



# **REPORT**

## **TECHNICAL PANEL ON COMMODITY STANDARDS**

**13 APRIL 2023**

**Virtual Meeting**

**IPPC Secretariat**

Required citation:

IPPC Secretariat. 2023. *Report of the meeting of the Technical Panel on Commodity Standards (TPCS), 13 April 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](mailto:publications-sales@fao.org). Requests for commercial use should be submitted via: [www.fao.org/contact-us/licence-request](http://www.fao.org/contact-us/licence-request). Queries regarding rights and licensing should be submitted to: [copyright@fao.org](mailto:copyright@fao.org).

**CONTENTS**

<b>1. Opening of the meeting</b> .....	4
1.1 Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat .....	4
<b>2. Meeting arrangements</b> .....	4
2.1 Selection of chairperson .....	4
2.2 Election of the rapporteur.....	4
2.3 Adoption of the agenda .....	4
<b>3. Administrative matters</b> .....	4
<b>4. TPCS work programme</b> .....	4
4.1 Revision of TPCS draft working procedures .....	4
4.2 Revisiting the purpose of the template form for submitting information on pests and measures.....	7
4.3 The TPCS work programme: discussion on potential proposals for commodity standards for the IPPC 2023 call for topics.....	8
<b>5. Any other business</b> .....	8
<b>6. Close of the meeting</b> .....	8
<b>Appendix 1 – Agenda</b> .....	9
<b>Appendix 2 – Draft Submission Form on Information Materials for Commodity Standards</b> .....	10

## **TECHNICAL PANEL ON COMMODITY STANDARDS**

**13 April 2023**

**Virtual Meeting**

### **REPORT**

#### **1. Opening of the meeting**

##### **1.1 Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat**

[1] Adriana MOREIRA, IPPC Standard Setting Officer and Deputy Lead of the Standard Setting Unit, opened the virtual meeting of the Technical Panel on Commodity Standards (TPCS) 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 IPPC Secretariat (hereafter referred to as “the secretariat”) introduced the TPCS membership list and invited participants to notify the secretariat of any information that required updating in the latter or was missing from it.

[6] The panel noted the absence of Samuel BISHOP (United Kingdom, TPCS Steward), Hideki TANIGUCHI (Japan) and Joanne WILSON (New Zealand, TPCS Assistant Steward).

#### **4. TPCS work programme**

##### **4.1 Revision of TPCS draft working procedures**

[7] The TPCS reviewed the draft working procedures that had been compiled at their meeting in January.<sup>1</sup> The secretariat explained that written comments on the draft had been received from Hideki TANIGUCHI (Japan), together with those from Lihong ZHU (New Zealand) that had been received earlier. The TPCS considered these comments during their review of the draft document.

[8] **Current tasks of the TPCS.** The secretariat referred the TPCS to Specification TP 6 (*Technical Panel on Commodity Standards*)<sup>2</sup>, which described the scope and purpose of the panel as being to develop and update commodity standards within the framework of ISPM 46 (*Commodity-specific standards for*

---

<sup>1</sup> 02\_TPCS\_Tel\_2023\_Apr.

<sup>2</sup> Specification TP 6 - TPCS: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/89276/>

*phytosanitary measures*) and to develop guidance on related aspects. The secretariat explained that the guidance in question was not referring to guidance on implementation but rather to the provision of advice to the Standards Committee (SC) on aspects related to the development of commodity standards. These aspects were detailed in the tasks listed in Specification TP 6, the final one of which tasked the TPCS with identifying potential impediments to operational and technical implementation, and providing information and recommendations on these to the SC. For clarity, the TPCS therefore agreed that, in the draft working procedures, this text drawn from TP 6 should be amended to refer to the TPCS *identifying implementation needs* rather than *developing guidance* on related aspects.

