



Food and Agriculture
Organization of the
United Nations



International
Plant Protection
Convention

REPORT

TECHNICAL PANEL ON COMMODITY STANDARDS

26 July 2023

Virtual Meeting

IPPC Secretariat

Required Citation:

IPPC Secretariat. 2023. *Report of the meeting of the Technical Panel on Commodity Standards (TPCS), 27 July 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 Updates on IPPC Call for Topics: Standards and Implementation	4
4.2 Additional information for mango	6
4.3 Brainstorming for an IPPC commodity-standards database.....	7
4.4 Updates on FAO and IPPC style guides.....	8
5. Any other business	8
6. Close of the meeting	9
Appendix 1: Agenda.....	10
Appendix 2: References	12

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] As agreed at their meeting in June 2023,¹ the TPCS selected Lihong ZHU (New Zealand) as chairperson.

2.2 Election of the rapporteur

- [3] The TPCS selected Alfayo OMBUYA (Kenya) as rapporteur.

2.3 Adoption of the agenda

- [4] The TPCS adopted the agenda (Appendix 1), modified to include any initial feedback from regions on the draft annex *International movement of fresh Mangifera indica fruit* (2021-011) to ISPM 46 (*Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures*) at the end of agenda item 4.2. They agreed to consider agenda item 4.4 before 4.3 and to consider the date for the next TPCS meeting under agenda item 5 (Any other business).

- [5] The TPCS:

- (1) *requested* that the IPPC Secretariat include a standing item on the TPCS agenda for the date of the next TPCS meeting.

3. Administrative matters

- [6] 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.

- [7] The panel noted the absence of Samuel BISHOP (United Kingdom) and Martin DAMUS (Canada).

4. TPCS work programme

4.1 Updates on IPPC Call for Topics: Standards and Implementation

- [8] Members of the panel shared updates on submissions being prepared by their respective countries in response to the 2023 Call for Topics: Standards and Implementation.

- [9] Joanne WILSON (New Zealand) presented two draft submissions being prepared by New Zealand – one for multiple species of *Citrus* and the other for *Vitis vinifera* (table grapes) – and invited the TPCS to provide feedback to improve the submissions.² In each case, the documentation included the topic proposal, a draft specification and the commodity-standards submission form for information materials. Ms WILSON particularly invited comments on the feasibility of having a multi-species commodity standard and explained that the rationale for doing this for *Citrus* was that many of the relevant pests and treatments were common to multiple species among the nine species listed.

¹ TPCS 2023-06, agenda item 2.1.

² *Citrus*: 02_TPC_Tel_2023_Jul; 03_TPC_Tel_2023_Jul; 04_TPC_Tel_2023_Jul; table grapes: 05_TPC_Tel_2023_Jul; 06_TPC_Tel_2023_Jul; 07_TPC_Tel_2023_Jul.

