



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



**International
Plant Protection
Convention**

Report

Technical Panel on Commodity Standards

8–12 December 2025

Rome, Italy

IPPC Secretariat

Required Citation:

IPPC Secretariat. 2026. *Report of the meeting of the Technical Panel on Commodity Standards, 08-12 December 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, 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.	Updates	4
4.1	Updates from the November Standards Committee meeting	4
4.2	Updates on draft annexes to ISPM 46 after first consultation in July 2025	9
4.3	Updates on draft annexes to ISPM 46 – for first consultation in July 2026	12
5.	TPCS specification and working procedures	14
5.1	Review of the TPCS specification and IPPC technical panels’ working procedures	14
6.	Development of draft annexes to ISPM 46	14
6.1	Reference documents	14
6.2	International movement of fresh <i>Malus domestica</i> fruit for consumption (2023-024), priority 2	15
7.	TPCS work programme	19
7.1	Criteria for excluding pests and measures	19
7.2	Review of the “information materials spreadsheet”	21
7.3	Commodity standards side-session at CPM-20 (2026)	21
7.4	Brainstorming session/SWOT analysis of the TPCS	21
7.5	TPCS workplan	21
8.	Any other business	21
9.	Evaluation of the meeting	22
10.	Recommendations to the Standards Committee or IPPC Secretariat	22
11.	Next TPCS meetings	23
12.	Close of the meeting	23
	Appendix 1: Agenda	24
	Appendix 2: Documents List	27
	Appendix 3: Participants List	29

1. Opening of the meeting

1.1 Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat

- [1] Avetik NERSISYAN, the IPPC Standard Setting Unit (SSU) lead, and the IPPC Secretary, Enrico PEROTTI, opened the fourth face-to-face meeting of the Technical Panel on Commodity Standards (TPCS) and welcomed all participants. The IPPC secretary emphasized the importance of the work undertaken by the TPCS and the need to carefully consider the issues raised during consultation on commodity standards, given the wide trade in some commodities. He also encouraged the TPCS to consider how best to present systems approaches in commodity standards, taking into account the outcomes of the IPPC Global Workshop on Systems Approaches held in Santiago, Chile (see agenda item 6.2). He finished by updating the TPCS about recent staffing changes within the SSU.

2. Meeting arrangements

2.1 Selection of chairperson

- [2] As agreed at their meeting in June 2023,¹ the TPCS selected Lihong ZHU (New Zealand) as chairperson.
- [3] The chairperson welcomed everyone, reflected on the work done by the panel to date and looked forward to a successful week. She also acknowledged the work of Joanne WILSON (New Zealand) in preparing for this meeting, both as TPCS steward and as steward for the draft annex *International movement of fresh Malus domestica fruit for consumption* (2023-024) to ISPM 46 (*Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures*).
- [4] Hereafter in this report, annexes to ISPM 46 are referred to as “commodity standards” (CSs).

2.2 Selection of the rapporteur

- [5] The TPCS selected Adriana CERIANI CAMDESSUS (Argentina) and Alfayo OMBUYA (Kenya) as the meeting rapporteurs.

2.3 Adoption of the agenda

- [6] The TPCS adopted the agenda (Appendix 1). Later in the meeting, the panel agreed to bring forward for discussion agenda item 7.1 (Criteria for excluding pests and measures) so that the outcome could inform the drafting and revising of the draft CSs.
- [7] The IPPC Secretariat (hereafter referred to as “the secretariat”) confirmed that the stewards providing updates in agenda items 4.1 and 4.2 would be joining via video link. The TPCS therefore agreed to adjust the timing of these agenda items to allow their participation.

3. Administrative matters

- [8] The TPCS noted the absence of Sun SHUANGYAN (China).
- [9] A documents list is provided as Appendix 2 and a participants list as Appendix 3.

4. Updates

4.1 Updates from the November Standards Committee meeting

- [10] The TPCS steward informed the panel that the Standards Committee (SC) had selected Nader ELBADRY (Egypt) to replace Eyad MOHAMMED (Syrian Arab Republic), who had resigned as one of the assistant TPCS stewards.

¹ TPCS 2023-06, agenda item 2.1.

Standards Committee responses to issues raised by TPCS

- [11] The TPCS steward presented an update on the response of the SC to two issues on which the TPCS had sought guidance: use of the terms “pest absence”, “pest free country” and “pest free area” in CSs; and concerns regarding the inclusion of certain pests in CSs.²
- [12] **Use of the terms “pest absence”, “pest free country” and “pest free area”.** The steward reported that, further to the TPCS’s request in June 2025,³ the SC had clarified that “pest absence” determined in accordance with ISPM 8 (*Determination of pest status in an area*) is a technical categorization, not a phytosanitary measure, although surveillance is still required. In contrast, a pest free area (PFA) established in accordance with ISPM 4 (*Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas*) is a phytosanitary measure and has to be maintained, but an importing country needs technical justification to require an exporting country to establish an PFA. To remove ambiguity from adopted ISPMs, the SC had proposed that the definition of “pest free area” in ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*) be revised and that ISPM 8 be subject to a focused revision to remove two “pest absent” categories that are covered by other “pest absent” categories. The SC had also suggested four options for the TPCS to consider when addressing submissions from contracting parties that include requirements for “pest absence” or “pest free country”. Two of these involved the inclusion of the following statement from ISPM 4 (*Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas*), either in the text of each CS (Option 1) or in ISPM 46 (Option 2): “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”. In Option 3, all references to pest absence would be omitted from CSs and pests for which pest absence is the only measure provided would be excluded. In Option 4, such pests would be included in the list of pests with a footnote to indicate the import requirements.
- [13] **Inclusion or exclusion of pests in commodity standards.** The TPCS steward reported that, in response to the paper agreed upon by the TPCS via e-forum,⁴ the SC had acknowledged the TPCS’s approach to fully exercising its authority as prescribed in ISPM 46, Specification TP 6 (*Technical Panel on Commodity Standards*) and its working procedures.⁵ The SC had acknowledged that the TPCS can exclude a pest from a draft CS if the evidence provided by the submitting contracting party does not demonstrate that the commodity as described in the draft CS is a pathway for the pest. The SC had also invited the TPCS to provide draft criteria for exclusion of pests and measures in CSs, for consideration by the SC in May 2026. Furthermore, because contracting parties do not have the opportunity to comment on pests or measures added as a result of the second consultation, the SC had noted that the process for managing changes at this stage needs to be considered and addressed through future changes to the Standard Setting Procedure.

TPCS discussion on pest absence

- [14] The TPCS discussed the SC response, noting that they would be considering the draft list of criteria for exclusion of pests and measures in agenda item 7.1 of this meeting. Partway through the discussion, the TPCS moved to agenda item 4.2 for discussion of the draft CS on International movement of fresh *Colocasia esculenta* corms (2023-023). They then returned to this agenda item.
- [15] **Focused revision of ISPM 8.** One TPCS member expressed concern that removing some of the pest absence categories from ISPM 8 could risk losing the distinction between categories that are the result of action and those that are not. The TPCS steward reassured the member that there would be the opportunity to raise concerns and suggestions during consultation as usual.

² 15_TPCS_2025_Dec.

³ TPCS 2025-06, agenda item 5.3.

⁴ 15_TPCS_2025_Dec, Annex 1; agreed by e-decision 2025_eTPCS_01, following TPCS 2025-06, agenda item 5.2.

⁵ SC 2025-11, agenda item 5.

