



REPORT

TECHNICAL PANEL ON COMMODITY STANDARDS

28 February 2023

Virtual Meeting

IPPC Secretariat

Required citation:

IPPC Secretariat. 2023. *Report of the meeting of the Technical Panel on Commodity Standards (TPCS), 28 February 2023*. 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, 2023



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 chairperson	4
2.2	Election of the rapporteur.....	4
2.3	Adoption of the agenda	4
3.	Administrative matters	4
4.	TPCS work programme	4
4.1	Review and approval of the draft annex to ISPM 46: International movement of fresh <i>Mangifera indica</i> fruit (2021-011)	4
4.2	Revision of the draft template form for submitting information on pests and measures.....	7
4.3	Revision of draft TPCS working procedures	8
5.	Any other business	8
6.	Close of the meeting	8
	Appendix 1: AGENDA	9

1. Opening of the meeting

1.1 Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat

- [1] Avetik NERSISYAN and Adriana MOREIRA opened this virtual meeting of the Technical Panel on Commodity Standards (TPCS) on behalf of the IPPC Secretariat (hereafter referred to as “the secretariat”) and welcomed all participants.

2. Meeting arrangements

2.1 Selection of chairperson

- [2] The TPCS selected Lihong ZHU (New Zealand) as chairperson.

2.2 Election of the rapporteur

- [3] The TPCS selected Douglas KERRUISH (Australia) as rapporteur.

2.3 Adoption of the agenda

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

3. Administrative matters

- [5] The secretariat introduced the participants and TPCS membership list and explained that the list still needed updating since the previous meeting.¹ Participants were invited to notify the secretariat of any further updates.

- [6] The TPCS noted that Samuel BISHOP (Steward; United Kingdom) and Martin DAMUS (Canada) were absent from the meeting.

4. TPCS work programme

4.1 Review and approval of the draft annex to ISPM 46: International movement of fresh *Mangifera indica* fruit (2021-011)

- [7] The steward for the topic, Joanne WILSON (New Zealand), presented the draft annex, which had been edited since the previous TPCS meeting.² The TPCS then reviewed the draft, including the queries raised by the secretariat during editing that remained to be addressed.

- [8] **Title.** The secretariat clarified that the word “mango” had been deleted from the title by the editor, as common names for organisms were only given in ISPMs upon first mention of the organism in the body text; they were therefore not, for example, given in titles of phytosanitary treatments (PTs).

- [9] **Authorities.** The secretariat confirmed that the IPPC editor had checked IPPC style in relation to species authorities for commodities. The annotated template for draft PTs specified that the authority is not given for species names of target regulated articles, and this style had been applied in all draft PTs since this style was introduced in late 2016. PT 30 (Vapour heat treatment for *Ceratitis capitata* on *Mangifera indica*) and PT 31 (Vapour heat treatment for *Bactrocera tryoni* on *Mangifera indica*), which had been adopted by the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures in 2017, still gave the authority because they had been approved by the Standards Committee before the new template was in

¹ TPCS membership list: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/91212/>

² 2021-011.

operation. The TPCS therefore agreed to omit the authority for the scientific name of the commodity in commodity standards, for consistency with PTs. The TPCS also agreed that this, and other relevant aspects of style, could be incorporated into an annotated template for draft commodity standards.

- [10] **Description of commodity and its intended use.** The TPCS considered whether to add some examples of processing after the phrase “intended for consumption or processing”, but agreed that this was not necessary as the text explicitly described the scope as being fresh whole fruit and examples of processed fruit were already given in the text. Also, giving further examples (e.g. citing the use of fruit in the production of cosmetics) may give rise to confusion rather than providing clarification.
- [11] The TPCS rearranged the text of this section so that the description of the fruit and the intended use were not combined in the same sentence.
- [12] **Order of pests in table of pests associated with fresh *M. indica* fruit.** The TPCS recognized the need to agree the order in which pests should be listed in the table of pests in a commodity standard. They noted the secretariat’s suggestion that the pests should be listed in order of decreasing biological complexity (e.g. insects before fungi) and considered the suggestion that, where there was more than one pest group within, say, insects, the groups could be listed alphabetically according to the scientific name of the Order (e.g. weevils (Coleoptera), fruit flies (Diptera), mealybugs (Hemiptera), and so on).
- [13] The TPCS acknowledged that it may seem odd not to list fruit flies first for *M. indica*, as fruit flies were the major pests of *M. indica*, but they recognized that a generic style that would apply to all commodity standards was needed and listing alphabetically by Order was the most logical solution.
- [14] **Dates for species authorities.** Where there was doubt about the date for a species authority, the TPCS agreed to leave the text as it was to see if a solution was offered during consultation.

