



Food and Agriculture
Organization of the
United Nations



International
Plant Protection
Convention

REPORT

Technical Panel on Commodity Standards (TPCS)

**Virtual Meeting
1 December 2022**

IPPC Secretariat

Required citation:

IPPC Secretariat. 2022. *Report of the meeting of the Technical Panel on Commodity Standards (TPCS), 1 December 2022*. Rome. Published by FAO on behalf of the Secretariat of the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC).

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, 2022



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 <http://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 (<http://www.fao.org/publications>) and can be purchased through publications-sales@fao.org. Requests for commercial use should be submitted via: 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 the Chairperson 4
 - 2.2 Selection of the Rapporteur..... 4
 - 2.3 Adoption of the agenda 4
- 3. Administrative matters 4
- 4. TPCS work programme – preparation for the January 2023 meeting 4
 - 4.1. Overview of the approved Specification 73: Annex International movement of mango (*Mangifera indica*) fruit to ISPM 46 (2021-011)..... 4
 - 4.2 Review of the information material received from the call..... 6
- 5. Any Other Business..... 8
- 6. Close of the Meeting..... 8
- Appendix 1: Agenda..... 9
- Appendix 2: Participants list 10

1. Opening of the Meeting

1.1 Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat

- [1] The Standard Setting Officer, Adriana MOREIRA, from the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) Secretariat (hereafter referred to as “the secretariat”), welcomed the participants to the first virtual meeting of the Technical Panel on Commodity Standards (TPCS).
- [2] The secretariat reminded the participants on the main tasks of this meeting: to look over the Specification 73 recently approved by the Standards Committee at the 2022 November meeting and to review the information received from the TPCS members.
- [3] The participants introduced themselves as some TPCS members were not present at the previous meeting.

2. Meeting arrangements

2.1 Selection of the Chairperson

- [4] The TPCS selected Lihong ZHU (New Zealand) as chairperson of the meeting.

2.2 Selection of the Rapporteur

- [5] The TPCS selected Martin DAMUS (Canada) as rapporteur.

2.3 Adoption of the agenda

- [6] The chairperson asked the secretariat to include the agenda of the face-to-face meeting in Japan under any other business (AOB) for the TPCS discussion, as some members could not be present.
- [7] The TPCS agreed with the inclusion and adopted the agenda (Appendix 1).

3. Administrative matters

- [8] The secretariat introduced the participants list (Appendix 2) and invited the participants to notify the Secretariat if any changes were needed to the information, as it is reflected in the TPCS membership list on the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP – www.ippc.int). The secretariat noted that Samuel BISHOP was not available to attend the meeting.

4. TPCS work programme – preparation for the January 2023 meeting

4.1. Overview of the approved Specification 73: Annex International movement of mango (*Mangifera indica*) fruit to ISPM 46 (2021-011)

- [9] The TPCS assistant steward, Joanne WILSON, presented the document¹. She confirmed the information given by the secretariat on the approval of the Specification 73 by the SC and detailed the tasks for the TPCS, which are:
1. Clearly describe the commodity and its intended use;
 2. Identify and provide a list of pests or pest groups that are known to be associated with the international movement of fresh mango fruit.
 3. Identify options for effective phytosanitary measures, including effective combinations of phytosanitary measures, against the pests or pest groups.
 4. Evaluate potential options for phytosanitary measures for inclusion in the annex and consider whether there is sufficient information on their effectiveness to support their inclusion.

¹ 02_TPCS_Tel_2022_Dec

5. Consider how to categorize the options for phytosanitary measures according to confidence in the effectiveness of measures and the intended use of the commodity.
6. Consider and list available methods that may be used for the detection of pests or pest groups that are known to be associated with the international movement of fresh mango fruit.
7. Consider existing standards, guidelines, pest risk analyses and related information, developed under the auspices of the IPPC Secretariat or by regional plant protection organizations or NPPOs, for managing the pest risk associated with the international movement of fresh mango fruit.
8. Liaise with the other technical panels (Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols, Technical Panel for the Glossary, Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments) and with the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee.
9. Consider implementation of the annex by contracting parties and identify potential operational and technical implementation issues. Provide information and possible recommendations on these issues to the Standards Committee.