- [16] **Terminology relating to pest absence.** The TPCS noted, as well as “pest free area”, submissions can include terms such as “pest free country”, “pest absence” and “pest does not occur”.
- [17] With regard to the submissions of “pest free country” from one particular region, a TPCS member from the region confirmed that this meant that the whole country is a PFA. The TPCS therefore agreed to present submissions of “pest free country” from this region as a PFA, with no footnote about the import requirement.
- [18] With regard to other terminology, the TPCS noted that there is a difference between “not known to occur” and “known not to occur”: the latter indicates that action has been taken to determine whether the pest occurs and hence could be a pest status of “absent” in accordance with ISPM 8, which requires surveillance; but this may not be the case for the former. The TPCS also noted that “pest absence” could refer to the results of an inspection.
- [19] The TPCS recognized that these various terms represented a spectrum of import requirements ranging from the most stringent (a PFA established in accordance with ISPM 4) to the least stringent (an inspection), with a pest status of “absent” in accordance with ISPM 8 being less stringent than a PFA because it does not need to be maintained. The TPCS agreed, therefore, that they should not make assumptions about the intended meaning of terms related to pest absence but should exercise due diligence and check with submitters to confirm whether the measure submitted is a PFA established in accordance with ISPM 4, a pest status of “absent” in accordance with ISPM 8, or something else. If the submitter confirms that the measure is a PFA, then it would be listed as a PFA without a footnote; but if the submitter responds that the measure is not a PFA, then the panel would need to apply the guidance to be agreed by the SC.
- [20] **Pest absence as a measure.** The TPCS acknowledged that, in accordance with the decision of the SC, pest absence is not a phytosanitary measure.
- [21] **Options suggested by the SC.** The TPCS discussed the options. As they had agreed that pest absence is not a phytosanitary measure, the main focus of the discussion was how to approach pests for which pest absence is the only measure provided by submitters. They noted that this was not likely to affect many pests, as for most there would be at least one other measure and pest absence had not been submitted by many contracting parties.
- [22] The TPCS did not reach consensus about which potential solution or solutions to propose to the SC. Comments made during the discussion including the following:
- With regard to the statement from ISPM 4:
 - if it is included, it would be quicker to do this in draft commodity CSs than in ISPM 46 (i.e. Option 1 is preferable to Option 2);
 - there is no need to repeat the statement, as it is already in ISPM 4 (i.e. Options 3 or 4 are acceptable);
 - the statement could be expanded to say that those pests that appear in the list of pests but not in the list of pest-specific measures were submitted with pest absence as the only measure; or
 - the statement could be included as a footnote.
 - With regard to pests for which pest absence is the only measure, the approach could be to:
 - exclude the pest (i.e. Option 3), because the main aim of CSs is to provide guidance on options for phytosanitary measures and pest absence is not a phytosanitary measure;
 - include the pest, with a footnote (i.e. Option 4), to avoid losing valuable information about pests that importing countries consider to be very economically important and to avoid conveying the impression that no countries require pest absence as an import requirement;
 - include the pest in the list of pests but not in the list of pest-specific measures (i.e. an extension of Option 4);

- ask the submitter whether they would apply any other measures and, if not, the rationale;
 - exclude the pest if the submission is from an exporting country (because pest absence is a statement the exporting country needs to enter onto their additional declarations, not a phytosanitary measure), but consider it for inclusion if the submission is from an importing country (because the importing country is the one that will have conducted the pest risk analysis (PRA)); or
 - consider on a case-by-case basis, as the TPCS should fully exercise its authority to evaluate the submissions.
- With regard to pests for which pest absence is one of multiple measures submitted, the other measures could be listed but with a footnote to refer to pest absence also being an import requirement.
 - The approach taken to pest absence needs to be consistent with the approach taken to pests that do not have a specification for the measure (e.g. submissions of “systems approach” without details).
 - Pest absence is outside the scope of ISPM 46, as the scope of ISPM 46 is commodity-specific phytosanitary measures and the SC have confirmed that pest absence is not a measure. It should therefore not be considered in draft CSs (i.e. Option 3). There is also no need to refer to pest absence in draft CSs, as import requirements for a particular pest status are the subject of bilateral negotiations between national plant protection organizations (NPPOs) and CSs focus on actionable measures.
 - Option 4 is the more precautionary approach, but Option 1 is also acceptable.

[23] In discussing whether pests for which pest absence is the only measure should be included in the list of pests, the TPCS considered how NPPOs should or would use the list of pests. Members of the TPCS expressed divergent views over whether NPPOs should conduct a PRA first to identify the pests and then use the CS to help identify potential measures, or whether some countries, instead of doing a PRA first, would use the list of pests in the CS as a “starter” list to help them determine which pests to regulate.

[24] During the discussion, the TPCS considered whether a country in which a pest cannot establish, and hence no actions are needed to maintain pest absence, could be considered a PFA. The TPCS steward clarified that a PFA established in accordance with ISPM 4 needs to be maintained, but a country should only require a PFA if it has technical justification to do so.

[25] The TPCS noted that they had resolved all instances of pest absence in the draft CS on International movement of *Citrus* spp. fruit (2023-019), with all being confirmed as a PFA. They therefore agreed to continue the discussion about pest absence as and when they came across examples in the draft CS on International movement of fresh *Malus domestica* fruit for consumption (2023-024). During development of the latter draft CS in agenda item 6.2, they resolved all instances of “pest absence” through panel members who were from the submitting countries. The TPCS recognized that they still needed to suggest one or two solutions to present to the SC in May 2026, but they agreed to do this at a virtual meeting in early 2026.

COSAVE proposal to review the criteria for the inclusion of pests in the draft annexes to ISPM 46

[26] The TPCS steward referred to a paper from Comité de Sanidad Vegetal del Cono Sur (COSAVE), which expressed similar concerns to those raised by the TPCS regarding the submission of some pests that did not meet the criteria for association with the pathway.⁶

[27] The chairperson noted that, since submission of the COSAVE paper, the SC had confirmed that the TPCS could fully exercise its authority to exclude pests if not technically justified. A TPCS member

⁶ 18_TPCS_2025_Dec.

from one of the COSAVE countries confirmed that the concerns in the COSAVE paper had been resolved by the SC's decisions and the TPCS agreed with this assessment.

APPPC considerations and recommendations on commodity standards

- [28] The TPCS steward referred to a paper prepared by the Asia members of the SC following discussion at the Asia and Pacific Plant Protection Commission (APPPC) Regional Workshop in September 2025.⁷ The APPPC participants had identified uncertainty in how certain categories of pests – incidental or contaminating pests, pests linked to discarded parts of the commodity, and pests that are relevant only if the commodity is diverted from its intended use – were addressed in the development of CSs. The APPPC participants had also sought greater transparency about the reasons for excluding pests.
- [29] The TPCS steward suggested that the issue of contaminating pests could be resolved by describing the commodities better (e.g. without leaves). Better commodity descriptions may also help address the issue of discarded plant parts, although not completely. Regarding transparency, the TPCS steward said that she would be making some suggestions in agenda items 7.1 and 7.2, when discussing the spreadsheet and database.
- [30] **Incidental or contaminating pests.** The TPCS agreed that expanding commodity descriptions (e.g. specifying “without leaves or stems” or “practically free from soil”) would help address some of the issues raised at the APPPC regional workshop, including contaminating pests. One TPCS member also highlighted the importance of making it clear that the CS only applied to the intended use described for the commodity. The TPCS recognized the difficulty for “dirty” crops, such as *Colocasia esculenta* (taro), for which there is a very high risk of contaminating pests. However, the TPCS recalled that ISPM 46 explicitly states that contamination is outside the scope of ISPM 46 and its annexes.
- [31] The TPCS recognized the need to ensure that commodity descriptions are aligned with the plant part that is internationally traded (e.g. if the commodity is traded with the petiole attached, the commodity description must include the petiole), otherwise the CS would be of limited use.
- [32] **Discarded parts of the commodity.** The TPCS noted that the parts of the commodity to be discarded would be removed and discarded in the importing country, so would still be part of the commodity upon import and hence should be considered part of the traded commodity.
- [33] **Diversion from intended use.** For commodities where the pest risk is very high if the commodity is diverted from the intended use, the TPCS considered whether to include text in the CS highlighting the risk of diversion from intended use. The TPCS recalled, however, that ISPM 46 explicitly states that diversion from intended use is outside the scope of ISPM 46 and its annexes.
- [34] **Viruses.** The TPCS noted that they would need to consider the inclusion or exclusion of viruses in draft CSs on a case-by-case basis, as the approach would depend on whether the virus could be transmitted mechanically (e.g. by contact with other fruits) or only if the commodity was planted. The panel's conclusions regarding viruses in the draft CS for taro are reported under agenda item 4.2.
- [35] **Transparency of reasons for excluding pests.** The TPCS recalled that, at their first face-to-face meeting, in Tokyo in January 2023, they had discussed transparency and had agreed to maintain a spreadsheet for each draft CS as an interim document,⁸ but it would not be published as it was a living document and was internal to the TPCS.
- [36] The TPCS steward confirmed that the intention of the APPPC request for transparency was to help submitting countries provide the appropriate information. She therefore assumed that the request was for the list of criteria for exclusion to be published, rather than the reasons for excluding individual pests.

⁷ 19_TPCS_2025_Dec.

⁸ TPCS 2023-01, agenda item 6.2.

