



Food and Agriculture
Organization of the
United Nations



International
Plant Protection
Convention

REPORT

Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols (TPDP)

**Angers, France
21-25 July 2025**

IPPC Secretariat

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, 2026



Some rights reserved. This work is made available under the Creative Commons Attribution- 4.0 International licence (CC BY 4.0: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/legalcode.en>).

Under the terms of this licence, this work may be copied, redistributed and adapted, 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 a translation or adaptation of this work is created, it must include the following disclaimer along with the required citation: "This translation [or adaptation] 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 [or adaptation]. The original English edition shall be the authoritative edition."

Any dispute arising under this licence that cannot be settled amicably shall be referred to arbitration in accordance with the Arbitration Rules of the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL). The parties shall be bound by any arbitration award rendered as a result of such arbitration as the final adjudication of such a dispute.

Third-party materials. This Creative Commons licence CC BY 4.0 does not apply to non-FAO copyright materials included in this publication. 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.

FAO photographs. FAO photographs that may appear in this work are not subject to the above-mentioned Creative Commons licence. Queries for the use of any FAO photographs should be submitted to: photo-library@fao.org.

Sales, rights and licensing. FAO information products are available on the FAO website (<https://www.fao.org/publications>) and print copies can be purchased through the distributors listed there. For general enquiries about FAO publications please contact: publications@fao.org. Queries regarding rights and licensing of publications should be submitted to: copyright@fao.org.

CONTENTS

1. Opening of the Meeting	5
1.1 Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat.....	5
1.2 Welcome by ANSES.....	5
2. Meeting Arrangements	5
2.1 Selection of the chairperson and vice-chairperson	5
2.2 Selection of the rapporteur.....	5
2.3 Adoption of the agenda.....	6
3. Administrative matters	6
3.1 Documents list	6
3.2 Participants list	6
3.3 Local information for participants	6
3.4 TPDP working procedures.....	6
3.5 Review of the IPPC standard setting procedure	6
4. EPPO and TPDP.....	7
4.1. EPPO plant pest diagnostic protocols.....	7
5. TPDP work programme –Instructions for Authors	8
5.1 Review of Instructions to Authors.....	8
6. Review of new draft DPs: for recommendation to the SC for consultation period	11
6.1 Tomato brown rugose fruit virus (2021-025), priority 1	11
6.2 <i>Thaumatotibia leucotreta</i> (2023-029), priority 1.....	13
6.3 <i>Amaranthus palmeri</i> (2019-006), priority 2	15
7. TPDP Work Programme – Review of draft DPs updated after Expert Consultation.....	16
7.1 <i>Dickeya</i> spp. (2021-014), priority 2.....	16
8. TPDP work programme: Review of topics in the work programme	18
8.1 Update on draft DPs in the work programme	18
9. TPDP and IPPC activities.....	18
9.2 Discussion on “Rethinking ISPMs”.....	20
9.3 TPDP and Diagnostic Laboratory Networking DAI: examples of existing plant health diagnostic networks	20
9.4 TPDP and Africa Phytosanitary Programme (APP): potential synergies	21
9.5 TPDP and International Forestry Quarantine Research Group (IFQRG).....	21
9.6 Communication material: review of IPPC video script for TPDP activities	22
9.7 New procedure for hosting TPDP meetings	22
10. Any other business	22
11. Recommendations to the Standards Committee (SC) or IPPC Secretariat.....	23
12. Tentative dates for upcoming meetings.....	23
13. Evaluation of the meeting.....	23
14. Closing of the meeting	23

Appendix 1: Agenda.....	25
Appendix 2: Documents list	28
Appendix 3: Participants list	30

1. Opening of the Meeting

1.1 Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat

- [1] The Deputy Lead to the Standard Setting Unit (SSU), Adriana G. MOREIRA, from the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) Secretariat (hereafter “the secretariat”), welcomed the participants of the Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols (TPDP) meeting and thanked ANSES (Agence Nationale de Sécurité Sanitaire) Plant Health Laboratory for hosting the meeting in Angers, France. She emphasized the critical role of the TPDP panel in harmonizing diagnostic procedures at the global level, noting that this alignment strengthens worldwide surveillance as well as preparedness and response capabilities. She also highlighted that the TPDP meeting provides a valuable platform for exchanging scientific knowledge, sharing best practices, and fostering innovation in diagnostic techniques. This collaborative environment enables experts to address emerging challenges, adapt to new technologies, and enhance the overall efficiency and accuracy of plant pest and disease diagnosis.

1.2 Welcome by ANSES

- [2] Mr. Philippe REIGNAULT, Director of the ANSES Plant Health Laboratory, welcomed participants, acknowledged their contributions to standard-setting activities, and expressed his wishes for a productive meeting.
- [3] He provided an overview of the work of ANSES, established in 2010 as a “One Health” agency covering multiple domains, including plant health, animal health, environmental health, occupational health, and food safety. He explained that ANSES carries out several core missions: assessing health risks, generating scientific knowledge, evaluating applications for marketing authorization, and developing monitoring tools and alert systems. In support of these activities, ANSES maintains extensive collaborations at both national and European Union levels, involving organizations, research centres, universities, and the European Commission.
- [4] He noted that the production of scientific knowledge is undertaken by a network of laboratories operating across diverse research areas, including plant health. ANSES comprises nine laboratories across sixteen sites, employing approximately 700 staff. In the area of plant health, laboratories are distributed across six sites. He emphasized that plant health and plant protection are complementary fields: plant health focuses on regulated and emerging pests, while plant protection addresses plant protection products and their effects on crops, forest species, wild flora, and urban vegetation.
- [5] It was also highlighted that three of ANSES units are also recognized as European Union Reference Laboratories (EURL): Entomology (insects and mites) in collaboration with AGES, Nematology in collaboration with ILVO and Mycology (fungi and oomycetes).
- [6] Following the introduction by the host, the participants introduced themselves briefly.
- [7] The Secretariat welcomed the new members Mr Adrian DINSDALE (Mycologist – Australia), and Mr Sietse VAN DER LINDE (Mycologist – Netherlands).

2. Meeting Arrangements

Presentation on roles for the meeting

- [8] The secretariat provided a presentation on the roles of participants for this meeting, such as experts, chairperson, rapporteur, secretariat, invited experts, steward (s), host/organizer.

2.1 Selection of the chairperson and vice-chairperson

- [9] The TPDP selected Géraldine ANTHOINE as chairperson.

2.2 Selection of the rapporteur

- [10] The TPDP selected Robert TAYLOR as rapporteur.

2.3 Adoption of the agenda

- [11] The TPDP adopted the agenda (Appendix 1). The secretariat clarified that some agenda items will be moving around to accommodate the TPDP experts joining online.

3. Administrative matters

- [12] The documents list (Appendix 2) and the participants' list (Appendix 3) had been made available to the TPDP before the meeting.

3.1 Documents list

- [13] The secretariat introduced the documents list and announced that all documents had been posted prior the meeting.

3.2 Participants list

- [14] The secretariat introduced the participants list. It was informed that Mr Vijayasankar RAMAN and Mr Norman BARR could not attend the meeting in person, therefore they would participate online according to their respective time zones. In addition, Ms Mi Chi YEA (Standards Committee (SC) assistant steward) could not attend the meeting.

3.3 Local information for participants

- [15] The host presented the local information¹.

3.4 TPDP working procedures

- [16] The secretariat introduced the documents, provided an overview of the technical panel's work, and encouraged all members to familiarize themselves with the procedures.
- [17] A member inquired about access to the TPDP e-forums and how the tool operates. The secretariat explained that it is used for electronic decision-making and that background documents are made available to the TPDP as needed to support the process. Another member asked whether it would be possible to receive notifications from the IPP when meeting documents are posted. The secretariat clarified that, for e-forums, automatic notifications are sent when a member submits a comment, but not when meeting documents are uploaded. The secretariat added that they would explore this possibility with their IT support colleagues and consider introducing it as an optional feature.