- [10] **Multi-species vs single-species standards.** Members of the panel shared their views on the feasibility and desirability of including multiple species in one commodity standard.
- [11] The TPCS acknowledged that a multi-species standard would be far more complex, as there may be some pests or pest groups that are not relevant to particular host species and it may be difficult to present information on measures that are very commodity-specific.
- [12] One TPCS member favoured single-species standards and commented that their region was preparing one submission for orange and another for banana.
- [13] Some other TPCS members expressed a preference for trying to see if a multi-species standard was possible, while recognizing that it might be complicated.
- [14] The TPCS noted that, for *Citrus*, the pest profiles for the different species were slightly different and there was a massive amount of information available for the main species traded, particularly oranges and lemons. There were therefore various options for different combinations of *Citrus* species in commodity standards.
- [15] The secretariat explained that, if commodity standards were to become “subjects” as recommended to CPM-18 (2024) by the SC,³ the TPCS would not only be able to propose additional commodity standards to the Standards Committee (SC) but would also be able to recommend changes to the scope of draft commodity standards that were on the work programme (either in terms of expanding or reducing the scope). The secretariat gave an example of a draft diagnostic protocol for which the SC had reduced the scope, on the recommendation of the Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols, because the original scope had proved not to be technically feasible. So, if a proposal for a multi-species commodity standard was submitted during the call for topics, one option for the TPCS would be to recommend that the decision be left open about whether to include all the species in one standard or break it into smaller standards, depending on how the drafting progressed.
- [16] The TPCS recognized that they would be in a better position to judge the feasibility of a multi-species standard once drafting was underway.
- [17] **Further information for the draft submissions.** Ms WILSON invited members of the panel to contact her with any further information from their countries that could be added to the draft submissions on *Citrus* and *Vitis vinifera*. She pointed out that the *Citrus* submission already included some information from other countries, as New Zealand exported *Citrus* fruit as well as importing it. The draft submission therefore included both import requirements and export requirements. For table grapes, she explained that although the submission related only to *Vitis vinifera*, other *Vitis* species were traded internationally (including being imported into New Zealand), and TPCS members may wish to consider the feasibility of including other *Vitis* species in the standard.
- [18] The TPCS chairperson encouraged TPCS members to contribute comments and to discuss with their IPPC contact point about their country and region lending their support to New Zealand’s submission.
- [19] Later in the meeting, one TPCS member noted that their country recognized the difficulties in drafting a *Citrus* standard, because of the hybridization within the *Citrus* genus. They were, however, potentially interested in the development of a standard for table grapes and were willing to share information on their phytosanitary import requirements and pest risk analysis for table grapes with New Zealand, if further information was needed.
- [20] The TPCS chairperson reiterated that if a national plant protection organization (NPPO) or a regional plant protection organization supports another NPPO’s proposal, they could either be a joint submitter or provide a supporting letter.

³ SC 2023-05, agenda item 6.4.

[21] **Recommendations to the SC.** The TPCS chairperson noted that the panel would have the opportunity to review submissions and provide recommendations to the SC after the call for topics. She encouraged everyone, in the meantime, to refer to the draft submissions from New Zealand, as they could be helpful when drafting other submissions.

[22] The TPCS:

- (2) *noted* the updates on draft submissions being prepared for the 2023 Call for Topics: Standards and Implementation.

4.2 Additional information for mango

Additional information provided by Thailand

[23] The TPCS chairperson presented some additional information from Thailand that had been received in relation to the draft annex *International movement of fresh Mangifera indica fruit* (2021-011) to ISPM 46 (*Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures*).⁴ Thailand had enquired about the possibility of adding a hot water immersion treatment (HWIT) of 46 °C for ten minutes to the draft annex and had provided additional supporting evidence of acceptance of the treatment by other contracting parties. The TPCS chairperson and the secretariat had both suggested to Thailand that they submit this additional supporting information as part of the ongoing first consultation on the draft annex.

[24] The secretariat added that Thailand had also informed them that they had an additional treatment that they may submit – an irradiation treatment with a lower radiation dose – but they were still finalizing the data.

[25] The TPCS noted that the supporting evidence provided by Thailand included evidence of the above HWIT for mango being accepted by 13 countries, with the corresponding export volumes. As the use of a measure between at least two contracting parties is the primary criterion for measures to be eligible for inclusion in ISPM 46, the TPCS recognized that the evidence provided by Thailand was very useful. A copy of a phytosanitary certificate had also been provided, but as this appeared to relate to a fumigation treatment rather than the HWIT, the TPCS chairperson confirmed that she would contact Thailand to seek clarification.

[26] **Variety-specific treatments.** The steward for the draft annex, Joanne WILSON (New Zealand), recalled the decision at the TPCS meeting in January 2023 to only include in the standard those treatments that were not specific to a variety or varieties.⁵ The resulting draft annex had therefore stated that the standard applied to the fruit of all cultivars and varieties of *Mangifera indica*. The TPCS noted that this decision may be applicable to the treatments submitted by Thailand.

[27] **Follow-up.** The TPCS chairperson invited members of the panel to review the information provided by Thailand and send comments to the steward for the draft annex, the TPCS chairperson and the secretariat. The secretariat confirmed that they would then follow-up with Thailand. The secretariat also encouraged TPCS members from the Asia region to speak with representatives from Thailand at the forthcoming IPPC regional workshop in Asia to clarify any questions they may have about their submission.

[28] One TPCS member provided details of a paper on the heat treatment of mango fruit (Jacobi, MacRae & Hetherington, 2001) that may be of interest to the panel.⁶

⁴ 08_TPCS_Tel_2023_Jul; 09_TPCS_Tel_2023_Jul; 10_TPCS_Tel_2023_Jul; 11_TPCS_Tel_2023_Jul; 12_TPCS_Tel_2023_Jul.