The TPCS noted that, thus far, no contracting parties had asked for the reasons that individual pests or measures had been excluded, so it should not be a problem to keep the spreadsheet internal.

[37] The TPCS agreed that the criteria for exclusion, once approved by the SC, should be included in the call for information, so that submitters have clearer guidance. The TPCS agreed that the most convenient way of doing this would be to include it in the template submission form.

[38] The TPCS returned to the role of the spreadsheet in transparency under agenda item 7.1.

[39] The TPCS:

- (1) *acknowledged* that, in accordance with the decision of the SC, pest absence is not a phytosanitary measure;
- (2) *agreed* that, in cases of doubt, they would check with submitters to confirm whether measures submitted in relation to pest absence are a PFA established in accordance with ISPM 4, a pest status of “absent” in accordance with ISPM 8, or something else;
- (3) *agreed* to continue their consideration of how to address import requirements for “pest absence” and “pest free country” in CSs at a virtual meeting in early 2026 (see agenda item 11);
- (4) *agreed* that the issues raised by COSAVE about the inclusion of pests in CSs had been resolved;
- (5) *agreed* that:
 - contaminating pests and pests that pose a pest risk only if the commodity is diverted from its intended use should be excluded from CSs, and CSs should be silent about the associated risk, as ISPM 46 clearly states that contamination and diversion from intended use are outside the scope of ISPM 46 and its annexes;
 - pests associated with parts of the commodity that are discarded in the importing country should be included in CSs, as those plant parts are part of the traded commodity;
 - the description of the commodity in CSs should be sufficient to address concerns about contamination, while remaining aligned with the traded commodity; and
- (6) *agreed* to include the list of criteria for exclusion of pests and measures, once approved by the SC, in the template submission form (spreadsheet) for pests and measures.

4.2 Updates on draft annexes to ISPM 46 after first consultation in July 2025

International movement of fresh Colocasia esculenta corms (2023-023), priority 1

[40] The Steward, Sophie PETERSON (Australia), joined the TPCS meeting via video link to provide an update on the outcome of the first consultation.⁹ She reported that approximately 380 comments had been received. Although she had not yet addressed the responses, she explained that the main issues raised related to how viruses and contamination are dealt with in CSs. The risk related to viruses was associated with diversion from intended use (if the corms are planted) and the disposal of waste material from the corms (as the corms could sprout). The issue of contamination was associated with how to manage soil on the corms. The steward emphasized that it was important to consider how such issues would be considered not only in the draft CS for taro but also other potential CSs in the future, such as potato. In addition to the issues related to viruses and contamination, one contracting party had also expressed substantial concerns about the need for the standard at all.

[41] **Concerns about the need for commodity standards.** The secretariat reported that the concerns about the need for the standard had also been made in relation to the draft CS on International movement of fresh *Musa* spp. fruit (2023-028) and had been sent in a letter to the SSU lead. The letter had been discussed by the SC along with the concerns from COSAVE (see agenda item 4.1).

[42] **Role of TPCS in draft commodity standards after initial drafting.** The TPCS noted that its role in draft CSs was not clear once the drafts had been submitted to the SC for approval for first consultation. The TPCS therefore sought clarity on what input the steward required from the TPCS. The secretariat

⁹ Draft for first consultation: 2023-023; TPG recommendations, 11_TPCS_2025_Dec.

explained that it was the role of the TPCS to provide advice to the steward. Sophie PETERSON (Australia), in her capacity as SC chairperson, explained that although draft CSs were “subjects” in the hierarchy of the *List of topics for IPPC standards*, they were being managed in the same way as topics; that is, once the TPCS has drafted the document, it then proceeds through the Standard Setting Procedure with an SC member as steward. She commented that, although any input from the TPCS was welcome, stewards had to balance that with other feedback when addressing consultation comments.

- [43] The SSU lead encouraged the TPCS to take an active role in providing advice to stewards that may be helpful in addressing consultation comments.
- [44] The chairperson welcomed the invitation for the TPCS to take an active role and confirmed the panel’s willingness to provide advice to stewards. She suggested that, throughout this meeting, the panel discuss issues that were common to more than one draft CS and then provide written advice to stewards based on these discussions.
- [45] **Viruses.** The steward confirmed that viruses were included in the draft CS for taro because one contracting party regulates them and the corresponding PRA had been provided. She explained that the pest risk varied, depending on the variety of taro. She sought advice from the TPCS on whether the viruses should be retained in the draft CS.
- [46] Later in the meeting, after considering the issues raised by the APPPC (agenda item 4.1), the TPCS agreed that the viruses should be retained in the draft CS. They recognized that, in the case of taro, virus transmission could occur as a result of planting or of disposal of the petiole: although the former was outside the scope of the standard, because it was a diversion from intended use, the latter was not, because it related to a discarded part of the traded commodity. They agreed that the commodity description should not be expanded to include “without petiole”, because although some importing countries required the petiole to be removed, others did not, so it should be considered part of the traded commodity.
- [47] **Diversion from intended use.** The TPCS confirmed that diversion from intended use (e.g. planting) was outside the scope of the standard and the standard should remain silent about it (see agenda item 4.1).
- [48] **Contamination.** The steward confirmed that the contamination risk for taro related to contamination with soil rather than contaminating pests. Later in the meeting, the TPCS agreed that the most appropriate way to address this in the draft CS was to expand the commodity description, if feasible (e.g. “practically free from soil”). The TPCS recognized, however, that there was still a need to ensure that the commodity description was aligned with the plant part that is internationally traded.
- [49] **TPCS work programme.** The secretariat reminded the TPCS that the workplan included the submission of three draft CSs for first consultation (*Malus domestica* (apple), *Citrus* spp. and *Phaseolus vulgaris* seeds), and two for second consultation (*Musa* spp. and taro), in July 2026. The secretariat confirmed that no proposals for new CSs had yet been submitted in the ongoing call for topics. The chairperson encouraged panel members to encourage submissions for new CSs through the call for topics. The SC chairperson commented that there was still work to do by the TPCS and the SC in addressing the concerns of contracting parties about CSs, but once these were resolved more proposals may be submitted.

International movement of fresh Musa spp. fruit (2023-028), priority 1

- [50] The Steward, André Felipe C.P. da SILVA (Brazil), joined the TPCS meeting via video link to provide an update on the outcome of the first consultation.¹⁰ He reported that 634 comments had been received. These included substantial concerns from one contracting party, which had proposed that development of this draft CS be stopped because it was unnecessary.¹¹ The steward had revised the draft to take

¹⁰ 12_TPCS_2025_Dec_REV; 14_TPCS_2025_Dec_REV; 17_TPCS_2025_Dec; 16_TPCS_2025_Dec.

¹¹ 17_TPCS_2025_Dec.

account of the consultation comments,¹² although he had not finished as he wished to seek advice from the TPCS.

- [51] The steward reported that the main comments made during the consultation were:
- four comments that considered the draft to be unnecessary, as it appeared to introduce additional trade restrictions while including pests not associated with the pathway and measures with which it would be difficult to comply;
 - three requests for inclusion of pests, some of which had provided references;
 - various suggestions to delete pests not associated with the pathway;
 - two suggestions to limit the scope of the standard to “green” (or green 0 to 1) fruit, this being the stage of maturity at which the fruit is internationally traded; and
 - one suggestion of new phytosanitary measures to include, but it was unclear whether any NPPO applies these measures.
- [52] The TPCS considered both the issues highlighted and the recommendations by the steward. In some cases, the steward and the TPCS held divergent views, but the final decisions were provided by the panel.
- [53] **Scope.** The steward confirmed that limiting the scope to mature green fruit would result in the removal of many Tephritidae species, as they are not associated with the green stage. However, the TPCS noted that, although most trade is of the green fruit, yellow fruit is sometimes traded over short distances as a premium product. The TPCS therefore agreed not to change the scope of the standard but to add a general footnote below the table of pests to explain that the maturity of the fruit could affect the host association with Tephritidae. They agreed that a general footnote was preferable to marking individual species with an asterisk.
- [54] **Fruit as a pathway.** One regional plant protection organization (RPPO) had suggested that the caption of the table of pests be amended to “Pests considered to be associated with fresh *Musa* spp. fruit pathway”. However, the TPCS agreed not to refer to “pathway” in the table title, to avoid confusion with pathway-specific standards (as “pathway” can refer either to the fruit or to the movement of the fruit in international trade).
- [55] **Table of pests.** In his notes,¹³ the steward had listed the pests proposed by consultation comments for addition or deletion. In each case, he had provided his recommendation. The TPCS provided their written recommendations to the steward later in the meeting, based on the exclusion criteria they drafted in agenda item 7.1.
- [56] The TPCS noted that, in two cases where there was uncertainty about whether the pest was regulated, the secretariat could be asked to contact the submitters to confirm the regulation but would need to give a firm deadline for response.
- [57] **Low-mobility pests.** The TPCS agreed that pests should not be excluded on grounds of low mobility, because even though they might have a low probability of transfer, they could still be a pathway for entry. However, such pests could be marked to indicate that there was low probability of transfer to the host.
- [58] **Irradiation treatments.** The steward sought advice on an irradiation treatment that had been proposed by an NPPO but without a reference. The steward had found the treatment in the NPPO’s treatment manual. The TPCS agreed that the NPPO treatment manual could be referenced.
- [59] The TPCS queried whether another irradiation treatment, for which the reference appeared to be a scientific paper, was applied in trade. The steward confirmed that the reference had been supplied by

¹² 2023-028_REV.

