



REPORT

TECHNICAL PANEL ON COMMODITY STANDARDS

6 December 2023

Virtual Meeting

IPPC Secretariat

Required Citation:

IPPC Secretariat. 2023. *Report of the meeting of the Technical Panel on Commodity Standards (TPCS), 06 December 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
1.2	Welcoming new TPCS members: new assistant stewards	4
2.	Meeting arrangements	4
2.1	Selection of chairperson	4
2.2	Selection of the rapporteur	4
2.3	Adoption of the agenda	4
3.	Administrative matters	4
4.	Standards Committee updates to the TPCS	4
5.	TPCS work programme	5
5.1	Draft annex to ISPM 46: International movement of fresh <i>Mangifera indica</i> fruit (2021-011).....	5
6.	Any other business.....	7
7.	Next TPCS meeting	7
8.	Close of the meeting	8
	Appendix 1: Agenda.....	9

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. She explained that the main focus of the meeting would be to review the consultation comments on the draft annex *International movement of fresh Mangifera indica* (2021-011) to ISPM 46 (*Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures*) and an update from the last Standards Committee (SC) meeting (2023-11 SC meeting).

1.2 Welcoming new TPCS members: new assistant stewards

- [2] The secretariat welcomed Mariangela CIAMPITTI (Italy) and Eyad MOHAMMED (Syrian Arab Republic), who had been assigned as assistant stewards to the TPCS by the Standards Committee (SC) in November. As the former TPCS Steward, Samuel BISHOP (United Kingdom), was no longer an SC member, the SC had also assigned Joanne WILSON (New Zealand), who had previously been the assistant TPCS steward, as steward to the TPCS.

2. Meeting arrangements

2.1 Selection of chairperson

- [3] The TPCS agreed that the secretariat would chair the meeting.

2.2 Selection of the rapporteur

- [4] The TPCS selected Douglas KERRUIISH (Australia) and Alfayo OMBUYA (Kenya) as rapporteurs.

2.3 Adoption of the agenda

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

3. Administrative matters

- [6] The TPCS noted the absence of Tiago Rodrigo LOHMAN (Brazil) and Lihong ZHU (New Zealand).

4. Standards Committee updates to the TPCS

- [7] The secretariat gave an update on matters relating to the TPCS considered by the SC at its meeting in November 2023,¹ explaining that the panel would not have sufficient time at this meeting to discuss the issues raised in full, so would probably need to return to this at a future meeting.

- [8] The secretariat reported that the SC had considered the observations made by the TPCS on the proposals for commodity standards submitted in response to the 2023 IPPC Call for Topics: Standards and Implementation. The SC had recommended four priority 1 topics and three priority 2 topics for inclusion in the *List of topics for IPPC standards*. The SC had also noted that the TPCS would consider the topic proposals in more detail at a future meeting, with a view to providing further advice to the SC about which of the priority 1 commodity standards to develop first once the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) had decided which topics to include in the list of topics. The secretariat suggested to the TPCS that, at that stage, a call for information materials could be opened for the priority 1 topics and the results of the call could then inform the panel's discussions.

- [9] The secretariat explained that the SC had raised some issues arising from the first-consultation comments on the draft annex *International movement of fresh Mangifera indica* (2021-011) to ISPM 46. The SC had invited the TPCS to consider how to address the comments related to the addition of sources for the pests listed in commodity standards; had invited the TPCS to consider, as they are developing the commodity standards, what criteria may be useful to the SC when considering priorities in future;

¹ 02_TPCS_Tel_2023_Dec.

and had invited the TPCS and the TPCS stewards to review the proposed text for section 7.4 of the *IPPC procedure manual for standard setting*, for presentation to the SC meeting in May 2024.

[10] The TPCS steward noted that some of the points raised by the SC would be discussed in agenda item 5.1.

[11] There were no other comments.

The TPCS:

(1) *noted* the update from the SC November 2023 meeting; and
agreed to discuss the issues raised by the SC further at the next virtual meeting of the TPCS.

5. TPCS work programme

5.1 Draft annex to ISPM 46: International movement of fresh *Mangifera indica* fruit (2021-011)

[12] Joanne WILSON (New Zealand), the Steward for the draft annex *International movement of fresh Mangifera indica* (2021-011) to ISPM 46 (*Commodity-based standards for phytosanitary measures*), referred the TPCS to the draft annex, which she had revised in response to the comments from the first consultation.²

[13] The TPCS reviewed the draft annex, starting with the issues highlighted by the steward for the potential attention of the SC Working Group (SC-7), and then progressing to other issues raised by TPCS members in the meeting. For ease of reading, the discussion is presented below in order of the corresponding sections of the draft annex.