3.5 Review of the IPPC standard setting procedure

- [18] The secretariat introduced the standard setting process², underlining the specific process to develop diagnostic protocols (DPs). The secretariat recalled that DPs are developed as annexes of ISPM 27 (*Diagnostic protocols for regulated pests*) under the supervision of the Standard Committee (SC) based on Specification TP 01³. It was noted that as of July 2025 there are 34 adopted DPs under various disciplines and 24 in the work programme under development (under the *List of topics for IPPC standards*).
- [19] The video on the IPPC standard setting procedure⁴ was presented to the participants.
- [20] A participant asked whether there are established criteria for including a test or method in a draft diagnostic protocol. It was explained that, at a minimum, methods must be published; however, the availability of validation data is not required and is considered on a case-by-case basis, depending on

¹ 04_TPDP_2025_July

² Presentation IPPC standard setting process: <https://ippc.int/en/publications/90063/>

³ Specification TP 1 – TPDP: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/1297/>

⁴ IPPC Standard Setting Procedure video: <https://youtu.be/W8zciLFG--8>

the discipline. It was also noted that IPPC DPs cover a wide range of applications and that the Standards Committee (SC) has not made a firm decision requiring validation as a condition for inclusion. That said, the TPDP's recent practice has been to include methods supported by validation data whenever available. General guidance on the inclusion of methods in IPPC diagnostic protocols is provided in the Instructions to Authors document.

[21] A participant asked about the IPPC approach to detection and identification steps. The Secretariat clarified that, in IPPC diagnostic protocols and in accordance with ISPM 5, these are treated as two distinct components of plant pest diagnosis.

[22] A participant inquired about the frequency of updates to IPPC DPs. The Secretariat explained that, as a general rule, DPs are updated approximately every five years, although this may vary depending on need, for example updates may occur sooner in response to taxonomic changes or the addition of new species to a complex. Minor, targeted modifications that do not affect test results can be processed more quickly through a streamlined procedure and submitted directly to the SC. In contrast, more substantial revisions require a more extensive process, including at least one round of country consultation.

[23] The TPDP:

- (1) *noted* the presentation and the links to the various resources.

4. EPPO and TPDP

4.1. EPPO plant pest diagnostic protocols

[24] Olga Tikka, Director-General of the European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization (EPPO) and invited expert to the TPDP meeting, delivered a presentation on EPPO's work in diagnostics. She noted that EPPO is a regional standard-setting body for phytosanitary measures (PM) and plant protection products (PP), with diagnostics covered under Standard PM 7. She further explained that EPPO coordinates several specialized technical panels in diagnostic disciplines, including nematology, bacteriology, entomology, virology and phytoplasmology and mycology. These specialized panels are currently engaged in revising existing standards, developing new pest-specific standards, and addressing cross-cutting issues. The work of these panels is coordinated by a horizontal panel on diagnostics and quality assurance that provides guidance on strategic and methodological aspects, including ongoing work on topics such as DNA barcoding as an identification tool, basic requirements for quality management in plant pest diagnostic laboratories, and guidelines for organizing interlaboratory comparisons.

[25] Several past and upcoming EPPO events were presented, including the announcement of the EPPO Conference on Diagnostics 2026, to be held from 22 to 24 April 2026 in Vienna, Austria, and hosted by AGES. Key themes of the conference will include advancing laboratory and on-site diagnostic technologies, reference materials, test development and validation, emerging pests, pest risk analysis (PRA) and regulation, and initiatives to strengthen plant health systems.

[26] The EPPO Director-General also introduced several EPPO databases, including the database on diagnostic expertise, which provides an inventory of available expertise across the EPPO region; the EPPO Q-bank, which supports phytosanitary diagnostic activities by providing validated sequences derived from vouchered biological material; the EPPO Global Database, which contains information on over 90,000 species, including datasheets, PRA reports, and images; as well as the EPPO platforms on pest risk analysis and communication materials.

[27] The TPDP:

- (2) *noted* the presentation from EPPO work related to diagnostic protocols.

5. TPDP work programme –Instructions for Authors

5.1 Review of Instructions to Authors

- [28] The champion for the Instructions to Authors document, Ms Géraldine ANTHOINE introduced paper 05_TPDP_2025_July, giving an overview of the document and noting that comments captured reflects discussions from the panel from the last three years.
- [29] The TPDP discussed the main points as follows:
- [30] **Structure / Repetition.** It was noted that there is some redundancy between the main body text and the appendices, with guidance dispersed throughout the document, which may be confusing for authors. It was therefore suggested that a blank template be provided as Annex 1, while consolidating all guidance within the main text. It was further observed that, with 34 diagnostic protocols (DPs) now adopted across different disciplines, these could be referenced to support and streamline the drafting of new DPs.
- [31] **Unpublished information and personal communication.** Comments were raised regarding the use of unpublished information and personal communications in DPs. The TPDP discussed this issue, noting that current guidance advises authors to avoid citing oral information, although only a few instances of such citations have occurred. As a follow-up to the 2022 meeting, the TPDP had previously requested that the secretariat include the option of citing “personal communication” in the *Instructions to Authors*. The IPPC scientific copy editor indicated that internal guidance already allows for this (“Personal communications may be cited in DPs”), pending the revision of the TPDP *Instructions to Authors*. However, the TPDP questioned whether this internal guidance is accessible to authors and noted that, if not, explicit guidance should be included in the updated instructions.
- [32] The TPDP agreed to include guidance advising authors to avoid citing personal communications. Where such citations are deemed necessary, they should be obtained directly from the primary source to the DP drafting group and be both recent and relevant. In discussing the definition of “recent,” the TPDP agreed that this should refer to information obtained during the development of the draft DP, in order to facilitate timely progression toward adoption.
- [33] **Controls for molecular tests.** The TPDP discussed the need for further horizontal consideration and clarification of the minimum requirements for controls in molecular tests. While noting that relevant guidance had been agreed by the panel in previous years and is included in Appendix 7, it was observed that additional information is also provided in Appendix 1, although not consistently (e.g. gaps exist for methods such as DNA barcoding). The panel considered whether to introduce a new appendix, particularly in light of the recognized need to address methods such as DNA barcoding, LAMP, RPA, and high-throughput sequencing (HTS). The TPDP agreed to develop a separate appendix dedicated to controls for molecular tests to ensure clarity and consistency.
- [34] **Guidance to Inclusion of a test in a DP.** The TPDP emphasized that DPs are not intended to be scientific reviews. The inclusion of a test should therefore be assessed within a broader context, taking into account factors such as validation status, specificity, routine use, cost, and overall test performance. The TPDP agreed to reflect this principle in the guidance and to request that DP authors provide a rationale for the inclusion or exclusion of tests. This rationale should be shared with the discipline lead and, where appropriate, with the TPDP, but would not form part of the DP itself.
- [35] **Permissions.** The TPDP noted that the current version of the *Instructions to Authors* states that the Secretariat is responsible for obtaining permission to use photographs or other illustrations. In practice, however, this responsibility is sometimes undertaken by discipline leads or lead authors. To reflect actual practice more accurately, the TPDP agreed that the responsibility for obtaining permissions should follow a clear sequence: first the lead author, then the discipline lead if necessary, and ultimately the Secretariat as a last step.
- [36] **Geographical distribution of a pest.** The TPDP agreed that references within DPs should remain general and avoid mentioning specific countries, unless a clear and justified rationale exists.