¹³ 14_TPCS_2025_Dec_REV.

the NPPO proposing the treatment, but it was not clear whether the NPPO required the treatment on *Musa* spp. The TPCS recalled that, according to ISPM 46, a measure needs to have been set as a phytosanitary import requirement by at least one contracting party for it to be included in a CS.

[60] **Systems approach.** The steward sought advice on a systems approach that had been proposed for inclusion but for which no details had been provided. The TPCS confirmed that, if there is no detail for a systems approach, it should not be included.

[61] **General measures: pest free areas, pest free places of production, export inspection.** The TPCS considered whether general measures should be included in the table of pest-specific options for phytosanitary measures if they are also listed in the table of general measures. They recalled that, for a previous draft CS, they had included “PFA” in the table of pest-specific measures where it was the only measure for a pest, to avoid excluding that pest from the draft CS. The steward commented, however, that it could be confusing if measures are presented as being both a general measure and a pest-specific measure.

[62] To respect the submissions, the TPCS agreed that general measures should be included in the table of pest-specific options for phytosanitary measures if submitted by a contracting party for a specific pest, even if the measure is also listed in the table of general measures or it is not the only pest-specific measure submitted for that pest. The TPCS also noted that, if necessary, a footnote could be added to explain that general measures listed in the table had been submitted by a contracting party for a specific pest.

[63] The TPCS:

- (7) *agreed* to provide written advice to the stewards of the draft CS on International movement of fresh *Colocasia esculenta* corms (2023-023) and the draft CS on International movement of fresh *Musa* spp. fruit (2023-028) on the issues highlighted at this meeting as needing further advice.

4.3 Updates on draft annexes to ISPM 46 – for first consultation in July 2026

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

[64] The Steward, André Felipe C.P. da SILVA (Brazil), joined the TPCS meeting (via video link) for this agenda item.¹⁴ He explained that, when drafting the standard at its meeting in June 2025, the TPCS had not had time for an in-depth discussion. The TPCS had therefore asked the steward to reorganize the table on cold treatments after the meeting, and the panel had asked the secretariat to seek clarification from one RPPO on the tephritid fruit flies it had submitted. The steward reported that he had reorganized the cold-treatment table in ascending order of temperature. He had also revised the Tephritidae entries in the list of pests, following clarification from the RPPO, with some species being added and others deleted.

[65] The TPCS reviewed the changes to the list of pests, the table of cold treatments, and other associated parts of the draft CS.¹⁵

[66] **Scope.** The TPCS agreed that text should be added to the Scope section to explain that, when considering the list of pests and measures, NPPOs should take into account that a given pest may be associated with only one or a few species of *Citrus*, not necessarily all of them. Furthermore, the measures may be effective for one or some of the *Citrus* species, but not necessarily all of them. Once this text was included, there would be no need to include “for some or all *Citrus* species” in the caption to the table of pest-specific options for phytosanitary measures.

[67] The TPCS noted the need, in future, for the species to be covered by a draft CS to be made very clear to contracting parties and RPPOs from the outset, to avoid confusion later in the drafting stages.

¹⁴ 13_TPCS_2025_Dec.

¹⁵ 2023-027.

- [68] **Table of pests.** In accordance with the draft list of exclusion criteria for pests (agenda item 7.1), the TPCS agreed to exclude *Anastrepha* spp., as no species names had been provided.
- [69] The TPCS agreed to exclude all viruses except *Citrus tristeza virus*, because transfer cannot occur to the host on the pathway.
- [70] The TPCS noted that there were a few other pests that may need to be excluded according to the draft criteria for exclusion of pests (see agenda item 7.1) and selected some TPCS members to review these after the meeting.
- [71] **Table of options for phytosanitary measures.** The TPCS agreed that all the entries for which “pest free country” had been submitted as the measure could be considered a PFA, so there was no longer a need for a footnote to explain that “PFA” included “pest free country”.
- [72] **Cold treatments.** The steward confirmed that, although some of the treatments were very similar to each other, he had retained the separate entries, as the TPCS had agreed to respect the individual submissions. He had also removed treatments for which there was no reference.
- [73] The TPCS highlighted some corrections that were needed to three of the cold treatments.
- [74] **Systems approaches.** For the systems approach that corresponded to ISPM 35 (*Systems approach for pest risk management of fruit flies (Tephritidae)*), the TPCS agreed to delete the example of pre-planting control measures (area of low pest prevalence), because it was not helpful and was not mandatory in ISPM 35.

International movement of seeds of Phaseolus vulgaris (2023-027), priority 1

- [75] The Steward, Stavroula IOANNIDOU (Greece), joined the TPCS meeting via video link to provide an update on this draft CS. She reported that there had been no discussion about the draft CS at the SC meeting in November 2025, but it would be presented to the SC in May 2026. She explained that, further to the SC’s decisions in November regarding the exclusion of pests from CSs (see agenda item 4.1), she had some concerns to discuss with the TPCS relating to the exclusion of pests.
- [76] The steward highlighted the pests for which she was seeking advice from the TPCS. The TPCS shared with the steward the exclusion criteria for pests that they had drafted under agenda item 7.1.
- [77] **Seed-borne but not seed-transmitted.** The steward referred to the submission from one contracting party that had been revised and resubmitted by the contracting party during the June 2025 TPCS meeting. The original submission categorized pathogens into seed-borne and seed-transmitted; the revised submission included only the seed-transmitted pathogens. The TPCS advised the steward that, following their draft criteria for exclusion, the resubmitted list of pests should be considered for inclusion in the draft CS but not the original list.
- [78] **Non-NPPO submissions.** The TPCS agreed that the submission from the International Seed Federation would be used in the same way as a scientific reference, as it was not a submission from an NPPO.
- [79] **References for pests.** The secretariat advised that the practice has been to include references for measures but not for pests, although there was precedence for including a Further reading section. However, the TPCS returned to this later in the meeting (see agenda item 8).
- [80] **Review of queried pests.** The steward agreed to review the pests that she had highlighted against the exclusion criteria, including whether the pests were regulated and had a corresponding measure. Later in the meeting, the steward provided a revised list of pests for the TPCS to consider which should be excluded. However, as there was insufficient time to discuss this list at this meeting, the TPCS agreed that the assistant stewards would liaise with the steward after the meeting. The TPCS also agreed to reconvene for a virtual meeting in January 2026 to consider the outcome and the draft CS as a whole (see agenda item 11 for next meetings).

[81] The TPCS:

- (8) *agreed* to provide written advice to the stewards of the draft CS on International movement of *Citrus* spp. fruit (2023-019) and the draft CS on International movement of seeds of *Phaseolus vulgaris* (2023-027) on the issues highlighted at this meeting as needing further advice;
- (9) *agreed* that Adriana CERIANI CAMDESSUS (Argentina), José María GUTIAN CASTRILLON (Spain), Tiago Rodrigo LOHMANN (Brazil) and Lihong ZHU (New Zealand) would liaise after the meeting to agree which other pests, if any, should be excluded from the draft CS on International movement of *Citrus* spp. fruit (2023-019) and to assist the steward in applying the approach to systems approaches agreed by the TPCS under agenda item 6.2;
- (10) *agreed* that the assistant stewards would liaise with the steward to determine which of the queried pests, if any, should be excluded from the draft CS on International movement of seeds of *Phaseolus vulgaris* (2023-027) and to assist the steward in applying the approach to systems approaches agreed by the TPCS under agenda item 6.2;
- (11) *requested* that the secretariat share the list of draft criteria for excluding pests and measures (agenda item 7.1) with all the stewards for CS subjects;
- (12) *suggested* that the secretariat provide further guidance to contracting parties and RPPOs on the supporting information required if proposing new pests or measures during consultation, with a request that the template submission form be used; and
- (13) *suggested* that the importance of submitting pests and measures during the call for information materials, with the opportunity to also do this during first consultation, could be emphasized at the side session on CSs at the Twentieth Session of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) in 2026.