⁵ TPCS 2023-01, agenda item 5.1, paragraph 48.

⁶ See Appendix 2.

Other feedback from regions about the draft annex

- [29] The TPCS chairperson invited TPCS members to share any further feedback from their regions about the draft annex *International movement of fresh Mangifera indica fruit* (2021-011) to ISPM 46, from the ongoing first consultation process.
- [30] One TPCS member confirmed that their country was in the process of reviewing the draft annex.
- [31] The TPCS:
- (3) *agreed* to send any further comments on the information provided by Thailand about mango treatments to the secretariat, the steward for the draft annex *International movement of fresh Mangifera indica fruit* (2021-011) to ISPM 46, and the chairperson of this TPCS meeting; and
 - (4) *agreed* to share emerging feedback about the draft annex on mango, arising from the IPPC regional workshops, with the steward for the draft annex.

4.3 Brainstorming for an IPPC commodity-standards database

- [32] Further to their agreement at their June meeting that it would be useful to have a “brainstorming” session about the proposed commodity-standards database,⁷ the TPCS chairperson invited the TPCS to discuss ideas for the database.
- [33] The secretariat recalled that the TPCS had also agreed that it would record the reasons for including and excluding pests and measures in a spreadsheet.
- [34] The TPCS chairperson commented that this spreadsheet would be an internal, working document for the panel and would be separate to the database, which would be publicly available.
- [35] The secretariat referred the panel to the TPCS specification, which said that the TPCS should “consider how to categorize and catalogue phytosanitary measures included in commodity standards, and those in other standards, for use in an online search tool for target pest, commodity and measure, cross-referenced to relevant sources of information”. This implied that the database or catalogue of information should be publicly available; however, the secretariat suggested that pests and measures excluded from a commodity standard, and the rationale for including and excluding pests and measures, should be recorded in a document only available in a restricted area of the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP) and upon request.
- [36] Some TPCS members expressed support for the idea of keeping a separate spreadsheet for the data on excluded pests and measures and the rationale, with information available to submitters upon request. One TPCS member, however, also raised the question of whether these data should also be in the public domain, so that in contentious cases the rationale for the panel’s decision would be clear.
- [37] The TPCS referred to the Phytosanitary Treatments Search Tool on the IPP,⁸ which allowed the user to search by pest and by commodity. The TPCS noted that the commodity-standards database would be more complex. Some TPCS members suggested that users of the latter database should be able to search by commodity, pest and measure, with links being provided to associated references. The TPCS noted that a link to the commodity standard would also need to be included on the database, whether directly from the commodity name or as a separate link.
- [38] One TPCS member raised the question of whether national phytosanitary regulations would be included as references and suggested that this may only be appropriate if they are cited in the commodity standard.

⁷ TPCS 2023-05, agenda item 4.1.

⁸ Phytosanitary Treatments Search Tool: <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/standards-setting/technical-panels/technical-panel-phytosanitary-treatments/phytosanitary-treatments-tool/>

- [39] The TPCS noted that, although it would take some time for there to be sufficient adopted commodity standards to make it worthwhile having a database, it was still important to continue their discussions about it, as it was a task in the TPCS specification and would help the future work of the panel.
- [40] The secretariat suggested that a further discussion on the matter could be included as an agenda item for the next face-to-face meeting of the TPCS.
- [41] The TPCS chairperson also noted the value in seeking ideas from the secretariat and SC, to ensure that discussions about the commodity-standards database were tied into the wider context of other relevant initiatives.
- [42] The TPCS:
- (5) *requested* that the secretariat include a further discussion about the development of a commodity-standards database in the agenda for the next face-to-face TPCS meeting.