Entries for individual pests in the table of pests. The TPCS reviewed those entries for which queries had been raised:

- *Bactrocera opiliae*. The TPCS noted that this pest was listed in the table of pests but not in the list of pest-specific measures. The TPCS discussed whether the generic irradiation treatment for Tephritidae applied to this species, but could not be certain and the TPCS could not recall any other reason for its inclusion in the table. The TPCS therefore deleted it.
 - *Bactrocera philippinensis*. The TPCS deleted this species for consistency with Diagnostic Protocol 29 (*Bactrocera dorsalis*), in which it is named as a synonym of *Bactrocera dorsalis* (Hendel, 1912). The TPCS noted that the only measure listed for *B. philippinensis* was vapour heat treatment, which was also listed for *B. dorsalis*, so no information on measures was being lost by the deletion of this species name.
 - *Zeugodacus*. The TPCS agreed to use the species names *Zeugodacus cucurbitae* and *Zeugodacus tau* rather than *Bactrocera cucurbitae* and *Bactrocera tau*, respectively, for consistency with PT 42 (Irradiation treatment for *Zeugodacus tau*), in which the Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments had decided to use *Zeugodacus* instead of *Bactrocera* following the elevation of the subgenus *Bactrocera* (*Zeugodacus*) to genus level.
 - *Thrips palmi*. The TPCS reinserted the entry for this pest, which had accidentally been deleted during formatting of the draft standard.
- [15] **Options for phytosanitary measures.** The TPCS reviewed some suggested text that had been added by the secretariat to balance similar text in the section on pests about the non-exhaustive nature of the list and the need for technical justification when regulating. The TPCS agreed to this insertion but also considered whether it was better to use the term “should” rather than “shall” to describe the level of obligation regarding the technical justification of phytosanitary measures. However, the secretariat clarified that, when quoting from the IPPC, even indirectly, IPPC style is to always scrupulously

reproduce the wording of the IPPC. The TPCS therefore agreed to retain “shall”, as the text in question was an indirect quotation from the IPPC.

- [16] The TPCS considered a suggestion from the secretariat that the two-tiered bulleted list of integrated measures be replaced by a simplified, one-tiered bulleted list. The TPCS recognized the benefits of simplicity in the one-tiered approach but also the value of distinguishing between components of the production process in the two-tiered approach. As consensus could not be reached about the preferred approach, they therefore agreed to retain the two-tiered list but asked the topic steward to include the one-tiered list as a possible alternative in her steward’s notes to the Standards Committee (SC).
- [17] **Table of options for phytosanitary measures that may be relevant to all pests associated with the international movement of fresh *M. indica* fruit.** When referring to this table, the TPCS considered whether to refer to “options for phytosanitary measures that may be relevant to all pests associated with the international movement of fresh *M. indica* fruit” or simply to “general measures”. They agreed to the former for the time being, as this matched the caption of the table.
- [18] One TPCS member suggested that the table be deleted altogether, as it was not specific to the commodity, but the TPCS agreed to keep it for completeness.
- [19] The TPCS agreed that the entries in the table should be listed according to the order of the supply chain rather than alphabetical order.
- [20] **“Measures” vs “options for phytosanitary measures”.** The TPCS noted the editorial style used by the secretariat, where “measures” were used when referring to the properties or characteristics of measures (e.g. their effectiveness) and “options for phytosanitary measures” when referring to the selection, consideration or presentation of options.
- [21] **Table of pest-specific measures.** Within each entry in this table, the TPCS agreed to list measures in alphabetical order rather than in the order of the subsequent tables.
- [22] The TPCS added a generic irradiation treatment for fruit flies (IRDN4) to all pests for which a specific irradiation treatment was not listed.
- [23] One TPCS member suggested that it would help users to understand the table if the table notes explaining the acronyms used in the table were moved from the bottom of the table to the top. The secretariat explained that it was FAO style to list the acronyms below the table, but also suggested that the member may wish to consider submitting a comment during consultation to suggest that the acronyms be explained in the body text preceding the table.
- [24] The TPCS deleted the reference to a systems approach from the entry for *Deanolis sublimabilis*, as there was no confirmed pest-specific systems approach for this species.
- [25] **Table of schedules for hot water immersion treatment.** The TPCS agreed to give all temperatures to one decimal point.
- [26] The topic steward commented on the value of listing the references cited in the table below the table (as per the new FAO style), as this meant that the sources for the measures were very clear.
- [27] **References.** The TPCS reviewed those entries for which information was still missing and agreed to provide the secretariat with the necessary information after the meeting. The chairperson agreed to check whether an additional hot water treatment reference was relevant.

The TPCS:

- (1) *accepted* the offer of Do Nam KIM (Republic of Korea), Lihong ZHU (New Zealand) and Joanne WILSON (New Zealand) to provide the secretariat with missing information for the references;

- (2) *recommended* the draft annex *International movement of fresh Mangifera indica fruit* (2021-011) to ISPM 46 (*Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures*), as modified by the TPCS at this meeting and subject to the finalization of the references, to the SC for approval for first consultation starting July 2023;
- (3) *agreed* the following aspects of style for commodity standards:
 - the authority should not be given for the species name of the commodity,
 - in the table of pests, the pest groups within each high-level group (e.g. insects) should be listed alphabetically by the scientific name of the Order;
- (4) *noted* that *Bactrocera opiliae* and *Bactrocera philippinensis* would need adding to the list of pests excluded from the draft annex *International movement of fresh Mangifera indica fruit* (2021-011), compiled at the TPCS meeting in January 2023; and

agreed to develop an annotated template for draft commodity standards once the first commodity standard has been adopted and *requested* that the secretariat archive this decision for future action by the TPCS.