[10] Regarding task 5, the chairperson asked about the categorizing options for phytosanitary measures and the evaluation that will be done by the TPCS on the confidence and effectiveness of the measures. The secretariat explained that this comment was made at the CPM-16 (2022) and that the TPCS is expected to agree on the process of selecting the phytosanitary measures, which involves the categorization of and criteria for inclusion of these measures. The TPCS is also invited to think more broadly on what criteria to use, such as the phytosanitary measures commonly applied, most used in trade, etc., and not only for mango, as these criteria will likely be used for future commodity standards as well. The secretariat completed saying that the ISPM 46 already set some criteria, and this is a huge task for the TPCS to deal with.

[11] The chairperson also asked about the implementation issues stated in task 9. She questioned whether the TPCS will provide information to the Implementation Committee (IC) or to the SC. The secretariat clarified that this is a standard task for technical panels or working groups that develop an ISPM. In the case of the first commodity standard to be drafted, the TPCS is expected to list potential issues a country may face in the implementation of the mango standard. The recommendations will be submitted to the SC, which oversees the TPCS debates, clarifies and transmits the recommendations to the IC.

[12] The TPCS assistant steward added that tasks 4 and 5 should be performed together and that for this, the TPCS should think differently to the Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments (TPPT) as it might include different concepts and ideas than are usually addressed. The chairperson suggested that the TPCS might foresee challenges in this regard and reminded that the NPPO of Japan provided an intervention at the CPM-16 regarding details of criteria the TPCS would need to consider; the TPCS could use it as a reference document along with ISPM 46 and the criteria listed therein. She re-iterated that the TPCS should think differently from the TPPT about those measures that have been used historically, bilaterally, multilaterally, and how they could be justified, including these measures in the first and future standards. The TPCS agreed that it will be a controversial and challenging task.

[13] The secretariat reminded the TPCS members that they are encouraged to draft discussion papers and to bring them to the next meeting to have a starting point. The TPCS agreed to have the discussion papers as an action point arising from this meeting.

[14] Regarding the reference material, the chairperson asked to include the APPPC proposal to develop mango standards in the references list of the specification and raised the attention of the participants to make sure that information will not be missed. The secretariat encouraged the participants to send reference material to the secretariat, which will be included in the documents list of the next TPCS meeting in Japan. The TPCS asked the secretariat to make these references received, including the regional APPPC standard, available by the next TPCS meeting in Japan.

- [15] No further questions were queried on the specification.

4.2 Review of the information material received from the call

- [16] **Australia.** The paper presented by Douglas KERRUISH.² The paper's content is a collation of Australian Department of Agriculture information, some of which appears in the import conditions for a number of countries exporting mangoes to Australia. It links risk analyses to the import conditions listed on the Australian website. The paper also listed the main treatments associated with a phytosanitary measure for the highest-risk pest group (fruit flies). Also, it lists the within-Australia certification agreements for trade amongst states. None of the participants asked questions.
- [17] **Brazil.** Tiago LOHMANN introduced the paper.³ The document lists Brazil's mango exportation and the phytosanitary requirements Brazil must comply with. It has also pest information, declarations required, etc. No questions were raised by the participants.
- [18] **China.** The paper was presented by Shuangyan SUN.⁴ It lists China imports and all pests in protocols signed between China and exporting countries with respect to mango. According to the document, China imports 84000 pounds of mango and intercepts many pests; these are also listed in the document. One TPCS member asked whether all pests listed are regulated on mango fruits and suggested to Ms SUN to bring the phytosanitary measures that are applied by China for these regulated pests to the next meeting, noting that the paper mentions some phytosanitary measures, e.g., for *Ceratitis capitata*. Ms SUN responded that the measures that China has taken against pests are listed in the document. The TPCS assistant steward asked about the value of having interception data and mentioned that the NPPO of New Zealand could provide some (without source country information). The chairperson queried whether the TPCS should include those pests for which China has no listed measures. Ms SUN explained that all listed pests may affect mango, but for the ones that China considered the risk very low, no specific phytosanitary measures need to be taken unless mentioned in the list. The chairperson clarified that not all pests are regulated and questioned whether all pests associated with the commodity should be included or just the regulated ones. She completed by saying that the TPCS should be clear about this in order to not be challenged on the regulatory status of a certain pest. In response, one TPCS member commented that the panel should recall that in the criteria listed in ISPM 46 for inclusion of a pest, it should be regulated by at least one contracting party in order to be listed in the standard. One TPCS member asked whether there would be a limit for interception records to be included in the list to be brought to the next meeting. The TPCS assistant steward responded that five years old could be the limit and that it would be useful to check whether live pests were found on treated fruit, which could be an indication of failure of the treatment. Also, any record of parallel treatment success, that is, of fruit treated for one pest that also kills another, would also be useful. The TPCS agreed to bring interception data from their countries to the next TPCS meeting in Japan. There is no need to identify the country from which the mango fruits were imported, just the pest intercepted.
- [19] **Japan.** The paper introduced by Hideki TANIGUCHI shows that mangoes are produced in Japan in a limited production region and volume, so Japan is a net importer.⁵ It also presents that among 21 countries that have requested market access to Japan, 11 have received it. The document is the Japanese pest list for mangoes, includes risk analyses for pests 1-9 (fruit flies), concluding that strong measures are required. Those measures are prohibition, pest-free area or heat/cold/fumigation treatments that can achieve complete disinfestation. Japan has chosen vapour heat or hot water immersion treatments proposed by exporting countries. To be noted that pest numbers 17-25 in the material presented have