4.4 Updates on FAO and IPPC style guides

- [43] The secretariat gave an update on the FAO and IPPC style guides.⁹ The secretariat informed the TPCS that the English version of the FAO style guide, *FAOSTYLE: English*, had been updated and that the *IPPC style guide* would be updated to align with the new FAO style at its next revision. The secretariat explained that the main change affecting IPPC style was to the style for referencing in stand-alone elements (figures, tables and boxes), with two options now being available: giving the bibliographic details below the stand-alone element or giving them in a subsection of the References section. The secretariat outlined the provisional approach being taken for draft standards and explained that, although this was only an editorial matter and hence no decision was needed from the SC or technical panels, feedback was welcome. The secretariat added that the main question was whether, in the opinion of contracting parties, one of the options was easier to read than the other.
- [44] One TPCS member expressed a personal view to leave this matter to the judgement of the secretariat. No other TPCS members provided comments.
- [45] The TPCS:
- (6) *noted* the update on FAO and IPPC style guides.

5. Any other business

- [46] The secretariat suggested that the TPCS meet in October to consider the submissions from the call for topics, November (suggested date 29 November) to review the draft mango standard, and then again in February (suggested dates 6, 7 or 8 February 2024) to finalize the draft mango standard before it was submitted to the SC Working Group (SC-7). The TPCS would then need to meet in person after CPM-18 (2024).
- [47] The TPCS noted that, if major issues about the draft mango standard arose during the regional workshops, these could be discussed at the TPCS meeting in October and there was no need for a meeting in September. The TPCS also noted that the November meeting could be either before or after the SC November meeting, depending on whether there was anything that needed to be discussed in advance of the SC meeting.
- [48] In discussion about the times for virtual TPCS meetings, the secretariat suggested that the timing rotate between meetings to be fairer to participants in different time zones.
- [49] The TPCS:
- (7) *agreed* that the next meeting would be held in virtual mode on Tuesday 3 October and Thursday 5 October 2023 at 10.00 to 12.00 CEST each day.

⁹ 13_TPC_Tel_2023_Jul.

6. Close of the meeting

[50] 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	--	IPPC Secretariat (MOREIRA)
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_Jul	Chairperson
3.	Administrative Matters		
3.1	TPCS membership list	TPCS membership list	MONTEROSA
3.2	Connections to Zoom and virtual meetings	Short guidelines for participants	
4.	TPCS work programme		
4.1	<p>Updates on IPPC call for topics: standards and implementation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submission form for <i>Citrus</i> (multiple species) Draft specification for <i>Citrus</i> (multiple species) Commodity information for <i>Citrus</i> (multiple species) Submission form for table Grape Draft specification for table Grape Commodity information for table Grape 	02_TPCS_Tel_2023_Jul 03_TPCS_Tel_2023_Jul 04_TPCS_Tel_2023_Jul 05_TPCS_Tel_2023_Jul 06_TPCS_Tel_2023_Jul 07_TPCS_Tel_2023_Jul	Stewards (BISHOP / WILSON) / Chair / Secretariat
4.2	<p>Additional information for Mango</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional Information for HWIT for Mango in Thailand Phytosanitary Certificate of Mango to EU Table of information by non-EU countries on phytosanitary import requirements Letter to Eu for pomelo (<i>Citrus maxima</i>) and mango (<i>Mangifera indica</i>) Letter from Eu for pomelo (<i>Citrus maxima</i>) and mango (<i>Mangifera indica</i>) 	08_TPCS_Tel_2023_Jul 09_TPCS_Tel_2023_Jul 10_TPCS_Tel_2023_Jul 11_TPCS_Tel_2023_Jul 12_TPCS_Tel_2023_Jul	ZHU

Agenda Item		Document No.	Presenter
4.3	Feedback on Draft Annex	--	ALL
4.4	Brainstorming for an IPPC commodity standards database: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider the PT search tool • User requirements • others 	IPPC Phytosanitary Treatments search tool --	Stewards (BISHOP / WILSON) / ALL
4.5	Updates on FAO and IPPC style guide	13_TPCS_Tel_2023_Jul	ROUEN / ALL
5.	Any other business	--	Chairperson
6.	Closing of the meeting	--	IPPC Secretariat / Chairperson

Appendix 2: References

Jacobi, K.K., MacRae, E.A. & Hetherington, S.E. 2001. Postharvest heat disinfestation treatments of mango fruit. *Scientia Horticulturae*, 89: 171–193. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-4238\(00\)00240-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-4238(00)00240-5) (also available at https://www.ippc.int/static/media/files/publications/en/2013/06/05/1274184285_2010_TPPT_Jul_10_Jacomi_et_al_20.pdf)