- [37] **Nomenclature.** The TPDP agreed that referencing ZooBank is no longer preferred, as it is not considered the most comprehensive database. The secretariat requested further justification for this position, noting that the issue is currently under discussion in the context of harmonizing references across ISPMs, including work on commodity standards under ISPM 46. It was emphasized that clear guidance and a well-substantiated rationale from the TPDP would support the Standards Committee in adopting a consistent approach.
- [38] The TPDP also discussed issues related to citing taxonomic authorities and dates, particularly in cases involving multiple authors. To advance this work, the TPDP requested David Ouvrard to prepare a draft text proposal, including a rationale for replacing references to ZooBank with a more suitable database (e.g. GBIF).
- [39] **Other scientific names.** The TPDP noted that not all synonyms can be true ones. Therefore, the TPDP agreed in 2024 that the draft DPs section would be refereed as to “other scientific names”, and this should be reflected in the Instructions to Authors.
- [40] **Detection and identification.** It was noted that consultation comments had suggested that descriptions of specimens should be placed under the “Identification” section rather than the “Detection” section. The TPDP recalled that it had previously recognized the need for clearer differentiation between detection and identification. In addition to existing guidance in ISPM 27, the panel agreed that further clarification for authors is necessary. The secretariat also recalled the definition of “pest diagnosis” in ISPM 5⁵:

Pest diagnosis: The process of detection and identification of a pest [ISPM 27, 2006].

- [41] During the discussion, the TPDP noted that the distinction between detection and identification varies depending on the discipline and the type of method used. For example, in virology, detection is often a preliminary step and may involve describing the sample in terms of observed symptoms; this is typically followed by identification, which in most cases involves the application of molecular methods with the use of generic or specific primers and sequencing techniques. In contrast, for fungi and insects, the distinction may be less clear, and in some cases, a complete diagnosis may be achieved in a single step, for example by analysing the morphology of the pest.
- [42] As an illustration, in mycology, morphological identification often requires prior isolation of the organism; thus, isolation is considered an integral component of the detection process. The TPDP acknowledged that detection and identification are not always readily separable and agreed that the definitions should remain flexible. Accordingly, it was agreed to include the following clarifying statement in the Instructions to Authors: “The TPDP acknowledges that the above distinctions may not be fully applicable to every diagnostic protocol.” In addition, the TPDP agreed to provide discipline-specific guidance on how such cases should be addressed.
- [43] Furthermore, the TPDP noted that its member from Australia will circulate a document from the Australian NPPO, which may provide additional guidance to inform its work on the detection/identification issue.
- [44] **Sampling.** The TPDP agreed that the section on sampling is very comprehensive and that there was no need to have a separate section on it.
- [45] **Sequencing and DNA barcoding.** The TPDP acknowledged that the level of detail currently varies across disciplines within the draft DPs. At the same time, it was agreed that a more standardized approach to the level of guidance should be further developed by the panel. To this end, the TPDP agreed that the two new TPDP members who have experience in sequencing approaches will review the current Appendix 8, with a view to explicitly addressing the interpretation of sequencing results and, where

⁵ ISPM 05: Glossary of phytosanitary terms: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/622/>

appropriate, aligning the text with the main document. A revised version will be prepared for circulation to the panel by December 2025.

- [46] **Records.** The TPDP had previously agreed to consider collectively which records are required for first detection and for routine diagnosis, and whether these should be more explicitly defined. Following further discussion, the TPDP concluded that the current guidance is sufficient, as it refers to ISPM 27, which provides the necessary flexibility.
- [47] **Contact points.** The discussion focused on both the ordering of entries and whether to list individuals or institutions. Some members suggested that the order should reflect the level of expertise, given that these contacts may be approached in case of technical queries, and also proposed including representatives from different regions. The Secretariat recalled earlier TPDP discussions recommending that institutions, rather than individual experts, be listed to ensure the long-term validity of the protocols, as individuals may change roles or retire. The TPDP agreed with this approach. However, it was also recognized that, after identifying the institution, naming a specific expert remains necessary to facilitate direct contact. In conclusion, the TPDP agreed to list institutions alongside a designated expert contact and to leave the ordering of entries to the discretion of the drafting team.
- [48] **“Methods, test, assays”⁶.** The TPDP revisited the terminology used in diagnostic protocols (DPs), with particular focus on the terms “assay,” “method,” and “test.” It was noted that “assay” should no longer be used in IPPC DPs, as it is difficult to translate and interpret consistently across languages and is not widely applied. The panel agreed that “method” is a broader and more appropriate term, encompassing multiple techniques (e.g. PCR and HTS), while “test” is more specific and should be used in accordance with the definition provided in ISPM 5.
- [49] In conclusion, the TPDP agreed that this clarification should be incorporated into the appendix on “Guidelines on formatting of DPs” in the IPPC Instructions to Authors.
- Test: Official examination, other than inspection, of plants, plant products or other regulated articles, to determine if pests are present, identify pests or verify conformity with specific phytosanitary requirements, using for example chemical, molecular or serological characterization [FAO, 1990; revised CPM, 2018; CPM, 2024]*
- [50] **Positive synthetic controls.** A consultation comment addressed the potential use of positive synthetic controls. The TPDP recalled that, while their use is possible, it requires careful consideration. It was previously agreed not to include additional information on band size in the draft DPs, but to consider providing general guidance in the Instructions to Authors. The TPDP reaffirmed that positive synthetic controls should be a last-resort option, mentioned with caution and only where appropriate to the method or test. This approach will be specified in Appendix 8.
- [51] **“should”, “may”, “can”.** The TPDP discussed the use of “should,” “may,” and “can,” noting that these terms have been widely considered across IPPC technical panels and governing bodies. The secretariat clarified that “should” carries a stronger obligation, while “may” and “can” are broadly equivalent. In conclusion, the TPDP agreed to refer to the IPPC Style Guide for guidance on their use.
- [52] **Tables.** The TPDP agreed that, as a general rule, table entries should be presented in alphabetical order, except where a taxonomic arrangement is required.
- [53] **Authorities.** The IPPC Style Guide (section 10.1) specifies that authorities and dates are required only for the target pest that is the subject of the DP, unless their omission could cause ambiguity, while guidance in the TPDP Instructions to Authors is less explicit regarding host species and other organisms. One member stressed that including both consistently for every species mentioned improves clarity and reduces ambiguity. While some members agreed this is technically preferable, others highlighted the need for a pragmatic approach to avoid making protocols overly complex or difficult to read.

⁶ 2016-07 TPDP Meeting Report: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/82977/>

[54] **References.** Several consultation comments sought clarification on whether journal issue numbers should be included in references. The TPDP noted that the IPPC Style Guide requires volume numbers, while issue numbers are optional, and that current drafts showed inconsistencies. The editor noted that issue numbers may be unnecessary when a DOI is provided and could be included only when no DOI is available. Following discussion, the TPDP agreed to prioritize the inclusion of DOIs instead of issue numbers, and that this approach should be reflected in Appendix 2.

[55] **Appendix 3.** The TPDP agreed that Appendix 3 should be updated to incorporate new information and recommendations once all other sections have been finalized. Moreover, the TPDP requested that the editor develop a checklist for authors to use in identifying key elements to review.

[56] **Concentration of nucleic acid solution.** Some consultation comments requested inclusion of nucleic acid solution concentrations. The TPDP noted that determining these can be challenging and costly, and considered whether guidance would be needed only in specific cases. In conclusion, the TPDP decided not to include such information, as it is not considered relevant for routine diagnosis.

[57] **Control options for molecular tests for pest categories and purposes of the tests (current Appendix 7).** The TPDP agreed to invite each discipline lead to revise the relevant section for their respective discipline, with updates to be further discussed at a future meeting.