[14] **Scope.** The TPCS noted that several consultation comments had called for the Scope to be adjusted so that it was specific to this annex. The steward explained that she had responded to this by pointing out that the Scope could not be changed, as this was standard text that would appear in all commodity standards and the wording was as specified in ISPM 46. However, the TPCS acknowledged that it could be disorientating for the reader to start the annex with generic text.

[15] The secretariat recalled that the intention was that the text would be the same in all commodity standards but noted that ISPM 46 did not explicitly say this. The secretariat explained that, if there were many consultation comments on this issue, it would be legitimate to change the text. However, if changes were to be made, care would need to be taken to avoid duplication with section 2 (Description of the commodity and its intended use).

[16] In addition to the suggested changes proposed during consultation, suggestions made by TPCS members included prefacing the text of the Scope section with the words “As an annex to ISPM 46,” or deleting the heading of section 2.

[17] The TPCS agreed that the steward would raise the matter with the SC-7.

[18] **Referencing pests.** The steward explained that some SC members had strongly supported the suggestion made during consultation that a reference be included for the association of each pest with the host. Given the likelihood of conflicting references, the steward had instead added text to say that the list of pests did not consider factors that affected the status of mango fruit as a host or factors that influenced pest infestation of fruit in the country of origin. The TPCS supported this insertion.

[19] The TPCS returned to this issue later in the meeting, with one TPCS member suggesting that high-level, secondary sources of information (e.g. the European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization’s Global Database) could be cited for each pest. However, the steward expressed the view that such sources are not available for all pests; it would never be possible to provide a definitive reference as to whether the commodity is a host for a particular pest, as there were often conflicting accounts; although

² 2021-011; 03_TPCS_Tel_2023_Dec.

pest risk analyses are transparent bilaterally, they may not be in the public domain and may be in different languages; and some high-level sources may not be sufficiently reliable.

- [20] The secretariat noted that if a source is given for one pest, then a source needed to be given for each pest, and the same would need to be done in all commodity standards.
- [21] One TPCS member commented that, although the TPCS may wish to request references for internal purposes, it would be challenging to include references for pests consistently.
- [22] The steward recalled that, when drafting the mango standard, the TPCS had omitted some pests suggested by countries and had recorded the reasons for these omissions in a spreadsheet.
- [23] The secretariat suggested that some general text could be included in the annex, referring to high-level sources. The secretariat commented that, if references for each pest were to be added, simple criteria could be applied for their inclusion and these criteria could be explicit, which could overcome the problem of there not being definitive sources for all pests. However, they acknowledged that commodity standards are not intended to be literature reviews.
- [24] The TPCS noted that the annex needed to be very clear that inclusion of the pest in the standard did not constitute technical justification for regulating the pest.
- [25] The steward thanked the TPCS for their input and agreed to consider what options to present to SC-7.
- [26] **Parameters for measures.** Following a consultation comment noting that the tables of options for phytosanitary measures did not provide all the necessary parameters for application, the steward had added some general text to explain that national plant protection organizations (NPPOs) should consider the parameters that are critical for the successful application of measures. The TPCS agreed with the insertion, as commodity standards did not aim to repeat all the details given in the primary sources.
- [27] **Efficacy.** The steward reported that some consultation comments expressed concerns about there being no efficacy estimates in the annex. The steward had added some text to explain that this was because estimates cannot be accurately calculated based solely on the use of those measures in international trade. The TPCS supported the insertion but adjusted its position in the draft annex.
- [28] **Systems approaches.** The steward explained that, in response to a consultation comment calling for greater clarity about the need to consider the use of a systems approach versus a single measure, she had added the suggested text. However, she asked the TPCS whether the text, which referred to the responsibilities of the NPPO of the importing country, was necessary given that importing responsibilities were documented in ISPM 14 (*The use of integrated measure sin a systems approach for pest risk management*), which was already cited in this part of the draft annex. The TPCS agreed to retain the new text.
- [29] The TPCS considered another consultation comment that questioned the need for the list of examples of integrated measures in the body text. The steward noted that this would be a major change to the standard but it was not certain that the examples listed were being used in international trade and it may be better to omit the measures if the TPCS did not have evidence that the measures worked. The TPCS noted the need to avoid duplication between the list of examples and the options for phytosanitary measures listed in the table on systems approaches, but they also recognized that the list of examples may help to clarify the concept of systems approaches. The TPCS therefore decided to retain the list of examples for the time being, pending the second consultation.
- [30] **Distinguishing between measures adopted by the CPM and other measures.** The steward explained that, in response to a consultation comment, she had distinguished CPM-adopted measures from other measures in all the tables of pest-specific options for phytosanitary measures and had added some additional text to explain the distinction. The TPCS agreed to some slightly modified wording that would remain valid once the draft annex itself was adopted.