5. TPCS specification and working procedures

5.1 Review of the TPCS specification and IPPC technical panels' working procedures

[82] At their meeting in June 2025, the TPCS had agreed to discuss further their approach to liaison with other technical panels and whether CSs should distinguish between quarantine pests and regulated non-quarantine pests.¹⁶

[83] The TPCS deferred discussion on liaison with other technical panels to a future meeting, because of time constraints.

[84] Regarding the need to distinguish quarantine pests and regulated non-quarantine pests, the TPCS agreed to consider this during the discussion on the draft CS for seeds of *Phaseolus vulgaris* (2023-027) (agenda item 4.3), if it arose. The issue did not arise in that discussion.

[85] The TPCS:

- (14) *deferred* discussion about the panel's approach to liaison with other technical panels.

6. Development of draft annexes to ISPM 46

6.1 Reference documents

[86] The secretariat introduced guidance on the editorial style used in ISPMs, including those aspects of style specific to CSs.¹⁷ The secretariat explained that, ultimately, the intention was to create an annotated template for draft CSs.

¹⁶ TPCS 2025-06, agenda item 4.2.

¹⁷ 07_TPCS_2025_Dec.

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

- [87] The Steward, Joanne WILSON (New Zealand), presented an initial draft of the CS together with supporting documentation.¹⁸ She reported that 20 submissions had been received: 19 using the new spreadsheet-format submission form and one as a portable document format (PDF) file. She had collated the 19 into one master spreadsheet.
- [88] The steward explained that the body text of the draft standard was based on CS 1 (*International movement of fresh Mangifera indica fruit*) and did not include any of the variations made to subsequent draft CSs by the TPCS. She highlighted the main issues requiring attention by the TPCS during this meeting: checking the pest association with the traded commodity; checking the pest group, order, family and species names; adding missing species authorities (of which there were many, as only a few submissions had included authorities); removing pests that were synonyms of other entries; checking treatment codes and resolving how best to present combined methyl bromide and cold treatments.
- [89] She reported that she had excluded pests if no corresponding measure had been provided, there was uncertainty about the required measure, or the measure was not for the traded plant part (i.e. fruit). One contracting party had confirmed that, although they had only been able to submit a list of pests, without corresponding measures, they may be able to submit the measures during first consultation.
- [90] The steward reported that several systems approaches had been submitted but, for many, the details submitted did not demonstrate at least two independent measures and therefore they did not meet the definition of a systems approach as per ISPM 14 (*The use of integrated measures in a systems approach for pest risk management*). To aid understanding of systems approaches, she had included an alternative way of presenting the information in the draft standard, including some additional text.
- [91] Finally, the steward shared her experience of collating the information that had been submitted in spreadsheet format. She reported that it had been easier than collating information from the previous Word version, but it had been difficult to collate information where the submitters had merged cells, split cells, included picture files, entered information into the incorrect columns, or used inconsistent or incorrect terminology. She suggested that the spreadsheet could be improved with drop-down lists for pest types and names of measures and by “locking” columns so that cells could not be split or merged. She also suggested that an additional column could be included, after submissions are collated, to indicate the reason for the exclusion of a pest.
- [92] The secretariat shared the original submissions with the TPCS.¹⁹
- [93] Following the SC’s decision (see agenda item 4.1), the TPCS agreed to fully exercise its authority to exclude a pest from a draft CS if the evidence did not demonstrate that the commodity is a pathway for the pest.
- [94] The steward confirmed that she had not included the PDF submission in the spreadsheet, because it was unclear whether the measures were “recommended measures” from PRA or phytosanitary measures required by the importing country. The TPCS therefore needed to assess what, if anything, needed to be added from this submission.

Review of the draft commodity standard

- [95] The TPCS evaluated the collated data from the submissions and reviewed the draft CS, both in plenary sessions and by working in groups and then reporting back to the whole panel. As part of this, they evaluated the PDF submission and incorporated the information into the collated spreadsheet.

¹⁸ 2023-024; 05_TPCS_2025_Dec; 06_TPCS_2025_Dec; 21_TPCS_2025_Dec.

¹⁹ CRP_01_TPCS_2025_Dec

- [96] **Pests associated with fresh *M. domestica* fruit.** The TPCS considered whether to refer to the fruit as a pathway but decided against this for the same reasons explained in agenda item 4.2 for the draft CS for *Musa* spp.
- [97] The secretariat noted that the footnotes to the table of pests would need updating for consistency with decisions taken by the TPCS since CS 1. The secretariat confirmed that the IPPC scientific copy-editor would check the draft CS against the editorial style for draft CSs²⁰ and amend the draft standard accordingly in liaison with the steward.
- [98] **Options for phytosanitary measures.** Given the time constraints, the TPCS agreed to focus on the tables of pests and measures rather than the body text, as there were no substantial concerns about the body text and it could be reviewed after the meeting if needed.
- [99] **Pests.** As agreed previously, the TPCS used the most recent accepted scientific name where more than one name had been submitted for the same organism. They applied the draft criteria for exclusion of pests (see agenda item 7.1) and deleted pest entries that were for a family or a genus rather than a species, pests for which no phytosanitary measure had been submitted, and pests for which the evidence submitted did not support the pest–commodity association. They identified some species for which they needed to check the pest–commodity association or request further detail about the corresponding measure from the submitter.
- [100] **Synonyms.** Where different sources for species names contradicted each other, so it was not clear whether two species names were synonyms, the TPCS agreed to follow a precautionary approach and retain both names for the time being. The TPCS noted that caution was particularly important in cases where the two named pests had different measures.
- [101] **Species authorities.** The steward populated the master spreadsheet for the draft CS with species authorities, where these were missing.
- [102] **Low-mobility pests.** For consistency, the TPCS agreed to take the same approach as they had agreed when discussing the draft CS for *Musa* spp. (2023-028) (see agenda item 4.2). The TPCS noted that a reference by COSAVE on low probability of transfer could be cited as a reference in the footnote to the table of pests.
- [103] **General measures.** In the table on general measures, the TPCS agreed not to list individual diagnostic protocols under the entry for ISPM 27 (*Diagnostic protocols for regulated pests*) for consistency with the entry for ISPM 28 (*Phytosanitary treatments for regulated pests*).
- [104] **Phytosanitary import requirements.** The TPCS identified some measures for which they needed to clarify with the submitter whether the measure had been set as a phytosanitary import requirement (e.g. if the measure was listed in a PRA but could simply be a PRA recommendation).
- [105] **Integrated fruit production.** The TPCS considered whether “integrated fruit production” could be considered a form of integrated pest management and whether it was a phytosanitary measure. They agreed that, for it to be included in the draft CS, the measure would need to be a phytosanitary measure and have been set as a phytosanitary import requirement. A TPCS member from one of the relevant submitting countries agreed to clarify with the submitter. The TPCS agreed to delete “PFA” as a measure for fruit flies if it had not been submitted as a measure for that particular species (rather than for the family Tephritidae, which had been removed). For entries indicating “country freedom (pest absence)”, the TPCS member from the submitting country confirmed that these could be changed to “PFA”.
- [106] **Combined treatments.** The TPCS agreed to present the combinations of methyl bromide fumigation and cold treatments as a separate table, as the sequencing of the components is critical.

²⁰ 07_TPCS_2025_Dec.