[58] The TPDP:

- (3) *agreed* to include a blank template as Appendix 1 to facilitate easier reference for authors;
- (4) *agreed* to transfer the content of the current Appendix 1 (“template”) into a new appendix and *requested* that Geraldine ANTHOINE and Juliet GOLDSMITH would work on it;
- (5) *requested* that David OUVARD work on the current Appendix 2;
- (6) *agreed* to develop a new appendix on controls for molecular tests, expanding coverage of RPA, HTS, sequencing, and other methods, and *requested* Robert TAYLOR to lead this work by the end of 2025, for subsequent circulation to the TPDP (via e-forum or virtual meeting);
- (7) *agreed* to include guidance for authors to avoid personal communications, or, where unavoidable, to ensure they are direct, recent, and relevant (i.e. from primary source to DP drafting group);
- (8) *agreed* to include a statement clarifying that IPPC DPs are not scientific reviews;
- (9) *agreed* to require authors to provide a rationale for the inclusion or exclusion of tests in DPs, to be shared with the discipline lead and subsequently the TPDP;
- (10) *agreed* that picture permission requests should follow a sequential process: DP drafting group, discipline lead, then the secretariat;
- (11) *requested* Adrian and Sietse to update and revise current Appendix 8;

6. Review of new draft DPs: for recommendation to the SC for consultation period

[59] *Note:* The draft DPs provided in this section are still going to be submitted for the IPPC DP Expert Consultation period.

6.1 Tomato brown rugose fruit virus (2021-025), priority 1

[60] The discipline lead, Andrew APPIAH, introduced the draft DP and the supporting documentation⁷.

[61] The draft DP, developed by a drafting team of six virology experts, describes the detection and identification of ToBRFV in tomato. He explained that ToBRFV is an emerging seed- and contact-transmitted virus affecting tomato and pepper crops, causing reduced plant vigour, yield losses and unmarketable fruit. The virus may also be present in asymptomatic plants.

[62] The draft protocol includes serological (DAS-ELISA) and molecular (RT-PCR, RT-qPCR and amplicon sequencing) methods. While he highlighted that the draft covers the key technical elements, it was noted

⁷ 2021-025, 16_TPDP_2025_July and 12_TPDP_2025_July

that additional work is needed to complete the protocol, including the inclusion of flow diagrams, photographs and references. The draft provides a sound basis for discussion but requires further development before it is ready to progress.

- [63] It was explained that the draft builds on existing regional diagnostic protocols, including the EPPO diagnostic protocol published in 2022 (PM 7/146 (2)) and the recently published NAPPO diagnostic protocol, which focuses primarily on seed testing.
- [64] Finally, it was acknowledged the work completed by the previous discipline lead for this DP, Ms Vessela MAVRODIEVA.
- [65] Discussion on the draft DP by the TPDP:
- [66] **Discussions on the composition of the DP drafting group.** One member inquired whether one of the authors listed in the cover paper had been formally selected by the TPDP, and the secretariat agreed to verify the relevant nomination records from previous calls. It was clarified that experts contributing to the drafting process should be recognized in the acknowledgements section; however, participation as a member of the drafting group, and therefore as an author, must follow the official IPPC selection process.
- [67] **Nomenclature.** The TPDP discussed the appropriate nomenclature for viruses in diagnostic protocols, particularly following recent guidance from the International Committee on Taxonomy of Viruses (ICTV). The discussion clarified that binomial Latin names should be used only when referring to taxonomic classification, and not for the virus or associated disease itself. The TPDP emphasized the importance of retaining English virus names in the main text, as these remain the most widely recognized and commonly used terms. In conclusion, the TPDP agreed that binomial nomenclature should be limited to taxonomic references, while English names should continue to be used throughout the protocols. The Secretariat noted that this would be addressed during the editorial stage in line with ICTV guidance.
- [68] **Asymptomatic samples.** One member requested clarification in the text on whether the virus can occur in asymptomatic material, as indicated in the Pest Information section. It was noted that, depending on whether the entire plant or only parts of it are asymptomatic (i.e. whether the virus is systemic), this has implications for surveillance programmes, survey design, and sampling strategies.
- [69] **Taxonomic information.** The TPDP discussed what information should be retained in the “References” subsection of the Taxonomic Information section. It was agreed that corresponding guidance will be included in the Instructions to Authors during the next collective review of the revised version.
- [70] **Potential of false negatives and false positives.** One member requested clarification regarding the specificity data and the inclusion of certain tests (e.g. RT-PCR), particularly in relation to their potential to produce false-negative or false-positive results.
- [71] The TPDP also requested a clearer justification for the inclusion of each test and recommended excluding methods that are known to have limitations in specificity or sensitivity that could lead to false-positive or false-negative results.
- [72] **Figures and pictures.** The TPDP highlighted the value of including figures and pictures illustrating the symptoms and requested that the DP drafting group provide suitable images, together with the necessary permissions for their use.
- [73] **Seed testing.** One member requested additional information on the ISHI test. It was explained that the test is widely used by the seed industry and that the protocol is publicly available. It was further noted that the method has been validated and has undergone ring testing.
- [74] **Identification.** The TPDP recommended that the DP drafting group revise this section to provide greater clarity and identify the most reliable tests for achieving robust results while minimizing the risk of false-positive results. The TPDP also requested clarification on the role of the ELISA test, specifically whether

it is intended as a screening method requiring confirmation by additional tests, or whether it can be used to confirm identification on its own.

- [75] **Sequencing.** The TPDP acknowledged the need for additional information on sample preparation for sequencing, sequence analysis, and the interpretation of results (e.g. BLAST analysis, Phred scores, and percentage sequence similarity). It was also noted that certain key details are currently missing, including the reference sequences and databases to be used.
- [76] **HTS technologies.** The TPDP noted that the drafting group was discussing the potential inclusion of high-throughput sequencing (HTS). It was agreed that, if HTS is included in the draft DP, minimum guidance on its implementation should be provided. However, one member pointed out that HTS may not constitute a minimum requirement for conducting a diagnostic test and therefore may not need to be included as a standard component of the protocol.
- [77] **Records - Isolates collection.** It was noted that the initial draft included guidance on the submission of isolates and sequence data for record keeping. Although this is not part of the diagnostic process, the panel agreed that it represents good practice, particularly for laboratory diagnostic networks, to encourage the submission of isolates and sequence data to relevant collections.
- [78] The TPDP:
- (12) *thanked* the current and former discipline leads and the DP drafting group for Tomato brown rugose fruit virus (2021-025);
 - (13) *agreed* that the discipline lead and the DP drafting group will further revise the draft DP with the adjustments agreed to at this meeting – by mid October 2025;
 - (14) *requested* the secretariat to open Expert Consultation Period for this draft DP after its revision;
 - (15) *agreed* to present back the revised draft DP, from the expert consultation to the TPDP (via e-decision or virtual meeting) with the recommendation to the SC for approval for consultation period.

6.2 *Thaumatotibia leucotreta* (2023-029), priority 1

- [79] The discipline lead, Juliet GOLDSMITH, introduced the draft DP and the supporting documentation.
- [80] She noted that the proposed revisions to the diagnostic protocol were intended to improve the document's clarity, scientific consistency, and practical usability. The revisions focused on streamlining repetitive content, particularly within the pest biology section, standardizing scientific terminology and taxonomic nomenclature, and improving the logical organization and readability of the text. Attention was also given to clarifying methodological procedures for larval preparation and examination, strengthening guidance for molecular diagnostic methods, and improving the consistency of figures, references, and diagnostic keys.
- [81] Discussion on the draft DP by the TPDP:
- [82] **Geographical distribution.** The TPDP reviewed the text relating to the geographical distribution of the pest, recalling the earlier discussion on this matter in the Instructions to Authors. It was noted that, in this instance, a general statement indicating that the pest has been reported outside its native range, without referring to specific countries, would be appropriate and informative. This approach was considered sufficient to indicate the pest's capacity for spread while maintaining consistency with the agreed drafting principles.
- [83] **Identification.** The TPDP agreed that clarification is needed on whether the different larval stages can be reliably distinguished and, if so, how this can be achieved. One member also noted the need to specify whether the closely related non-pathogenic species mentioned may occur alongside *T. leucotreta*, either spatially or temporally. This information is important to determine the intended purpose and applicability of the identification method.