- [9] **IPPC call for topics.** The TPCS agreed that information on pests and measures should be publicly available or available on request, but that it was not necessary to specify to whom the information would be made available on request.
- [10] The TPCS recalled that one of the recommendations they had made at their meeting in January 2023 was that draft specifications for commodity standards received in response to calls for topics should be revised by the TPCS and the SC without the need to be submitted for consultation.<sup>3</sup> The TPCS chairperson clarified that the rationale for this was twofold: to avoid unnecessary delays in the development of commodity standards and because the content of each specification for a commodity standard (annex to ISPM 46) would be largely the same and so it was not necessary to have a consultation on each draft specification.
- [11] **Consultation period on draft ISPMs.** The TPCS modified this section of the draft working procedures to align with the template form for submission of information on pests and measures that they had drafted. This included deleting a reference to regional plant protection organizations receiving the form during consultation periods on draft ISPMs, and making it clear that the pests in question were *regulated* pests.
- [12] The TPCS recalled that, at their meeting in January 2023, they had also recommended that there should be the option of omitting a second consultation on a draft commodity standard if no substantive comments are received in response to the first consultation. The TPCS discussed whether it would be better to defer this recommendation until after the first consultation on the first annex to ISPM 46, to see how many and what kind of comments were received. They noted that the fast-tracked procedure agreed by the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) for phytosanitary treatments had been based on the experience of the Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments, who had recognized that substantive comments were mostly submitted during the first consultation and that very few comments were submitted during the second consultation. The TPCS agreed that they would prefer to retain the option to omit a second consultation for commodity standards, to avoid unnecessary delay in the adoption of commodity standards, but acknowledged that they did not anticipate a second consultation being omitted for the first annex to ISPM 46. They therefore agreed that this was an issue for future SC consideration rather than necessarily an immediate one.
- [13] **Specifications.** The secretariat explained that the text for this section of the draft working procedures was derived from the TPCS meeting in January 2023. For the 2023 call for topics, the current process would be followed, but with the addition of the template form drafted by the TPCS, subject to SC approval. The TPCS chairperson emphasized that the changes being suggested to the Standard Setting Procedure did not involve any changes to the development of the draft standards themselves, which would go through the usual consultation periods, but just involved bypassing the consultation step in the development of draft specifications to streamline the process.
- [14] **Criteria for inclusion of a pest.** The secretariat explained that the text for this section of the draft working procedures was derived from the TPCS meeting in January 2023. It gave the principal criterion for inclusion of a pest in a commodity standard – regulation by at least one contracting party – and listed some subsidiary criteria (hereafter referred to as “subcriteria”) that had been drafted by the TPCS.

---

<sup>3</sup> TPCS 2023-01, agenda item 6.2 (Decision 12).

- [15] The TPCS considered whether to include the economic importance of the pest to the list of subcriteria. They concluded, however, that this was not necessary, as the concept of economic importance or impact was integral to the definitions of regulated pests (quarantine pests and regulated non-quarantine pests) in ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*) and hence was already covered by the criterion that the pest must be regulated to be included.
- [16] One TPCS member indicated that there was no need to have a subcriterion that the pest was a “major or minor” pest, as this did not provide any value other than to say that the organism was a pest. However, another member supported retention of this subcriterion and the TPCS retained it.
- [17] The TPCS agreed to retain reference to the commodity as being a host of the pest but acknowledged that the use of the term “host” here was not based on any particular definition of the term. Later in the discussion, one TPCS member suggested that it might be helpful for this subcriterion to be limited to reports of hosts within a certain number of years, but this suggestion was not incorporated.
- [18] The TPCS recalled that, at their meeting in January, the list of subcriteria had initially been drafted to address situations where regulation of a pest may have been based on data that were out-of-date or inaccurate. The TPCS steward, at that meeting, had made it clear, however, that it was not the role of the TPCS to judge the validity of the technical justifications used by contracting parties when regulating pests, nor to determine whether a pest posed a major or minor pest risk, but the TPCS could exclude a pest if there was insufficient evidence to support its inclusion. The TPCS therefore considered whether to convert the list of subcriteria into a list of reasons why a regulated pest may be excluded, rather than subcriteria for inclusion, as this could be more transparent and may be more easily applied. The secretariat recalled the intervention made at CPM-16 (2022) regarding the need for there to be a transparent process by which the criteria for categorizing measures according to confidence are agreed. The secretariat commented that this intervention had been related to the criteria for inclusion, not just exclusion, and was another reason why the TPCS had drafted the list of subcriteria. The TPCS therefore agreed that the draft subcriteria would suffice, subject to some refinements.
- [19] The TPCS agreed that, for a pest to be included in a commodity standard, at least one of the subcriteria should be met in addition to the principal criterion of the pest being regulated by at least one country, as explicit in ISPM 46.
- [20] The TPCS agreed that the availability of options for phytosanitary measures should be a subcriterion for inclusion of a pest but that inclusion should also be subject to there being sufficient confidence for the option or options to be included in the commodity standard.
- [21] The TPCS agreed that repeated interceptions of the pest should be another subcriterion, but they modified the text to make it clear that this related to interceptions on the commodity. They recalled that this subcriterion had been added in the context of a specific situation experienced by one contracting party.<sup>4</sup>
- [22] The TPCS agreed that evidence of establishment of the pest after entry should be a subcriterion but acknowledged that such evidence specific to the commodity may be rare. They therefore considered whether this evidence should be broadened to the commodity category (e.g. using the categories in ISPM 32 (*Categorization of commodities according to their pest risk*)). For mango, for example, the category could be “fruit for consumption”. However, the TPCS recognized that doing so may risk the perception that the scope of the commodity standard was being broadened; they also noted that it did not matter if evidence of establishment via the commodity was rare, as where it did exist it would support inclusion of the pest. They therefore left the text unmodified, referring to the commodity not the commodity category.
- [23] **Criteria and confidence for inclusion of a phytosanitary measure.** The TPCS recognized that the availability of compliance or non-compliance data from contracting parties would be useful evidence