² 03_TPCS_Tel_2022_Dec

³ 04_TPCS_Tel_2022_Dec

⁴ 05_TPCS_Tel_2022_Dec

⁵ 06_TPCS_Tel_2022_Dec

been intercepted during import inspection. The chairperson commented that it is good to have such broad coverage of information from importing and exporting countries.

[20] **Argentina.** Adriana CERIANI presented the paper.⁶ The document contains the harmonized phytosanitary requirements from MERCOSUR countries (Argentina, Brazil, Paraguay and Uruguay). It includes phytosanitary requirements from country of origin and country of destination for all pairs of countries. The paper also lists all the additional declarations that must be met by exporting MERCOSUR countries and includes mango plants and mango fruits. The chairperson questioned the categories and whether that is related to the risk of the pest. Ms CERIANI responded that the categories follow the pest risk according to the commodity, as established by ISPM 32. The chairperson replied that to draft the mango standard, the TPCS would not consider frozen or canned mangoes, so there is no need for multiple categories from ISPM 32 as the standard will be developed for fresh mango fruit. Ms CERIANI complemented saying that this document is only available in Spanish and Portuguese.

[21] **Thailand.** Three papers in abstract format were introduced by Joanne WILSON. First paper about hot water immersion and tests against oriental fruit fly.⁷ The key messages taken from the document were that the treatment did not affect fruit quality. This is important for the considerations on feasibility for the inclusion of phytosanitary measures into the mango standard that is going to be developed. It is also a good abstract to introduce the idea about practicality. The chairperson asked whether it is possible to search for the full paper for the TPCS references. Ms WILSON was not certain about full paper availability. The chairperson completed the idea saying that the group should think about the sort of information to be accepted. For example, a good reference with phytosanitary measures which have already been accepted by at least one NPPO. The secretariat added that the full papers and the information on the use of these treatments in bilateral market access agreements would be requested of the NPPO of Thailand.

[22] The second paper was about a schedule for vapour heat treatment for *Bactrocera dorsalis* and *B. cucurbitae*. The abstract also mentions fruit quality and since it summarises information regarding more than one fly, it may be difficult to separate efficacy of the treatments versus individual fly species based on this paper. The TPCS would need to harmonize phytosanitary measures for the various fly species. The chairperson queried whether the phytosanitary measures suggested by the TPCS should consider fruit quality and how the TPCS intends to deal with that. The assistant steward responded that the TPCS could consider that the phytosanitary treatments selected and recommended are suitable for any variety and that quality of fruit needs to be considered and should be referenced by the standard. One TPCS member commented that much of the research supporting phytosanitary treatments focuses on fruit quality. Based on this, the TPCS could assume that fruit quality is not a problem if the measure is accepted in international trade. Then, the TPCS is expected to address while drafting the fit-for-purpose criteria that the phytosanitary measures selected should not damage the quality of the fruit.