- [84] **Glossary of characteristics.** The drafting group had initially proposed the inclusion of a glossary of characteristics specific to this pest. Although this section was subsequently removed in order to align the document with the standard IPPC DPs template, the TPDP recommended that the relevant characteristic descriptions be incorporated within the main text or in the captions of figures. This was considered important to ensure that essential information supporting accurate and reliable pest diagnosis is retained in the protocol.
- [85] **Minimum requirements.** The TPDP highlighted that further clarification is still necessary regarding the minimum requirements for diagnosis, particularly to determine whether a combination of morphological identification, host plant information, and location data is sufficient for reliable identification of the pest, or whether molecular confirmation should also be required. It was also pointed out that, in addition to accurate identification of the pest itself, it is equally important to minimise the risk of confusion or misidentification with other morphologically similar species.
- [86] **Determination of live larvae.** The TPDP discussed whether this section should be included in the DP and whether it forms part of the diagnostic process. The discipline lead explained that the drafting group had proposed its inclusion because of its potential relevance for regulatory purposes. However, the TPDP questioned whether assessing larval viability constitutes a minimum diagnostic requirement, noting that the diagnostic procedures described in the DP require the larva to be rendered non-viable in any case. The TPDP also discussed where such information would be most appropriately placed within the document. Ultimately, the TPDP agreed that this is not part of the diagnostic process and therefore does not represent a minimum requirement for diagnosis.
- [87] **Identification of pupae.** The discipline lead noted that species-level identification of pupae is generally difficult and unreliable, and therefore the information provided may have limited diagnostic value. The TPDP agreed that, although examination of pupae may help exclude certain families within the Order, it cannot provide reliable species-level identification. As this is insufficient for diagnostic purposes, the information was considered outside the scope of the DP.
- [88] **Interpretation of results.** The TPDP noted that the section on interpretation of results requires revision, as some information is missing. In addition, concerns were raised regarding the potential for false-positive results observed in some tests. It was explained that performance data had been provided, allowing users to determine the suitability of the test for its intended use, such as routine diagnosis or surveillance.
- [89] **Specificity and sensitivity.** The TPDP discussed whether additional details, such as the number of specimens used to determine sensitivity and specificity data, should be included. It was clarified that this information is not required; however, if available, it would be useful supplementary information for the protocol.
- [90] The TPDP:
- (16) *thanked* the discipline lead and the DP drafting group for *Thaumatotibia leucotreta* (2023-029);
 - (17) *agreed* that the lead author will further revise the draft DP with the adjustments agreed at this meeting – by mid-October 2025;
 - (18) *requested* the secretariat to open Expert Consultation Period for this draft DP after its revision;
 - (19) *agreed* to present back the revised draft DP, from the expert consultation to the TPDP (via e-decision or virtual meeting) with the recommendation to the SC for approval for consultation period.

6.3 *Amaranthus palmeri* (2019-006), priority 2

- [91] The DP discipline lead, Vijayasankar RAMAN, introduced the draft DP and the supporting documentation⁸. Main points raised by the discipline lead were as follows.
- [92] The discipline lead introduced the draft diagnostic protocol (DP) for *Amaranthus palmeri* and provided an overview of its development. The subject was added to the TPDP work programme in 2019. Following several unsuccessful calls for authors, a drafting team was established in 2022 and reconstructed in 2024, with an additional expert contributing to the molecular methods section.
- [93] The first draft of the DP was completed in June 2025. Most comments from the initial review by the discipline lead have been incorporated, and the referee has initiated a detailed review. The draft has not yet undergone expert consultation.
- [94] The draft protocol describes morphological, biochemical and molecular methods for the detection and identification of *A. palmeri*. It was noted that the genus *Amaranthus* comprises more than 90 species, many of which are morphologically similar, making accurate species identification challenging and highlighting the value of the proposed diagnostic protocol.
- [95] Discussion on the draft DP by the TPDP:
- [96] **Country names.** Building on discussions held during the review of previous draft DPs and the guidance provided in the Instructions to Authors, particularly regarding pest distribution and host ranges, the TPDP noted that, as a general rule, references to specific countries should be avoided. The TPDP recommended referring to regions instead, while recognizing that any regional references should be consistent with FAO regional classifications. The TPDP therefore requested that the IPPC Secretariat editor verify whether there is existing guidance or a standard approach on this matter.
- [97] **Detection of seeds.** The TPDP agreed that the characteristics or criteria that a sample must exhibit before proceeding with identification should be described more clearly. The TPDP emphasized that these requirements are an important part of the procedure and should be specified explicitly rather than left open to interpretation by the user.
- [98] **Minimum requirements for identification.** The TPDP requested that the discipline lead and the DP drafting group clarify the minimum requirements for the identification of *A. palmeri*, including the types of samples that may be used for diagnosis (e.g. seeds, whole plants, or plant parts such as leaves). The TPDP also requested that the protocol clearly distinguish the identification procedures applicable to each sample type and describe how identification should be achieved depending on the nature of the material being examined.
- [99] **MALDI-TOF.** The TPDP discussed the availability of the database required for MALDI-TOF analysis and highlighted the need to clarify whether such a database is publicly available or whether the Database Generation section is intended to provide guidance on its development. The TPDP also discussed the relevance of including MALDI-TOF as a diagnostic method in the DP. While some members supported its inclusion as an emerging technology that should be reflected in diagnostic protocols, others noted practical challenges, including the significant effort required to develop and maintain reference databases and the limited accessibility of the technology. After the discussion, the TPDP agreed to retain the method in the DP but recommended that the associated limitations and implementation challenges be clearly described.
- [100] **Potential new DP proposal on horizontal method.** One TPDP member asked whether a diagnostic protocol on the use of MALDI-TOF technology for plants is currently included in the TPDP work programme. It was clarified that no such topic is currently on the work programme. However, it was noted that, should the TPDP consider it a priority, a proposal could be submitted to the SC for its

⁸ 2019-006, 13_TPDP_2025_July and 17_TPDP_2025_July

inclusion. The TPDP was reminded that any new topic must follow the established process and be supported by an appropriate justification for the development of a draft DP.

[101] **DNA extraction.** The TPDP asked that the DP authors add more specific information on how to perform DNA extraction, both for seeds and for plants, building on the already available information included in other DPs.

[102] **DNA test primers.** One member highlighted the need for clearer guidance on how to achieve reliable identification while minimizing the risk of false-positive results. Another member suggested that additional barcodes be included, where available, to strengthen the identification process and provide greater confidence in the results.

[103] **Plant identification key.** The discipline lead expressed concerns regarding the large number of species included in the taxonomic key. It was explained that the authors had chosen a broad approach because of the difficulty in determining which species are most closely related to *A. palmeri* and therefore most relevant for comparison. One member questioned whether the introductory text of the key should explicitly state that all relevant plant organs must be present to enable accurate identification. The discipline lead noted that this is generally understood in botanical identification and is implicit in the term “plant identification key”. The TPDP also discussed the plant developmental stage required for reliable identification, and the discipline lead clarified that *A. palmeri* can be reliably identified once flowers and fruits have developed.

[104] **Acknowledgments.** The secretariat clarified that this section should first list the authors selected by the TPDP as members of the drafting group. Additional contributors may also be recognized, but this should be done in a separate sentence. The secretariat further noted that, if an author is unresponsive, the discipline lead should notify the Secretariat, which will then carry out the necessary official follow-up. The procedure for including newly identified authors in the drafting group was also clarified.