4.2 Revision of the draft template form for submitting information on pests and measures

- [28] The Assistant TPCS Steward, Joanne WILSON (New Zealand), presented a draft template form for submission of information on pests and measures.³ She explained that she had based it on the format of the submission form for PTs, and had incorporated the criteria from ISPM 46. The form could be used for new proposals or for information on proposals that have already been submitted.
- [29] The TPCS reviewed the draft template.
- [30] **Person submitting the form.** The secretariat informed the TPCS that, in the template form for PTs, the form is submitted by the official national plant protection (NPPO) or regional plant protection organization (RPPO) contact point, but the contact person specified on the form is intended to be a technical person who will be able to answer queries about the treatment. The TPCS acknowledged that having a technical person as the contact for commodity standards may not add any value, and so it may be sufficient to have the details of the official NPPO or RPPO contact point. However, they agreed to leave the text unchanged (i.e. to allow for a technical person to be the contact) and review it if needed at a later date, once a call for information has been made and it is clearer what additional information may be required from individuals listed as a contact person.
- [31] **Lists of regulated pests associated with the commodity for trade.** The TPCS deleted reference to RPPOs, as RPPOs do not regulate pests. However, they retained reference to RPPOs in the “submitted by” field above this section, as the form could be submitted by an RPPO.
- [32] **Name and description of measure.** In this section, the TPCS added a field to provide references for measures.
- [33] The TPCS expressed support for the form as modified above and thanked the Assistant TPCS Steward for drafting it.
- [34] **Use of the form.** The TPCS discussed how and when the form would be used. They agreed that the main use of the form would be to gather information on pests and measures through a call for information once a topic has been added to the work programme. They also agreed that the form should be used when NPPOs or RPPOs are suggesting the inclusion of a pest or measure in a draft

³ 02_TPCS_Tel_2023_Feb.

commodity standard submitted for consultation. However, the TPCS recognized that how the form could or should be used during a call for topics was less clear.

- [35] Regarding the potential use of the form during a call for topics, the TPCS noted that information submitted via this route may help the TPCS determine whether there was sufficient information to draft a particular commodity standard being proposed. It may also encourage submitters of topics to consider in more detail the information needed for the topic submission. Although this would require more work by submitters at the call for topics stage, there would be benefits later on. However, the TPCS also recognized that there are already agreed forms for submissions in calls for topics and the work involved in completing them is fairly substantial. The TPCS therefore agreed that the best approach would be for NPPOs and RPPOs to be *encouraged* to complete the commodity-standard submission form when submitting a topic proposal for a commodity standard, but for this to be optional rather than compulsory.

The TPCS:

- (5) *invited* the SC to approve the form for submitting information on pests and measures as modified by the TPCS at this meeting; and
- (6) *recommended* to the SC that the form be used in the following circumstances:
 - when submitting a proposal for a commodity standard in response to a call for topics (with submission of the form being optional, not compulsory),
 - when responding to a call for information for a topic that has been accepted onto the work programme, and
 - when submitting a consultation comment on a draft commodity standard, suggesting the addition of a pest or measure to the draft standard.

4.3 Revision of draft TPCS working procedures

- [36] This agenda item was deferred.

The TPCS:

- (7) *requested* that the secretariat schedule a virtual meeting to consider the draft TPCS working procedures.

5. Any other business

- [37] There was no other business.

6. Close of the meeting

- [38] The secretariat thanked the participants for their contributions and explained the next steps for the draft annex *International movement of fresh Mangifera indica fruit* (2021-011).

- [39] The chairperson thanked the participants and the secretariat and closed the meeting.

Appendix 1: Agenda**VIRTUAL MEETING OF THE
TECHNICAL PANEL ON COMMODITY STANDARDS (TPCS)****28 February 2023****10:00-12:00 (GMT+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_2023_Feb Chairperson
3.	Administrative Matters	
3.1	TPCS membership list	TPCS membership list MOREIRA
3.2	Connections to Zoom and virtual meetings	Short guidelines for participants
4.	TPCS work programme	
4.1	Review and approval of the draft Annex International movement of mango fresh fruit (<i>Mangifera indica</i>) to ISPM 46 (2021-011) to the Standards Committee	2021-011 WILSON
4.2	Revision of the draft template form for submitting information on pests and measure approval to the Standards Committee	02_TPCS_Tel_2023_Feb WILSON
4.3	Revision of TPCS draft working procedures and approval to the Standards Committee	03_TPCS_Tel_2023_Feb MOREIRA / ALL
5.	Any other business	
		-- Chairperson
6.	Closing of the meeting	
		-- IPPC Secretariat / Chairperson