- [31] **Systems approaches for fruit flies.** The steward referred the TPCS to the second of the two systems approaches listed in the draft annex: ISPM 35 (*Systems approach for pest risk management of fruit flies (Tephritidae)*). Although ISPM 35 was applicable to all Tephritidae, the steward asked whether it was valid to list it for all tephritid fruit fly species in the annex, given that no evidence had been submitted of its use in trade for fruit flies other than *Anastrepha* spp. One of the TPCS members confirmed that some African countries used ISPM 35 for tephritid fruit flies, and offered to check whether this was only for *Ceratitis* spp. and *Bactrocera zonata* or also other species. The steward commented that, as ISPM 35 is an international standard, she considered it acceptable to include it for all fruit flies, pending comments during second consultation.
- [32] **Codes used for measures.** The steward explained that one consultation comment had suggested that commodity standards use the same treatment codes used in the IPPC phytosanitary treatments search tool on the International Phytosanitary Portal.³ The TPCS noted that this would make the codes longer than at present in commodity standards, which could give a more cluttered look, but recognized the value in using the same codes if the search tool were to be combined with a commodity-standards database in future. The steward suggested that she try using the codes and present both options to the SC-7 for their decision.
- [33] **Combining all heat treatments into one table.** The steward explained that she had combined the table for high temperature forced air with that for vapour heat treatment in response to a consultation comment. She had not, however, combined the resulting table with that for hot water immersion treatment, as she did not think this made the annex easier to read. The TPCS agreed to keep the tables for hot water immersion treatment and vapour heat treatment separate, as the parameters given for the two types of treatment were different.
- [34] **Incorrect reference for hot water immersion treatment.** The steward agreed with the consultation comment that a reference provided for one of the hot water immersion treatments was incorrect and should be replaced. Two TPCS members agreed to confirm the correct reference.
- [35] **Table of systems approaches.** The steward highlighted the changes she had made to this table in response to consultation comments: she had added ISPM 35, identifying the main critical control points described in ISPM 35, and had added another reference. She had also added some extra text to the other systems approach listed.

The TPCS:

- (2) *noted* that Mariangela CIAMPITTI (Italy) and Alfayo OMBUYA (Kenya) would advise the steward on the correct reference to use for the final hot water immersion treatment listed in the draft annex *International movement of fresh Mangifera indica* (2021-011) to ISPM 46; and
- (3) *agreed* to review the draft annex *International movement of fresh Mangifera indica* (2021-011) to ISPM 46 at their next meeting, with a view to agreeing the responses to first consultation comments and recommending the revised draft to the SC-7 for approval for second consultation.

6. Any other business

- [36] The secretariat referred to an online space that had been created to brainstorm ideas about how to improve the operations of the secretariat's Standard Setting Unit⁴.

7. Next TPCS meeting

- [37] The next meeting will be held in virtual mode on 7 February 2024 at 10.00 CET (Rome time; UTC +1).

³ Phytosanitary treatments search tool: <https://www.ippc.int/en/centre-of-excellence/phytosanitary-treatments-tool/>

⁴ Standard Setting Unit brainstorming page: <https://forms.office.com/e/WqDTBeZYz7>

[38] The secretariat explained that, at their next meeting, the TPCS would need to consider not only the revised draft annex International movement of fresh *Mangifera indica* (2021-011) but also the TPCS working procedures.

8. Close of the meeting

[39] The secretariat 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)
1.2 Welcoming new TPCS members: new Assistant Stewards		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_Dec	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. SC Updates to the TPCS		
4.1 SC Updates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider topics added to List of Topics – advice on which priority 1 should be developed first Develop TPCS criteria to be used by the SC for considering future priorities Review of section 7.4 of IPPC Standard Setting Procedure Manual 	02_TPCS_Tel_2023_Dec	IPPC Secretariat / WILSON (Steward)/ All
5. TPCS work programme		
5.1 Draft Annex to ISPM 46: International movement of fresh <i>Mangifera indica</i> fruit: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summary of major points / steward's notes Response to consultations comments Compiled comments from consultation period (for reference) 	2021-011 03_TPCS_Tel_2023_Dec (responses to first consultation comments)	WILSON / All
5. Any other business	--	Chairperson
6. Next TPCS meeting		IPPC Secretariat / Chairperson
7. Closing of the meeting	--	IPPC Secretariat / Chairperson