[105] **Pictures.** It was noted that the use of the terms "capsule" and "urticle" in the figure captions should be made more consistent. The distinction between the two structures should be clearly evident from both the captions and the corresponding images.

[106] The TPDP:

- (20) *thanked* the discipline lead and the DP drafting group for *Amaranthus palmeri* (2019-006),
- (21) *agreed* that the discipline lead and the DP drafting group will further revise the draft DP with the adjustments agreed at this meeting – by mid-October 2025;
- (22) *requested* the secretariat to open Expert Consultation Period for this draft DP after its revision;
- (23) *requested* the IPPC Secretariat editor to verify whether there is an established approach for describing pest distribution and host range;
- (24) *agreed* to present back the revised draft DP, from the expert consultation to the TPDP (via e-decision or virtual meeting) with the recommendation to the SC for approval for consultation period.

7. TPDP Work Programme – Review of draft DPs updated after Expert Consultation

[107] *Note:* The draft DPs included in this section had already been revised during the TPDP face to face meeting in October 2024 and were submitted for Expert Consultation in May 2025.

7.1 *Dickeya* spp. (2021-014), priority 2

[108] The discipline lead, Robert TAYLOR, introduced the draft DP and the supporting documentation below⁹. Main points raised by the discipline lead were as follows.

⁹ 2021-014; 08_TPDP_2025_July; 10_TPDP_2025_July; 11_TPDP_2025_July; [TPDP 2024 meeting report](#)

- [109] Detection of *Dickeya* spp. on potato can be challenging due to the genetic heterogeneity observed among strains, and the ability of several species to induce similar symptoms in the host. Detection and identification of *Dickeya* spp. on potato can be further complicated by other bacterial pathogens such as *Pectobacterium* spp., *Ralstonia solanaecarum* and *Clavibacter sepedonicus*.
- [110] The protocol describes a range of test methods that include isolation, biochemical, pathogenicity testing and molecular methods.
- [111] The authors are new to the IPPC diagnostic protocol process. Previous versions have required substantial reformatting. It was also noted that this draft will still go under IPPC scientific editorial revision.
- [112] It was mentioned that EPPO, in 2023, published diagnostic protocol PM 7/155 (1) *Pectobacterium* spp. and *Dickeya* spp. and some of the methods described in this IPPC draft DP were adapted from the EPPO protocol.
- [113] Changes have been made to address comments raised during the last TPDP meeting. This included formatting issues (e.g. PCR tables and controls), removal of unnecessary information, clarity around the minimum requirements for detection and identification, sampling information, improvements to the isolation media section, inclusion of more media types, figures for *Dickeya* symptoms,
- [114] This draft has now undergone expert consultation and has been revised accordingly. During this time the authors have also added three new methods that have been recently published.
- [115] Key changes since last reviewed by the technical panel:
- Inclusion of two new multiplex real-time PCR methods for the detection of the *Dickeya* genera and *D. dianthicola* and *D. solani*. These have been recently published, were developed using whole genome comparisons and are well validated.
 - Inclusion of one new LAMP assay for *D. solani* detection. Recently published in 2024.
 - Changes after expert review.
 - Inclusion of figures for symptoms of *Dickeya* (provided by the lead author).
- [116] Discussion on the draft DP by the TPDP:
- [117] **Taxonomic information.** The TPDP advised revising this section. As the draft DP focuses on specific *Dickeya* species rather than the genus as a whole, the content should be updated accordingly. In particular, references to alternative scientific names for the genus should be removed, as no such alternative names exist.
- [118] **New methods included in the draft DP.** One member questioned the inclusion of additional new methods in the draft DP and it was explained that these are based on recent publications and were selected because they offer greater specificity for the target *Dickeya* species addressed in the protocol.
- [119] The TPDP acknowledged the value of incorporating recently published methods but noted that laboratories may have limited experience with these newer approaches. The panel reiterated that IPPC DPs are not scientific publications and requested that the drafting group provide a clear justification for the inclusion of these new methods, focusing on their added value in relation to the methods already included in the draft. A potential overlap among methods targeting the same species was also noted, and a review was suggested to ensure clarity and avoid redundancy. In addition, it was observed that, in the absence of a flow diagram, a summary table linking methods to target species would improve clarity.
- [120] The TPDP:
- (25) *thanked* the discipline lead and the DP drafting group for *Dickeya* spp. (2021-014);
 - (26) *agreed* that the discipline lead and the DP drafting group will further revise the draft DP with the adjustments agreed at this meeting – by 15 October;

- (27) *agreed* to submit the draft DP to the SC for approval for consultation period (tentative for 30 January 2026).

8. TPDP work programme: Review of topics in the work programme

8.1 Update on draft DPs in the work programme

- [121] The TPDP reviewed its entire work programme, which comprised 21 subjects as of July 2025. Discipline leads provided progress updates on each draft DP, and the secretariat presented an overview of the work programme schedule, including upcoming deadlines.
- [122] **Consultation period.** It was estimated that one draft DP would be released for consultation in January 2026, followed by three additional draft DPs in July 2026.
- [123] **Expert consultation.** Five draft DPs were tentatively scheduled for expert consultation in October/November 2025. A further four draft DPs were scheduled for expert consultation during the first/ second quarter of 2026.
- [124] **Revision of adopted DPs.** The secretariat recalled that the new call for topics and subjects is currently underway. It was also noted that the TPDP may propose new subjects to the SC as needs arise. The TPDP discussed the process for revising and updating adopted DPs and explored options for streamlining the process to reduce the increase of revisions and the associated resource requirements. It was suggested that the TPDP establish a systematic process whereby each discipline lead regularly reports on relevant research developments and revisions of methods included in adopted IPPC diagnostic protocols. The TPDP agreed that this would formalize an approach that is already largely in place and recommended including this as a standing agenda item at future meetings, with all TPDP members providing updates on adopted DPs within their respective areas of expertise.
- [125] The TPDP:
- (28) *agreed* to update the drafting groups list;
 - (29) *agreed* to the workplan as revised during the meeting;
 - (30) *agreed* to include, on the agenda for the next meeting, an item on potential revisions of adopted DPs.

9. TPDP and IPPC activities

9.1 Updates from the IPPC Secretariat

- [126] The secretariat presented the document outlining the recent updates, including the ones from CPM-19 held in March 2025 and the SC meeting in May 2025.
- [127] **Call for new TPDP members.** In light of recent TPDP changes in membership and following SC e-decision (2025_eSC_May_10), the secretariat opened a call for TPDP experts in Virology from 01 June 2025 to 15 July 2025 to select one new TPDP member. Several nominations were submitted and it was explained that the SC would examine them in the coming months.
- [128] **Notification period (July 1 – August 15).** The Standards Committee (SC) approved the responses to the consultation comments and the following draft diagnostic protocols for adoption (2025_eSC_Nov_02 and 2025_eSC_Nov_01):
- *Pospiviroid* species (2018-031)
 - *Meloidogyne mali* (2018-019)
- [129] Consequently, starting 1 July 2025, these protocols have been submitted for a 45-day notification period. During this period, contracting parties will have the chance to review the DPs and submit an objection to their adoption, along with a technical justification and suggestions for improvement. secretariat will

proceed to forward any objection received, if any, to the respective discipline lead. If no objection is received, the DP is considered adopted by the SC on behalf of the CPM.

[130] Updates from CPM 19 -2025.

[131] Rethinking ISPMs: A representative from New Zealand presented a paper addressing challenges with the readability and translatability of ISPMs, proposing modern and flexible approaches for improvement. Building on earlier discussions at regional meetings and the 2024 SPG, the paper's recommendations were revised and submitted to the CPM.