---

<sup>4</sup> Intercepted pests included because it was not known whether they could establish after entry: TPCS 2023-01, agenda item 5.2 (paragraph 69).

on whether a measure was being used successfully in trade, as would the number of years that the measure had been used in trade. They therefore modified this section to include these examples of evidence.

- [24] The TPCS chairperson clarified that, where the draft working procedures referred to commodity standards not being as *descriptive* as the treatment schedules in ISPM 28 (*Phytosanitary treatments for regulated pests*), this meant that they were not as detailed.
- [25] **Revision of commodity standards.** In response to a question, the TPCS chairperson clarified that this section was not referring to new treatments being proposed for inclusion in an adopted commodity standard but to situations where evidence arose that a measure included in an adopted standard was no longer effective. The suggestion made at the TPCS meeting in January 2023 had been that, as an interim solution until the standard could be revised, a footnote could be added as an ink amendment.<sup>5</sup>
- [26] The secretariat explained that ISPM 46 referred to the review of data and the revision of pest lists and options for phytosanitary measures, but did not explicitly refer to the incorporation of new measures. The TPCS chairperson commented that if there was a need for more explicit guidance then the ISPM 46 could be revised at a later date.
- [27] The TPCS agreed that there may also be a need to include a footnote as an ink amendment when there is a change to the taxonomic status of a pest. They noted that this would only apply where the change does not affect the options for phytosanitary measures.
- [28] **Searchable online database.** The TPCS noted that the rationale for developing an online database of pests and measures was to provide transparency. They noted that a spreadsheet would be used in the meantime.

[29] The TPCS:

- (1) *invited* the SC to approve the draft working procedures for the TPCS as modified at this meeting.

#### 4.2 Revisiting the purpose of the template form for submitting information on pests and measures

- [30] The chairperson referred the TPCS to the template form for submission of information on pests and measures that had been agreed by the TPCS at their previous meeting.<sup>6</sup> Recalling that the TPCS had identified three circumstances in which the form would be used, she invited the SC to revisit the first of these, which related to the use of the form when proposing a commodity standard in response to a call for topics. She suggested that it may be better to avoid explicitly saying that submission of the form was optional, as it was important that, when a contracting party proposes a commodity standard, they at least provide information on pests and measures.
- [31] The TPCS agreed that submission of the form should not be mandatory when proposing a commodity standard, as this may deter the submission or review of topic proposals that would otherwise merit consideration. However, they agreed that it was better to encourage contracting parties to submit the form, rather than referring to submission being optional or mandatory. They agreed to leave it to the SC to decide how best to express this.
- [32] The TPCS:
- (2) *confirmed* that no further changes were needed to the template form for submitting information on pests and measures agreed by the TPCS at their meeting in February 2023 (Appendix 2); and
  - (3) *invited* the SC to encourage contracting parties to submit the form when proposing a topic for a commodity standard in a call for topics.

---

<sup>5</sup> TPCS 2023-01, agenda item 6.2 (paragraph 139).