[23] The third abstract presented was similar to the previous one in that it also deals with two fruit flies and proposes the same specifications as previous papers. Ms WILSON reported that these specifications are already accepted by New Zealand and have been operating for some time. Specific varieties are also mentioned in this document. The chairperson questioned whether the TPCS should consider varieties, at least regarding size. The assistant steward commented that to consider varieties would be troublesome, as there are many, and recommended that the TPCS not name varieties. She completed saying that size is taken into consideration in APPPC standards, so that might be appropriate for fruit flies and hot water dip, but perhaps not for vapour heat treatment, for example. The chairperson clarified that the mango standard to be developed should not differentiate varieties but consider size (mass). One member requested Ms WILSON to elaborate on the different criteria for accepting phytosanitary treatments. She responded with reference to section 3 of ISPM 46, e.g., experimental evidence, experience from domestic use. She suggested looking at criteria in regional standards, aiming to make the standard useful

⁶ 07_TPCS_Tel_2022_Dec

⁷ 08_TPCS_Tel_2022_Dec

to every trading country. The TPCS should think broadly how it could justify inclusion of measures. The participants agreed to review ISPM 46 in order to prepare discussion papers and bring them to the next meeting, as this standard sets the groundwork for future similar standards.

[24] The chairperson asked if there were any further paper submissions. The secretariat informed the participants that no other papers were received. The chairperson encouraged the TPCS members to formally prepare information to take to the next meeting in Japan. The deadline for the submissions is 15 December. The secretariat was requested to post the APPPC standard in the TPCS work area on IPP.

5. Any Other Business

[25] The secretariat presented the agenda for the TPCS January meeting to be held in Japan. It was reinforced that the main documents for guidance would be Specification 73 and the ISPM 46. The TPCS members were also encouraged to familiarize themselves with ISPM 5, IPPC style guide and IPPC procedure manual for standard setting (links in the agenda – Appendix 1). Usually, the first two days of the expert working groups drafting sessions are a general discussion of what to include; the last days are the actual drafting. The TPCS could work in a similar manner. One member asked that as the panel does not have information on pests that are not associated with the commodity, if it should have a list of pests that should not be regulated. The assistant steward responded that ISPM 46 had this provision in previous drafts, but it was removed from the standard after consultation and further discussions. The APPPC standard had the same issue and settled on a category for "uncertain association". The "not associated" category was removed after country consultation. The assistant steward queried about criteria for including pests or pest groups and whether the TPCS is required to develop them. The assistant steward clarified that this is not prescribed in ISPM 46, but it is a good point. The secretariat completed that ISPM 46 already lists the basic criteria (it should be regulated at least by one contracting party), but there is no specific task for this. The TPCS is expected to come up with some criteria for inclusion of pests, even if this task is not specifically mentioned in ISPM 46. One member commented that whether the criteria in ISPM 46 is not sufficient, the TPCS might not have agreement on the list of pests. Another member asked about regulated pests by countries not present in the panel. One TPCS member responded that the panel should restrict its efforts to the information provided; the draft standard, while in consultation, will collect this information from other countries. He suggested the TPCS bring only the list of pests that are regulated, to discuss and agree about them, or to come up with more criteria for selection. The suggestion was accepted by the TPCS.

[26] Lastly, the chairperson polled attendees regarding attendance at Japan meeting.

[27] The TPCS:

- (1) *asked* the secretariat to make the regional APPPC standard and other references received available by the next meeting.
- (2) *agreed* to bring interception data from their countries to the next meeting, except for the exporting countries' details;
- (3) *asked* the secretariat to contact the NPPO of Thailand to request the full papers and information on the use of phytosanitary treatments mentioned in them;
- (4) *agreed* to review ISPM 46 in order to prepare discussion papers to be brought to the next meeting;
- (5) *agreed* to bring the list of pests that are regulated by their countries to the next meeting;

6. Close of the Meeting

[28] Prior to closing the meeting, the secretariat informed the TPCS of the next steps. The secretariat and the chairperson thanked the participants for their participation and closed the meeting.