[132] Contracting parties emphasized the importance of ISPMs being clear, translatable, and implementable. Concerns were raised about the process for revising ISPMs, including collaboration with other standard-setting bodies, resource implications, and the role of IPPC subsidiary bodies.

[133] Following these discussions, the CPM chairperson convened a Friends of the Chair meeting, fostering broad agreement to advance the topic for further consideration at the 2025 SPG meeting.

[134] Call for topics: The Standards Committee (SC) and Implementation Committee (IC) jointly proposed changes to the current Call for Topics process, highlighting the resource strain on the Secretariat, submitters, and Task Force on Topics (TFT) members.

[135] They recommended disestablishing the TFT and replacing the biennial call with an ongoing open call, simplifying submission forms, and having the SC and IC directly evaluate and prioritize new topic submissions.

[136] In response, the CPM agreed to pause the current TFT-based process for two years. During this trial period, topics submitted in the 2025 Call for Topics and through a one-year open call will be reviewed and prioritized directly by the SC and IC. If successful, the revised approach may be formally adopted in the future.

[137] Update to the Standards Committee (SC) May 2025. The Secretariat presented a report on membership of the Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols (TPDP), an overview of the TPDP's activities since June 2024 and the tentative workplan for 2025/2026.

[138] The most relevant development related to the TPDP was the SC's agreement to update the status of the revision of DP 5 (*Phyllosticta citricarpa* (McAlpine) Aa on fruit) (2019-011) from "pending" to "under development," following a request from the TPDP to resume work on this protocol.

[139] Moreover, considering the trial approach for 2025 Call for Topics, the SC agreed the following schedule for reviewing topics in 2025:

- September – secretariat compiles the information and posts it on the IPP,
- September – secretariat shares all submissions with the SC and, where a submission is relevant to a technical panel, shares the submission with that panel,
- Technical panels receiving submissions provide advice to the SC on feasibility and recommend priorities,
- November – SC reviews submissions at its face-to-face meeting,
- December – SC reviews its final recommendations by SC e-decision,
- Secretariat submits SC recommendations to CPM-20 (2026).

[140] SC also noted that, after the two-year trial period, an assessment of the new process would be conducted and the results presented to CPM-21 (2027) with recommendations for future steps.

[141] The TPDP:

(31) *noted* the IPPC secretariat update.

9.2 Discussion on “Rethinking ISPMs”

- [142] The TPDP engaged in a discussion based on CPM paper 2025/47 on ways to streamline the readability and implementability of ISPMs, focusing on DPs specifically.
- [143] The TPDP discussed the following points:
- [144] Translation. The panel noted that advances in artificial intelligence could facilitate more efficient translation of DPs into additional languages in the future.
- [145] Contact points. The TPDP emphasized the importance of the contact points section in each DP, noting that it is specifically intended to address the needs of contracting parties by providing the contact details of designated experts who can offer technical support and information.
- [146] Reading and implementation. Members stressed the need to read each DP in full at the outset to clearly understand the minimum diagnostic requirements before implementation.
- [147] Revision of the *Instructions to Authors*. The TPDP recalled that part of its current work programme includes the revision of the document on the Instructions to Authors. As part of this revision, a proposal that could be considered is to include guidance in DPs on how to meet minimum diagnostic requirements, for instance by summarizing them in a table.
- [148] Intended audience of DPs. The TPDP reaffirmed that DPs are technical documents intended for laboratories performing pest diagnosis, as stated in ISPM 27. Such laboratories may be established under, or authorized by NPPOs, so that diagnostic results can be considered as part of NPPO phytosanitary measures.
- [149] Capacity development. The panel noted that additional capacity development activities and initiatives could be provided under IPPC programmes to support the implementation of DPs, as one of the main constraints in implementing DPs is the uneven level of expertise among contracting parties.
- [150] Information on constraints. The TPDP highlighted the need for more information on existing constraints in the use and implementation of DPs specifically, to better identify gaps and address challenges.
- [151] The TPDP:
- (32) *noted* the paper provided to CPM-19 (2025);
 - (33) *provided* some comments on “Rethinking ISPMs” and *agreed* to present them to the SC at its November 2025 meeting.

9.3 TPDP and Diagnostic Laboratory Networking DAI: examples of existing plant health diagnostic networks

- [152] The secretariat introduced the topic on Diagnostic Laboratory Networking, noting that it is a development agenda item under the IPPC 2020–2030 Strategic Framework¹⁰. It was further recalled that the CPM had approved the establishment of a focus group on this topic and the issuance of a call for experts to collect nominations for its membership.
- [153] Nolan AFRICANDER (Scientific Manager – Department of Agriculture, South Africa), providing an in-kind contribution to the secretariat, joined online to present preparatory work for the CPM Focus Group on Diagnostic Laboratory Networking. He reported that literature reviews are underway, along with interviews with researchers and NPPOs, including those from Australia, Kenya, and the Caribbean Agricultural Health and Food Safety Agency (CAHFSA). He also referred to a recent biosecurity summit, where plant health diagnostic networking was identified as a key topic of discussion.
- [154] TPDP members provided brief updates on their national and regional experiences and responded to questions related to laboratory engagement in networks, legislative frameworks, accreditation systems,

¹⁰ IPPC Strategic Framework 2020-2030: <https://openknowledge.fao.org/handle/20.500.14283/cb3995en>

and funding mechanisms. Experiences were shared from France (ANSES), New Zealand, EPPO, the European Union (including the EURLs and their proficiency testing systems), and Ghana.

[155] Several opportunities were identified, including the potential for such networks to support not only plant pest diagnostics but also the sharing of materials and specimens.

[156] Key constraints were also highlighted, particularly issues related to confidentiality agreements when handling samples at the international level, especially where regulated quarantine pests are detected. Concerns were also raised about whether broad global participation would be feasible, given that some countries may be more inclined or able to participate in regional or more limited-scope collaboration. In addition, limitations related to financial resources and technical capacity were noted.

[157] The TPDP:

(34) *thanked* Nolan AFRICANDER and *anticipates* the progress of this IPPC development agenda item.

9.4 TPDP and Africa Phytosanitary Programme (APP): potential synergies

[158] The secretariat introduced the IPPC Africa Phytosanitary Programme (APP) and outlined its objectives, including the development of survey guidelines for specific pests.

[159] The TPDP noted potential challenges in ensuring alignment between protocols developed under the APP and the TPDP. Members highlighted that recommendations from the TPDP and those developed by the APP technical team for survey guidelines could, in some cases, differ. The TPDP therefore suggested that, where appropriate, it could support the review of APP protocols to ensure consistency with IPPC DPs, noting that this would require SC agreement as it may impact the TPDP mandate.

[160] It was also noted the importance of considering country-specific context in the development of such protocols, including operational factors such as pest life cycles, trapping periods and broader cultural and social conditions. Members emphasized that while experts can provide technical diagnostic input, effective protocol development requires sufficient contextual information from the interested countries.

[161] The TPDP:

(35) *suggested* that the Secretariat explore options for involving the TPDP in the review of APP survey guidelines for specific pests, to ensure alignment with DPs.

9.5 TPDP and International Forestry Quarantine Research Group (IFQRG)

[162] The secretariat introduced the activities of the International Forestry Quarantine Research Group (IFQRG), including the development of diagnostic guidelines. It was also mentioned that the next IFQRG meeting will be hosted by ANSES (Paris) in October 2025.

[163] The TPDP discussed the work of the IFQRG and expressed concern that the development of diagnostic guidelines outside the IPPC standard-setting process could create confusion with ISPMs and DPs. Members also noted that the IFQRG is a research network rather than a standard-setting body.

[164] The TPDP further noted that the IFQRG Terms of Reference identify its clients as the IPPC, the CPM, NPPOs, RPPOs and the former IPPC Technical Panel on Forest Quarantine (TPFQ), which no longer exists. The TPDP suggested that the role and purpose of the IFQRG within the IPPC framework may warrant further consideration by the appropriate IPPC bodies.