- [107] **Laboratory analysis.** The TPCS agreed to seek clarification from the SC about the terminology to use for laboratory analysis if submitted as a measure, and whether this should differ depending on the pest group (e.g. include it in “export inspection” for insects as in CS 1, as it would be a consequence of export inspection, but use “testing” for pathogens). The TPCS noted that laboratory analysis using a microscope is “inspection” according to ISPM 5 and that, depending on the import requirements, it is not necessarily a consequence of export inspection. The TPCS noted that in the draft CS for *Citrus* spp., laboratory analysis had been deleted for insects but for *Phytophthora* species the TPCS had treated it as testing with the following footnote: “Samples taken during inspection are sent to an official laboratory for analysis and identification to species. If the pest is detected, a remedial action is applied to the affected consignment or the consignment is rejected for export.”
- [108] **Inspection during storage.** The TPCS considered whether, when commodities are held in cold storage for up to a year before export (in this case, a measure for the fungus *Botryotinia fuckeliana*), inspection that takes place before the end of that period could be considered as export inspection. They agreed to clarify with the submitter.
- [109] **References.** The steward confirmed that she would try to find references for each treatment, but the submitting countries would not be listed.
- [110] **Phytosanitary treatments that are adopted by the CPM but have not been submitted by a contracting party.** The TPCS agreed to include Phytosanitary Treatment (PT) No. 10 (Irradiation treatment for *Grapholita molesta*) and PT 11 (Irradiation treatment for *Grapholita molesta* under hypoxia) even though they had not been submitted by a contracting party, as they were adopted ISPMs of relevance to the pests in Table 1. The TPCS recalled that there was precedence for this in a previous draft CS.²¹

Update on global workshop on systems approaches

- [111] To inform the TPCS’s discussion about how to address systems approaches in draft CSs, the TPCS asked whether the secretariat could provide an update on the *IPPC global workshop on systems approaches* that had been held in Santiago, Chile, 1–4 December 2025. The SSU lead gave an overview of the outcomes of the workshop. The workshop participants had made several recommendations, including that the CPM be requested to ask the SC to consider the need for a revision of ISPM 14. The SSU lead explained that the intention was to focus on definitions rather than revising the whole ISPM. He clarified that the next step would be for the secretariat, through the CPM Bureau, to draft a paper to the CPM, based on the outcomes of the workshop.
- [112] The chairperson explained the difficulties faced by the TPCS in considering the submissions of systems approaches for inclusion in draft CSs. These difficulties included a lack of detail, component options that were not measures aimed at managing pest risk, and systems approaches that did not appear to include two independent measures. There were also questions such as whether integrated pest management is considered a systems approach, or can be a part of a systems approach, or is separate to a systems approach. The SSU lead advised that, if a measure is a phytosanitary measure then it could be considered for inclusion in a draft CS.
- [113] The TPCS recognized that the measures to be considered for inclusion in drafting CSs need to be measures that managed pest risk and yet some of the options listed in ISPM 14 (e.g. producer registration) do not do that and are not a phytosanitary measure. They noted that ISPM 14 does not distinguish between what is a phytosanitary measure and what is not; however, a revision of ISPM 14, extending beyond simply ink amendments, could help clarify this. The TPCS also noted that there is a need for clarity over the difference between a systems approach and a workplan agreed bilaterally with exporting countries. One TPCS member recommended that ISPM 14 be revised to focus on the governance of systems approaches and hence the responsibilities of NPPOs rather than the responsibilities of industry. The TPCS noted that revision of ISPM 14 could take up to seven years,

²¹ TPCS 2025-02, agenda item 4.1.

whereas ink amendments to clarify definitions would be quicker and would not preclude a subsequent revision.

- [114] The SSU lead informed the TPCS that the Republic of Korea had provided funding that could potentially contribute to a global workshop on CSs in 2027. This was welcomed by the TPCS. One of the TPCS members from New Zealand informed the TPCS that the APPPC had agreed to hold a regional workshop on CSs in the Philippines in 2026.

Approach to systems approaches in commodity standards

- [115] The TPCS took account of the outcome of the global workshop when considering how to approach systems approaches in draft CSs. They noted that, depending on the panel's approach, it could result in an excessive number of systems approaches in a single CS, which would not be a useful way to present the information to NPPOs using the standard.
- [116] The TPCS noted that one potential approach, if ISPM 14 were to be revised, would be to include an annex to ISPM 14 providing potential options for inclusion in systems approaches related to different pest groups. In CSs, systems approaches could then be listed simply as "systems approach" and the corresponding reference would be ISPM 14. However, this could result in very little information about options for phytosanitary measures in those CSs where most of the options were systems approaches (e.g. the draft CS for *Citrus* spp. (2023-019)). Just indicating "systems approach" would also not be very helpful to NPPOs.
- [117] The TPCS considered several options for presenting systems approaches in draft CSs and agreed to recommend the following approach to the SC. They agreed that this should be applied to the three draft CSs that had not yet been submitted to first consultation (i.e. draft CSs for *Citrus* spp. (2023-019), seeds of *Phaseolus vulgaris* (2023-027) and apple (2023-024)), but not to the draft CSs that had been through first consultation (i.e. draft CSs for *Musa* spp. (2023-028) and taro (2023-023)).
- [118] **Recommended approach.** The TPCS recommended that the information on systems approaches in draft CSs should be arranged into two tables:
- a table of numbered systems approaches (SA 1, SA 2, etc.), listing those systems approaches for which sufficient detail was available and that included at least two independent measures, together with the corresponding references; and
 - a summary table of independent measures that submitters had listed as being components of a systems approach, together with an associated explanation in the body text.
- [119] In this approach, the numbered systems approaches would be included in the table of pest-specific options for phytosanitary measures, but the independent component measures in the summary table would not.
- [120] The TPCS agreed that, for draft CSs including only a few systems approaches, the summary table may be omitted if it simply repeated the information in the table of numbered systems approaches. However, the standard text should still be included in the body text.
- [121] The secretariat highlighted that, to comply with the underlying principles in ISPM 46, the standard text associated with the body text should not include any new obligations for contracting parties (i.e. no instances of "should" unless they refer to a requirement that is already in an adopted ISPM).
- [122] The TPCS:
- (15) *agreed* to continue work on the draft CS on International movement of fresh *Malus domestica* for consumption (2023-024) after the meeting as follows:
 - relevant TPCS members and the secretariat would seek clarification from submitters on those pests and measures submitted for which there was uncertainty,

- Tiago Rodrigo LOHMANN (Brazil) would provide the COSAVE reference on low probability of transfer to cite in the footnote to the table of pests in relation to low-mobility pests,
 - the steward would add references to the measures in the tables, insert the missing species authorities, incorporate the clarifications provided by submitters and the COSAVE reference, and apply the approach agreed by the TPCS for systems approaches, and
 - the TPCS would review the revised draft via an e-forum followed by a virtual meeting, with a view to recommending the draft CS to the SC for approval for first consultation in July 2026;
- (16) *invited* the SC to advise on the terminology to use when “laboratory analysis” has been submitted as a phytosanitary measure for inclusion in a draft CS, and whether this should differ depending on the pest group (e.g. including it within “export inspection” for insects, as it would be a consequence of export inspection (the approach taken in CS 1), but use “testing” for pathogens); and
- (17) *agreed* to prepare a document, outlining the challenges of incorporating systems approaches into CSs and the panel’s recommended solution, for inclusion in the TPCS update paper to the SC meeting in May 2026, and *requested* that the secretariat share the document with the TPCS for comment via an e-forum before including it in the TPCS update.

7. TPCS work programme

7.1 Criteria for excluding pests and measures

[123] The TPCS noted the invitation from the SC to provide a draft list of criteria for exclusion of pests and measures in CSs, for consideration by the SC in May 2026 (see agenda item 4.1). The secretariat confirmed that the SC had specifically requested a list of criteria rather than reasons and that the SC had requested criteria for both pests and measures, not just pests.

Criteria for excluding pests

[124] The TPCS reviewed the list of potential reasons for excluding a pest, which they had revised in June 2025,²² together with some editorial improvements suggested by the secretariat.²³ The TPCS amended the list to improve clarity and made some further amendments on technical grounds.

[125] **Pest association with the host or commodity.** The TPCS recognized that the pest–commodity association (the association with the plant part being traded) is more critical than the pest–host association (the association with the whole plant), but a criterion was needed for each of these.

[126] **Transfer of the pest to the host.** The TPCS agreed that, when considering whether the pest can transfer to the host, they may need to consider evidence other than that provided by the submitter, as the latter may relate only to the pathway in the submitting country and the situation may be different in another country. The TPCS also agreed that the criterion related only to pests where transfer *cannot* occur (e.g. viruses that are seed-borne but not seed-transmitted), not where there is a *low probability* of transfer.