<sup>6</sup> 02\_TPCS\_Tel\_2023\_Feb.



### 4.3 The TPCS work programme: discussion on potential proposals for commodity standards for the IPPC 2023 call for topics

[33] The TPCS deferred this item until a future meeting, because of time constraints.

## 5. Any other business

[34] The TPCS chairperson drew the attention of the TPCS to a draft paper providing an update from the TPCS to the SC.<sup>7</sup> The paper referred to concerns that, under Specification TP 6, the Standard Setting Procedure and the current work programme, the TPCS would have no commodity standards to develop until 2025. The draft paper invited the SC to amend the TPCS specification to allow the TPCS to review and prioritize ISPM 46 annex proposals for inclusion in its work programme subject to approval by the SC. It also invited the SC to consider recommending changes to the Standard Setting Procedure to allow an ongoing call for topics for annexes to ISPM 46, using the same submission procedure as used for the Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments (but with a different submission form), and to remove the draft specification consultation step for ISPM 46 annexes (see also discussion above).

[35] The TPCS did not discuss the paper in detail, because of time constraints, but supported the paper in principle and agreed that it should be submitted to the SC on behalf of the TPCS. The secretariat explained that there was a standard format for technical-panel updates to the SC, but that they would make the necessary adjustments to the paper to conform with that format.

[36] The secretariat explained that the CPM ultimately decides upon the prioritization of topics each year, but that the SC can adjust the priorities of subjects at any time based on the recommendations of technical panels (for example subjects under ISPM 27 and ISPM 28). The TPCS chairperson emphasized that the point being made in the paper regarding prioritization was that the TPCS will be the body best placed to decide upon the relative priorities of different subjects for commodity standards.

[37] The TPCS:

- (4) *approved* the update from the TPCS to the Standards Committee and *agreed* that the secretariat, in liaison with the stewards, would adjust it as required for submission to the SC.

## 6. Close of the meeting

[38] The chairperson and secretariat thanked everyone.

[39] The TPCS agreed that it would be useful to have a virtual meeting after the SC May meeting and the secretariat offered to open a poll to agree on a suitable date.

[40] The chairperson closed the meeting.

---

<sup>7</sup> 03\_TPCS\_Tel\_2023\_Apr.



## APPENDIX 1 – AGENDA

**VIRTUAL MEETING OF THE  
TECHNICAL PANEL ON COMMODITY STANDARDS (TPCS)**

**13 April 2023**

**12:00-14:00 (Rome time, currently GMT+2)**

**AGENDA**

Agenda Item	Document No.	Presenter
<b>1.</b>	<b>Opening of the Meeting</b>	
1.1	Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat	--
		IPPC Secretariat (MOREIRA)
<b>2.</b>	<b>Meeting Arrangements</b>	
2.1	Selection of Chairperson	--
		MOREIRA
2.2	Selection of the Rapporteur	--
		Chairperson
2.3	Adoption of the Agenda	01_TPCS_Tel_2023_Apr
		Chairperson
<b>3.</b>	<b>Administrative Matters</b>	
3.1	TPCS membership list	<a href="#">TPCS membership list</a>
		MONTEROSA
3.2	Connections to Zoom and virtual meetings	
<b>4.</b>	<b>TPCS work programme</b>	
4.1	Revision of TPCS draft working procedures and approval to the Standards Committee <i>Notes: file in track changes</i>	02_TPCS_Tel_2023_Apr
		MOREIRA / ALL
4.2	Revisiting the purpose of the template form for submitting information on pests and measures - Refer to document 02_TPCS_Tel_2023_Feb	<a href="#">Link to TPCS 2023-02 virtual meeting report</a>
		Chairperson / IPPC Secretariat
4.3	The TPCS work programme: discussion on potential commodity standards proposal(s) for the IPPC 2023 call for topics	<a href="#">Link IPPC call for topics</a>
		Chairperson /Stewards / ALL
<b>5.</b>	<b>Any other business</b>	
	- Draft paper: Update from the TPCS to the Standards Committee	03_TPCS_Tel_2023_Apr
		Chairperson
<b>6.</b>	<b>Closing of the meeting</b>	
		--
		IPPC Secretariat / Chairperson

**APPENDIX 2 – DRAFT SUBMISSION FORM ON INFORMATION MATERIALS FOR COMMODITY STANDARDS**

*Submission Form  
Information Materials for Commodity Standards*

Name of Country: \_\_\_\_\_

[Click here](http://www.ippc.int) to find the IPPC Procedure Manual for Standard Setting on the IPP ([www.ippc.int](http://www.ippc.int)), where you can download this form.

