 4.1 | Link to video |
| Presentation of the standard setting procedure | 4.1 | PPT link |
| TPCS Specification – TP 06 | 4.2 | Link to TPCS Specification – TP 06 |
| IPPC procedure manual for standard setting | 4.2 | Link to IPPC procedure manual for standard setting |

| Links | AGENDA ITEM | DOCUMENT LINK |
|---|-------------|--|
| IPPC Style Guide and annotated templates (particularly Part 1, sections 2, 3 and 5) | 5.1 | Link to the IPPC Style Guide |
| ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms) | 5.1 | Link to ISPM 5 |
| Guidelines for a consistent ISPM terminology (Section 3.3.2 of the IPPC Procedure Manual for Standard Setting) | 5.1 | Link to the IPPC Procedure Manual for Standard Setting (2020-2021) |
| Submissions of Information Materials: International movement of seeds of <i>Phaseolus vulgaris</i> (2023-008), priority 1 | 5.2 | Link to submission forms |
| Submissions of Information Materials: International movement of Citrus fruit (2023-019) priority 1 | 5.3 | Link to submission forms |

Additional resources

- [IPPC standard setting procedure: video](#)
- [Link to adopted ISPMs](#)
- [Standard setting main page: https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/standards-setting/](https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/standards-setting/)
- TPCS main page: <https://ippc.int/en/core-activities/standards-setting/expert-drafting-groups/technical-panels/technical-panel-on-commodity-standards/>

Appendix 3: Participants list

| | Participant role | Name, mailing address, telephone | Email address | Term begins | Term ends |
|---|---------------------|---|--|-------------|------------|
| ✓ | Steward to the TPCS | Ms Joanne WILSON Animal and Plant Health Directorate Biosecurity New Zealand Ministry for Primary Industries Wellington NEW ZEALAND Tel.: +64 489 40528 | joanne.wilson@mpi.govt.nz | | |
| ✓ | Member | Ms Adriana CERIANI CAMDESSUS Professional Plant Protection Analyst National Service of Agri-Food Health and Quality -SENASA 162 Venezuela St, 7th floor (1063) Buenos Aires ARGENTINA Tel.: +54 911 6578 7357 | aceriani@senasa.gob.ar | April 2022 | April 2027 |
| ✓ | Member | Mr Tiago Rodrigo LOHMANN Chief of the Plant Quarantine Division Department of Plant Health and Agricultural Inputs Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Food Supply Esplanada dos Ministérios Bloco D, Anexo 70.043-900 Brasília, DF BRAZIL Tel.: +55 (61) 3218 2981 | tiago.lohmann@agro.gov.br | April 2022 | April 2027 |
| ✓ | Member | Ms Sun SHUANGYAN Senior Agronomist Research Center of GACC for International Inspection and Quarantine Standards and Technical Regulations Building 3, No. 20 Hepingli East Street, Dongcheng District, Beijing CHINA Tel.: +86 10 57954651 | sunshyan2008@163.com | April 2022 | April 2027 |
| ✓ | Member | Mr Alfayo OMBUYA Principal Plant Health Inspector Kenya Plant Health Inspectorate Service (KEPHIS) Kephis Mombasa, P.O. Box 80126-80100 Mombasa KENYA Tel.: +254 722 209 501 | a.ombuya@kephis.org ; alfayoombuya@yahoo.com | April 2022 | April 2027 |
| ✓ | Member | Ms Donam KIM Assistant Director Animal and Plant Quarantine Agency (APQA) 177 Hyoksin 8-ro, Gimcheon REPUBLIC OF KOREA | dongam75@korea.kr | April 2022 | April 2027 |

| | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------------|--|--|------------|------------|
| | | Tel.: +82 54 912 0628 | | | |
| ✓ | Member/ Host representative | Ms Lihong ZHU Portfolio Manager IPPC New Zealand Ministry for Primary Industries (NPPO) Charles Fergusson Building, 34-38 Bowen Street, PO Box 2526, Wellington 6140 NEW ZEALAND Tel.: +64 4 894 0261 | Lihong.zhu@mpi.govt.nz | April 2022 | April 2027 |
| ✓ | Member | Mr Jose Maria GUITIAN CASTRILLON Head of Plant Health Department Tragsatec Calle Julian Camarillo 6A 4º A 28037, Madrid SPAIN Tel.: +34610591439 | jmgc@tragsa.es | April 2025 | April 2030 |
| ✓ | Member | Mr Patrick Kwesi BESEH Deputy Director - Plant Quarantine PPRSD-MOFA BOX M37, Accra GHANA Tel.: +233243306667 | pkbeseh@gmail.com | April 2025 | April 2030 |
| ✓ | Member | Ms Helen Mary ANDERSON Pest Risk Analyst Defra, Room 11G19, York Biotech Campus, Sand Hutton, York, YO41 1LZ UK Tel.: 07385349003 or 07307866619 | helen.anderson@defra.gov.uk | April 2025 | April 2030 |

Other stewardship (SC members)

| | Participant role | Name | Email address |
|---|---|---|--|
| ✓ | Steward to “International movement of Citrus fruit (2023-019)” and “International movement of fresh banana (<i>Musa paradisiaca</i> fruit) (2023-028)” | Mr André Felipe C. P. da SILVA Federal Inspector Quarantine Division Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Food Supply BRAZIL Tel: (61) 3218-2925 | andre.peralta@agro.gov.br |
| ✓ | Steward to “International movement of seeds of <i>Phaseolus vulgaris</i> (2023-008)” | Stavroula IOANNIDOU Department of Phytosanitary Control, Directorate of Plant Production Protection, Hellenic Ministry of Rural Development and Food 150 Sygrou Ave, 17671, Kalithea, Athens, GREECE Phone: +30 210 9287133 | stioannidou@minagric.gr |

IPPC Secretariat

| | Participant role | Name | Email address |
|---|-------------------------------------|--|--|
| ✓ | IPPC Secretariat Lead to TPCS | Ms Adriana G. MOREIRA Deputy Lead of the IPPC Standard Setting Unit / Standards Officer IPPC Secretariat / FAO Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00153 Rome, Italy Tel.: (+39) 06 570 55809 | Adriana.Moreira@fao.org |
| ✓ | IPPC Secretariat Support to TPCS | Ms Karen ROUEN Standard Setting Specialist and Report Writer Standard Setting Unit IPPC Secretariat / FAO | Karen.Rouen@fao.org |

Others

| | Participant role | Name | Email address |
|---|------------------|---|--|
| ✓ | Invited expert | Ms Adinda DERKX Senior Officer Plant Health Netherlands Food and Consumer Product Safety Authority (NVWA) Utrecht & Wageningen, KINGDOM OF THE NETHERLANDS Tel: +31 6 11 50 86 18 | a.p.derks@nvwa.nl |

Host

| Name | Email address |
|---|--|
| Ms Angela Townson International Standards Coordinator Trade Facilitation & Standards Sustainable Trade & Environment Ministry for Primary Industries Manatū Ahu Matua NEW ZEALAND Tel: +64 4 830 1506 | Angela.Townson@mpi.govt.nz |