[127] **Pest regulation.** Up until this meeting, the TPCS had used the list of potential reasons for exclusion of a pest as a supplement to the criteria in ISPM 46. However, for completeness, the TPCS added an extra criterion to exclude pests that do not meet the requirement of ISPM 46 to be regulated by at least one contracting party or for which there is uncertainty or a lack of confirmation about this.

[128] **Lack of a corresponding phytosanitary measure.** The TPCS agreed to distinguish between cases where no phytosanitary measure had been provided by the submitter and cases where a phytosanitary

²² TPCS 2025-06, agenda item 6.2.

²³ 08_TPCS_2025_Dec.

measure had been submitted but the TPCS had excluded it because it lacked a specification (i.e. it lacked the necessary detail) and was the only measure submitted for that pest.

- [129] **Possible additional criterion in the future.** During review of the draft CS for *Musa* spp. (agenda item 4.2), the TPCS acknowledged that a situation could arise where a PRA submitted by a contracting party supports an association with the host and with the commodity but subsequent scientific evidence contradicts this. The TPCS agreed not to add an extra criterion to cover this for the time being, but to review this if the situation arose in future.

Criteria for excluding measures

- [130] The TPCS drafted a list of three criteria. These covered cases where the phytosanitary measure submitted lacks a specification (e.g. a system approach without any detail of the component measures, or a treatment without a treatment schedule), the measure does not target the pest that is the subject of the standard, or there is uncertainty about whether the measure has been set as a phytosanitary import requirement by at least one contracting party.

Use of the criteria and verification of information

- [131] To manage the workflow, given the capacity of the panel, one TPCS member suggested that a phased approach be taken to checking submitted pests and measures against the criteria for exclusion, rather than checking the submissions against all the criteria at the initial drafting stage. The member suggested that: at the initial drafting stage, the TPCS consider only those criteria relating to species identity and whether a measure has been submitted with sufficient detail; then, after the first consultation, if a consultation comment queries the inclusion of a pest or measure (e.g. on grounds of pest–host association), then the relevant criteria are checked and, if necessary, information is verified with the submitter. The TPCS noted that, in this approach, the second phase would happen in the period when the draft CS is under the remit of the SC or the SC Working Group (SC-7) rather than the TPCS, but the assistant stewards, who were TPCS members, could assist the steward in checking against criteria and verifying information.
- [132] The TPCS noted that, if they have queries, their practice is already to go back to the submitter. Rather than applying a phased approach, they therefore included a general statement at the start of the criteria for excluding pests and measures. This statement explained that the evidence provided by submitters would generally be accepted as correct and that verification would only occur if there was reason to suspect inaccuracies or inconsistencies.

Discussions on potential database

- [133] The TPCS agreed that, rather than developing a database, it would be more practical to maintain a master spreadsheet for each draft CS, including the collated information from the submitters and, for excluded entries, the reason for exclusion.

Application of the criteria

- [134] The TPCS applied the draft exclusion criteria when drafting the CS for apple (2023-024) and when providing advice to the stewards of the other draft CSs considered at this meeting. When excluding pests from the draft CS for apple, the TPCS recorded the reason for exclusion (i.e. the applicable criterion) in the master spreadsheet for the standard. For completeness, “withdrawn by submitter” was also added to the spreadsheet as a reason for exclusion.
- [135] The TPCS:
- (18) *recommended* the draft criteria for exclusion of pests and measures, as modified at this meeting, to the SC for approval for inclusion in the TPCS working procedures;
 - (19) *recognized* that the TPCS would need to keep the criteria for exclusion of pests and measures, once approved by the SC, under review in case further changes are needed in future; and

- (20) *agreed* that, rather than developing a database, they would maintain a spreadsheet for each CS, including the reasons for excluding specific pests or measures, and those reasons would be available on request.

7.2 Review of the “information materials spreadsheet”

[136] The TPCS noted the improvements to the spreadsheet made by the steward since the June 2025 meeting and the addition of the criteria for exclusion of pests.

[137] The TPCS deferred further discussion on this agenda item, noting that there had not yet been any proposals for new TPCS subjects submitted through the ongoing call for topics.

[138] The TPCS:

- (21) *agreed* to include the template submission form in the TPCS update to the SC meeting in May 2026, for noting.

7.3 Commodity standards side-session at CPM-20 (2026)

[139] The TPCS did not consider this agenda item. However, they did make one suggestion regarding the side session under agenda item 4.3.

7.4 Brainstorming session/SWOT analysis of the TPCS

[140] This agenda item was deferred.

7.5 TPCS workplan

[141] The secretariat shared the TPCS workplan for 2026 in agenda item 4.2 and referred to the dates of meetings in agenda item 11.

8. Any other business

References for pests

[142] The secretariat shared a paper summarizing the use of references for pests in CSs.²⁴ This noted that the default practice was to not include references for pests,²⁵ but two of the current draft CSs (*Musa* spp. (2023-2028) and *Citrus* spp. (2023-019)) had a Further reading section. The Further reading section had been included in the initial draft CS for *Musa* spp. (2023-2028) because the only references cited were ISPMs.²⁶ However, since then, several citations had been added to the draft standard. In the draft SC for *Citrus* spp., the steward had moved the references not cited in the text into a Further reading section, as required by FAO style, but the TPCS had not yet had chance to discuss this. The other three drafts, together with the one adopted CS (CS 1), did not have a Further reading section. There was therefore inconsistency between CSs.

[143] The TPCS considered the advantage and disadvantages of including a Further reading section in draft CSs. They noted that, in the draft CS for *Musa* spp. (2023-2028), the Further reading section consisted of sources provided by submitters in support of a pest–commodity association, with regulations listed in the References section (because they were cited). The Further reading section in the draft CS for *Citrus* spp. (2023-019), however, included PRAs. The TPCS did not consider it appropriate to list PRAs, as they did not have the same status as regulations and did, in time, become out of date.

²⁴ CRP_03_TPCS_2025_Dec.

²⁵ TPCS 2023-01, agenda item 5.2 (paragraph 108); SC 2023-11, agenda item 5 (para. 45); TPCS 2023-12, agenda item 5.1 (para. 18–23); SC-7 2024-05, agenda item 4.1 (para. 13–14); SC 2024-11, agenda item 4.1 (para. 26).

²⁶ SC 2025-05, agenda item 5.1, steward’s notes 04_SC_2025_May.

- [144] The TPCS considered whether there was an alternative means of making the supporting evidence available but noted that only references that were in the public domain, or for which the submitter had granted consent, could be made publicly available.
- [145] The secretariat reported that the TPDP had discussed the possibility of including a Further reading section in diagnostic protocols at their face-to-face meeting in 2025, but the final outcome had yet to be agreed.
- [146] The TPCS noted that the sources provided by submitters in support of pest–commodity associations would be on the spreadsheet for each draft CS and were available on request. For simplicity, the TPCS therefore agreed not to include a Further reading section in draft CSs.
- [147] The TPCS:
- (22) *recommended* to the SC that, for consistency between CSs, a Further reading section should not be included; and
 - (23) *agreed* to apply this approach to the current draft CSs that had not yet been submitted to consultation (International movement of *Citrus* spp. fruit (2023-019), International movement of seeds of *Phaseolus vulgaris* (2023-027) and International movement of fresh *Malus domestica* fruit for consumption (2023-024)); and
 - (24) *advised* the stewards of the draft CSs that had already been submitted to first consultation (International movement of fresh *Musa* spp. fruit (2023-028) and International movement of fresh *Colocasia esculenta* corms (2023-023)) to consider the TPCS’s recommended approach.

9. Evaluation of the meeting

- [148] The secretariat encouraged TPCS members to provide feedback on the meeting via the survey link that had been provided in the agenda for this meeting. The secretariat confirmed that they would also email the link to members.

10. Recommendations to the Standards Committee or IPPC Secretariat

- [149] Recommendations to the SC or the secretariat are described in previous sections of this report. To facilitate reference, they are also compiled below.
- [150] The TPCS invited the SC to:
- advise on the terminology to use when “laboratory analysis” has been submitted as a phytosanitary measure for inclusion in a draft CS (see agenda item 6.2).
- [151] The TPCS recommended to the SC:
- the draft criteria for exclusion of pests and measures for approval for inclusion in the TPCS working procedures (see agenda item 7.1); and
 - that a Further reading section should not be included in draft CSs (see agenda item 8).
- [152] The TPCS agreed to prepare a document for the SC for inclusion in the TPCS update to the May 2025 SC meeting:
- outlining the challenges of incorporating systems approaches into CSs and the panel’s recommended solution (see agenda item 6.2).
- [153] The TPCS requested that the secretariat:
- share the list of draft criteria for excluding pests and measures (agenda item 7.1) with all the stewards for CSs (see agenda item 4.3); and
 - share the draft document on systems approaches with the TPCS for comment via an e-forum before including it in the TPCS update for the May 2026 SC meeting (see agenda item 6.2).