**Submission number (Secretariat Use Only):**

Complete the following form, preferably in electronic format, and submit by e-mail to the IPPC Secretariat ([ippc@fao.org](mailto:ippc@fao.org)).

Please use one form per commodity. An electronic version of this form is available on the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP) at [IPPC - International Plant Protection Convention](http://www.ippc.int). Incomplete submissions will be returned. Please save the completed submission form with the following file name: COUNTRY or RPPO NAME –Title of commodity.doc, prior to submitting to the IPPC Secretariat via e-mail.

(Text in brackets given for explanatory purposes)

<b>Name and description of Commodity</b>	<i>(Provide enough detail to identify the commodity including the botanical name, authority, part of the plant for trade and its intended use)</i>
--	--

<b>Submitted by:</b> <i>(Name of national or regional plant protection organization)</i>	
<b>Contact:</b> <i>(Contact information of an individual able to clarify issues relating to this submission, including pest risk assessment, phytosanitary measures, interception data related to measure etc.)</i>	
Name: .....	
Position and organization: .....	
Mailing address: .....	
.....	
Phone:.....	Fax:.....
E-mail:.....	

**List of regulated pests associated with the commodity for trade**

*(Only include pests that are regulated by your national and are associated with the plant or plant part traded (e.g. if only fruit is traded then do not include pests that are only associated with leaves)).*

Pest type	Family	Species (include authority)	Link to pest risk assessment (if available)
e.g. fruit flies, moths, thrips, fungi, bacteria, fungi, virus			

**List of Measures** (*Please repeat this part for each measure proposed*)

<b>Name and Description of Measure</b>	
<b>Name of Measure</b>	<i>e.g. vapour heat treatment, cold treatment, irradiation, systems approach, PFA, PFPP, PFPS, pesticide</i>
<b>Measure Type</b>	<i>e.g. physical, chemical, biological</i>
<b>Active Ingredient</b>	<i>For chemical treatments only</i>
<b>Schedule</b>	<i>For treatments, the schedule should include details such as dose, concentration, time, temperature, relative humidity, where applicable, efficacy and confidence if known.  For systems approaches, please include a description of the independent measures.</i>
<b>Target Pest</b>	<i>Include the regulated pests and life stages that the measure manages. Pests should be included in the list of pests (above)</i>
<b>Reference</b>	<i>Include any available reference or website link</i>

<b>Other information</b> ( <i>Please complete as many fields as possible</i> )	
<b>Is there quantitative or qualitative evidence to indicate the measure is effective?</b>	
<i>Where possible, provide published references or experimental data to support the measure.</i>	
<b>Does experience from use in international trade indicate that the measure is effective?</b>	
<i>Describe the countries that use the measure in trade (e.g. importing country – exporting country) and the number of years the measure has been used (e.g. year regulations were set). Include information on volume of trade and relevant pest interception data where possible.</i>	
<b>Has the measure been successfully used to manage non-compliant consignments?</b>	
<i>Describe the circumstances for use and how often the measure is used to manage non-compliant consignments.</i>	
<b>Has the measure been successfully used to effectively manage pest risk domestically?</b>	
<i>Describe the circumstances for domestic use of the measure e.g. the measure has been used extensively in relation to domestic movement of commodities; the measure has been used successfully in outbreak management and eradication programmes; information from domestic plant certification schemes indicates that the measure is effective; best management practices for the measure are available.</i>	
<b>Has the measure been used successfully by the private sector or authorized entities?</b>	
<b>Has the measure has been identified as an effective pest risk management option based on a PRA or comparable technical evaluation?</b>	
<i>Please provide PRAs or comparable evaluations that identify the measure as being effective.</i>	
<b>Is the measure, relevant to the pest, adopted in an ISPM or regional standard?</b>	
<i>Please provide reference to ISPM or a regional standard</i>	

**Send submissions to:**

**E-mail:** [ippc@fao.org](mailto:ippc@fao.org)  
(preferred)