Appendix 1: Agenda

Agenda Item	Document No.	Presenter
1. Opening of the Meeting		
1.1 Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat	--	(MOREIRA) IPPC Secretariat
2. Meeting Arrangements		
2.1 Selection of Chairperson	--	MOREIRA
2.2 Selection of the Rapporteur	--	Chairperson
2.3 Adoption of the Agenda	01_TPCS_Tel_2022_Dec	Chairperson
3. Administrative Matters		
3.1 TPCS membership list	TPCS membership list	MANGILI
3.2 Connections to Zoom and virtual meetings	Short guidelines for participants	
4. TPCS work programme – preparation for the January 2023 meeting		
4.1 Overview of the approved Specification 73: Annex International movement of mango (<i>Mangifera indica</i>) fruit to ISPM 46 (2021-011)	02_TPCS_Tel_2022_Dec	WILSON / BISHOP
4.2 Review of the information material received from the call	03_TPCS_Tel_2022_Dec (Paper from Australia)	KERRUISH
	04_TPCS_Tel_2022_Dec (Paper from Brazil)	LOHMANN
	05_TPCS_Tel_2022_Dec (Paper from China)	SHUANGYAN
	06_TPCS_Tel_2022_Dec (Paper from Japan)	TANIGUCHI
	07_TPCS_Tel_2022_Dec (Paper from COSAVE)	CAMDESSUS
	08_TPCS_Tel_2022_Dec (Paper from Thailand – HWIT)	Stewards/IPPC Secretariat
	09_TPCS_Tel_2022_Dec (Paper from Thailand – VHT 1)	Stewards/IPPC Secretariat
	10_TPCS_Tel_2022_Dec (Paper from Thailand – VHT 2)	Stewards/IPPC Secretariat
5. Any other business	--	Chairperson
6. Closing of the meeting	--	IPPC Secretariat / Chairperson

Appendix 2: Participants list

✓	Participant role	Name, mailing address, telephone	Email address	Term begins	Term ends
	Steward	Mr Samuel BISHOP Plant Health Policy team Room 11G35 Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs National Agri-Food Innovation Campus Sand Hutton York North Yorkshire UNITED KINGDOM Tel.: +44 (0) 2080262506	sam.bishop@defra.gsi.gov.uk		
✓	Assistant Steward	Ms Joanne WILSON Principal Adviser, Risk Management Plant Imports Group Ministry for Primary Industries 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 367 Paseo Colon Av., 6th floor (1063), Buenos Aires ARGENTINA Tel.: +54 911 6578 7357	aceriani@senasa.gob.ar	April 2022	April 2027
✓	Member	Mr Douglas KERRUISH A/g Director, Fresh Imported Horticultural Program Australian Government Department of Agriculture 7 London Circuit ACT 2601 Canberra AUSTRALIA Tel: +61 02 7272 4568	douglas.kerruish@agriculture.gov.au	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 Martin DAMUS Senior Plant Health Risk Assessor - Entomology Canadian Food Inspection Agency 1400 Merivale Road, K1A 0Y9 Ottawa, Ontario CANADA Tel.: +1 343 550 6418	martin.damus@inspection.gc.ca	April 2022	April 2027
✓	Member	Ms Sun SHUANGYAN Senior Agronomist Research Center of GACC for International Inspection and	sunshyan2008@163.com	April 2022	April 2027

		Quarantine Standards and Technical Regulations Building 3, No. 20 Hepingli East Street, Dongcheng District, Beijing CHINA Tel.: +86 10 57954651			
✓	Member	Mr Moshe VAKNIN Pest Risk Analyst Plant Protection and Inspection Services, Israel P.O. Box 78, Bet Dagan 50250 ISRAEL Tel.: +972 3 9681577	MosheV@moag.gov.il	April 2022	April 2027
✓	Member	Mr Hideki TANIGUCHI Deputy director, Plant Protection Division, Food Safety and Consumer Affairs Bureau Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (MAFF) 1-2 -1 Kasumigaseki Chiyoda-ku 100-8950 Tokyo JAPAN Tel.: +81-3-3502-5978	hideki_taniguchi690@maff.go.jp	April 2022	April 2027
✓	Member	Mr Alfayo OMBUYA Senior 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) 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

IPPC Secretariat

	Participant role	Name, mailing address, telephone	Email address
✓	IPPC Secretariat Lead	Ms Adriana G. MOREIRA Standards Officer / Deputy Assistant to Unit Leader IPPC Secretariat / FAO Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00153 Rome, Italy Tel.: (+39) 06 570 55809	Adriana.Moreira@fao.org
✓	IPPC Secretariat Support	Ms Erika MANGILI ANDRÉ Standard Setting Specialist IPPC Secretariat / FAO Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00153 Rome, Italy	Erika.MangiliAndre@fao.org