11. Next TPCS meetings

- [154] The TPCS agreed to meet in virtual mode on 22 and 27 January 2026 (time to be confirmed). In these meetings, the TPCS will review the revised draft CSs for *Citrus* spp., seeds of *Phaseolus vulgaris* and apple, and formulate a recommendation to the SC on how to address pest absence in draft CSs.
- [155] The next face-to-face meeting of the TPCS is tentatively scheduled to be held in Milan, Italy in 2026, with the dates and venue to be confirmed. Among other issues, the TPCS will draft the CS for *Vitis vinifera*, consider the remaining items deferred from this meeting (the panel's approach to liaison with other technical panels, review of the "information materials spreadsheet", and brainstorming session/SWOT analysis of the TPCS), and consider the annotated template for draft CSs.
- [156] The TPCS agreed to review the revised drafts of the CSs for *Citrus* spp., seeds of *Phaseolus vulgaris* and apple via e-fora. The secretariat advised that the e-decisions would be scheduled for:
- 14–21 January 2026 for *Citrus* spp. and seeds of *Phaseolus vulgaris* (draft standards to be submitted to secretariat by 14 January); and
 - 21–28 January for apple.

12. Close of the meeting

- [157] 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	Updates from the November Standards Committee meeting - from IPPC Secretariat and TPCS Steward 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	15_TPCS_2025_Dec 18_TPCS_2025_Dec 19_TPCS_2025_Dec	WILSON/ MARTINO
4.2	Updates on draft annexes to ISPM 46 after first consultation in July 2025 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 Musa 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 Musa spp. fruit to ISPM 46 TPG recommendations	2023-023 11_TPCS_2025_Dec 2023-028_REV 12_TPCS_2025_Dec_REV 14_TPCS_2025_Dec_REV 17_TPCS_2025_Dec 16_TPCS_2025_Dec	PETERSON/ ALL DA SILVA/ ALL

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
	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	Review of the TPCS Specification and IPPC Technical Panels working procedures: 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.	<i>Reference documents:</i> <i>IPPC Style Guide and annotated templates (particularly Part 1, sections 2, 3 and 5)</i> <i>FAO Style Guide</i> <i>ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms)</i>	Link to the IPPC Style Guide Link to FAOSTYLE Link to ISPM 5	ROUEN
	<i>Editorial style for commodity standards</i>	07_TPCS_2025_Dec	
	<i>Guidelines for a consistent ISPM terminology (Section 3.3.2 of the IPPC Procedure Manual for Standard Setting)</i> <i>Annotated template for draft ISPMs</i>	Link to the IPPC Procedure Manual for Standard Setting (2023-2024) Link to the Annotated template for draft ISPMs	
6.2	Development of the text of the draft International movement of <i>Malus domestica</i> fruit for consumption, priority 2 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

Agenda Item		Document No.	Presenter
7.	TPCS work programme		
7.1	Potential reasons for “excluding a pest and a measure” 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) 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 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: 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

Appendix 2: Documents List

DOCUMENT NO.	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE	POSTED
01_TPCS_2025_Dec	2.3	Provisional agenda (v6)	2025-12-04
02_TPCS_2025_Dec	3.1	Document list	2025-12-04
03_TPCS_2025_Dec	3.2	Participants list	2025-12-04
04_TPCS_2025_Dec	3.3	Local information	2025-11-12
15_TPCS_2025_Dec	4.1	Updates from the SC November meeting	2025-11-28
2023-024	4.2	Draft standard - International movement of <i>Malus domestica</i> fruit for consumption	2025-11-12
05_TPCS_2025_Dec	4.2	<i>Malus domestica</i> information material submissions – Steward master file	2025-11-12
06_TPCS_2025_Dec	4.2	<i>Malus domestica</i> information material-Iraq submission	2025-11-12
07_TPCS_2025_Dec	6.1	Editorial style for commodity standards	2025-11-12
08_TPCS_2025_Dec	7.1	Amendments to the list of potential reasons for excluding a pest	2025-11-12
09_TPCS_2025_Dec	7.3	Concept note for CPM side session on commodity standards	2025-11-12
10_TPCS_2025_Dec	7.4	SWOT analysis – background document	2025-11-12
11_TPCS_2025_Dec	4.2	TPG recommendations for draft annex International movement of fresh <i>Colocasia esculenta</i> corms (2023-023) to ISPM 46	2025-11-12
12_TPCS_2025_Dec	4.2	Compiled comments for draft annex International movement of fresh Musa spp. fruit to ISPM 46 (2023-028) – Steward's Response	2025-11-12
2023-028_REV	4.2	Draft annex to ISPM 46: International movement of fresh Musa spp. fruit (2023-028)	2025-11-18

2023-019	4.3	Draft annex to ISPM 46: International movement of Citrus fruit (2023-019)	2025-11-18
13_TPCS_2025_Dec	4.3	Steward notes - International movement of Citrus fruit (2023-019)	2025-11-18
14_TPCS_2025_Dec	4.2	Issues raised from the first consultation - International movement of fresh <i>Musa</i> spp. fruit (2023-028)	2025-11-18
16_TPCS_2025_Dec	4.2	TPG recommendations for draft annex International movement of fresh <i>Musa</i> spp. fruit (2023-028) to ISPM 46	2025-11-28
17_TPCS_2025_Dec	4.2	Comunidad Andina paper: First consultation: 2023-028 - Draft annex international movement of fresh <i>Musa</i> spp. fruit to ISPM 46	2025-11-28
18_TPCS_2025_Dec	4.1	COSAVE paper: COSAVE proposal to review the criteria for the inclusion of pests in the draft annexes to ISPM 46	2025-11-28
19_TPCS_2025_Dec	4.1	APPPC paper: APPPC Considerations and Recommendations on Commodity Standards	2025-11-28
20_TPCS_2025_Dec	7.2	Information material spreadsheet	2025-11-28
2023-023	4.2	International movement of fresh taro (<i>Colocasia esculenta</i>) corm for consumption, priority 1	2025-12-02
21_TPCS_2025_Dec	6.2	Steward's notes - International movement of fresh <i>Malus domestica</i> fruit (2023-024)	2025-12-05

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	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 Tel.: +82 54 912 0628	dongam75@korea.kr	April 2022	April 2027
Member	Ms Lihong ZHU Portfolio Manager IPPC New Zealand Ministry for Primary Industries (NPPO)	Lihong.zhu@mpi.govt.nz	April 2022	April 2027

	Charles Fergusson Building, 34-38 Bowen Street, PO Box 2526, Wellington 6140 NEW ZEALAND Tel.: +64 4 894 0261			
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
Member	Mr Moshe VAKNIN Pest Risk Analyst Plant Protection and Inspection Services, Israel P.O. Box 78, Bet Dagan 50250 ISRAEL Tel.: +972 3 9681500	MosheV@moag.gov.il	April 2022	April 2027

Members who did not attend

Participant role	Name, mailing address, telephone	Email address	Term begins	Term ends
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

Other stewardship (SC members) – Online participants

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 fresh taro (<i>Colocasia esculenta</i>) corm for consumption (2023-023)”	Sophie PETERSON Director, Pacific Engagement and International Plant Health Australian Chief Plant Protection Office Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment AUSTRALIA Tel: +61 2 6272 3769 Mob: +61 466 867 519	sophie.peterson@aff.gov.au ; sophie.peterson@agriculture.gov.au
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 Standard Setting Unit Lead	Mr Avetik NERSISYAN Standards Senior Officer / Standard Setting Unit Lead IPPC Secretariat / FAO Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00153 Rome, Italy	Avetik.Nersisyan@fao.org
✓	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

✓	IPPC Secretariat Support to TPCS	Marina Elena Martino Phytosanitary Standard Setting Specialist Standard Setting Unit IPPC Secretariat / FAO	Marina.Martino@fao.org
✓	IPPC Secretariat Support to TPCS	Emmanuel Krah Phytosanitary Standard Setting Support Specialist Standard Setting Unit IPPC Secretariat / FAO	Emmanuel.Krah@fao.org