[165] The TPDP:

(36) *noted* the update and *emphasized* that IFQRG outputs should be clearly distinguished from IPPC standards and diagnostic protocols.

9.6 Communication material: review of IPPC video script for TPDP activities

- [166] The TPDP discussed IPPC outreach activities and noted that awareness of the IPPC and its work could be improved within the research and academic communities. Members emphasized the importance of developing communication materials that effectively explain the role and value of diagnostic protocols.
- [167] The secretariat introduced Paper 09_TPDP_2025_July, explaining that it proposes the development of a communication video highlighting the work of the TPDP, with publication targeted for the first or second quarter of 2026. The TPDP appointed Juliet GOLDSMITH and Adrian DINSDALE as champions to work with the secretariat on the development of the video.
- [168] General comments:
- [169] The TPDP recommended illustrating the impact of pest introductions and the importance of timely, reliable diagnostic protocols through a practical example, such as the one of *Xylella fastidiosa*. Members suggested concluding with a positive example demonstrating how diagnostic protocols contribute to safeguarding plant health.
- [170] There were suggestions to include data on agricultural production and economic losses to better illustrate the impacts of pest outbreaks, while ensuring that the overall message does not create the impression that visible symptoms on plants are inherently dangerous.
- [171] It was also recommended that the examples presented in the video to demonstrate the value of ISPMs and diagnostic protocols not only for international trade, but also for surveillance activities and environmental protection.
- [172] The TPDP recommended strengthening the closing message by emphasizing the role of plant health in protecting food security and linking this to the broader One Health concept. Members noted that, if the One Health framework is mentioned, it should be explained in simple, accessible language suitable for a general audience.
- [173] The TPDP:
- (37) *revised* the first version of the video script and *noted* that it needs further work to ensure proper wording to reach out to generic public.
 - (38) *agreed* to have Juliet GOLDSMITH and Adrian DINSDALE as champions for this initiative.

9.7 New procedure for hosting TPDP meetings

- [174] The secretariat introduced the paper outlining the new procedure for hosting TPDP meetings. Under the revised process, organizations interested in hosting a TPDP meeting are invited to submit an expression of interest to the secretariat.
- [175] Some TPDP members expressed interest in potentially hosting a future meeting of the panel, highlighting the benefits of doing so, including increased visibility for their institutions, promotion of their research activities, and opportunities to engage their staff with the work of the TPDP.
- [176] The TPDP:
- (39) *noted* the new procedure for hosting TPDP meetings.

10. Any other business

- [177] The TPDP Steward, Prudence Tonator ATTIPOE, thanked the panel members for their dedication and significant contributions to the development of IPPC DPs. He invited the TPDP to consider opportunities to further improve the efficiency of the DP development process.

[178] The TPDP acknowledged that there may be opportunities to further improve the process but noted that recent changes, including the introduction of an additional consultation period for draft DPs, have already contributed to greater efficiency. Members also observed that preparing the initial draft of the DP remains one of the main bottlenecks in the development process.

11. Recommendations to the Standards Committee (SC) or IPPC Secretariat

[179] Recommendations to the SC are described in previous sections of this report. To facilitate reference, they are compiled below.

[180] The TPDP:

- (40) *requested* the secretariat to open Expert Consultation period for Tomato brown rugose fruit virus (2021-025) after the revision of the draft DP;
- (41) *requested* the secretariat to open Expert Consultation period for *Thaumatotibia leucotreta* (2023-029) after the revision of the draft DP;
- (42) *requested* the secretariat to open Expert Consultation period for *Amaranthus palmeri* (2019-006) after the revision of the draft DP;
- (43) *requested* the IPPC Secretariat editor to verify whether there is an established approach for describing pest distribution and host range;
- (44) *agreed* to submit *Dickeya* spp. (2021-014) DP to the SC for approval for consultation period (tentative for 30 January 2026);
- (45) *agreed* to include, on the agenda for the next meeting, an item on potential revisions of adopted DPs;
- (46) *provided* some comments on “Rethinking ISPMs” and *agreed* to present them to the SC at its November 2025 meeting;
- (47) *suggested* that the Secretariat explore options for involving the TPDP in the review of APP survey guidelines for specific pests, to ensure alignment with DPs;

12. Tentative dates for upcoming meetings

[181] The Secretariat and the TPDP discussed the schedule for upcoming meetings. They agreed to hold a virtual meeting in October 2025 to review topic proposals submitted through the Call for Topics and another virtual meeting during the first half of 2026 to review the revised *Instructions to Authors*.

[182] The 2026 TPDP face to face meeting was scheduled for 21-25 September 2026.

13. Evaluation of the meeting

[183] The Secretariat invited TPDP members to complete the meeting evaluation survey using the link provided in the agenda. Members were reminded that responses are anonymous and that all feedback and suggestions for improvement are welcome.

[184] Overall, the TPDP expressed satisfaction with the meeting. Members emphasized the importance of circulating meeting papers sufficiently in advance to allow adequate time for review

[185] The TPDP also highlighted the value of holding meetings in different countries and regions. Members noted that this provides opportunities to better understand local phytosanitary contexts and practices, facilitates the exchange of knowledge and experiences, broadens regional participation, and strengthens collaboration with local experts and stakeholders.

14. Closing of the meeting

[186] The TPDP and the secretariat thanked ANSES Plant Health Laboratory for hosting the meeting, and for providing everything necessary for its successful outcome.

[187] The secretariat thanked the participants for their active participation.

[188] The TPDP thanked the secretariat staff for their professional support and dedication to the work.

[189] The chairperson thanked the participants for their contributions 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 - Adriana MOREIRA (Deputy Lead to Standard Setting Unit)
1.2	Welcome by the host, ANSES (French Agency for Food, Environmental and Occupational Health & Safety)	--	Mr Phillippe REIGNAULT Head of the Plant Health Laboratory and Scientific Director for Plant Health, ANSES
1.3	Introductions	--	IPPC Secretariat / ANSES
2.	Meeting Arrangements - Presentation on roles for the meeting		
2.1	Selection of Chairperson	--	MOREIRA
2.2	Selection of the Rapporteur	--	Chairperson
2.3	Adoption of the Agenda	01_TPDP_2025_July	Chairperson
3.	Administrative Matters		
3.1	Documents List	02_TPDP_2025_July	MARTINO
3.2	Participants List / TPDP membership list	03_TPDP_2025_July TPDP membership list	
3.3	Local information for participants	04_TPDP_2025_July	ANTHOINE
3.4	TPDP working procedures	TPDP Working procedures Checklist for discipline leads and referees (work area page) TPDP Specification TP 01	MARTINO / MOREIRA
3.5	Review of the IPPC standard setting procedure	Link to video (PPT link)	MARTINO / MOREIRA
4.	EPPO and TPDP		
4.1	EPPO plant pest diagnostic protocols	--	TIKKA
5.	TPDP work programme – Review of Instructions for Authors		
5.1	Review of TPDP Instruction for Authors	05_TPDP_2025_July Link to Instruction to authors	ANTHOINE / All
6.	TPDP work programme – Review of new draft DPs: for recommendation to the SC for consultation period		

Agenda Item		Document No.	Presenter
6.1	<i>Tomato brown rugose fruit virus</i> (2021-025), priority 1 Discipline lead: Andrew APPIAH Referee: Géraldine ANTHOINE - Discipline lead notes - Checklist for discipline leads and referees	2021-025 16_TPDP_2025_July 12_TPDP_2025_July	APPIAH
6.2	<i>Thaumatotibia leucotreta</i> (2023-029) priority 1 Discipline lead: Juliet GOLDSMITH Referee: Norman BARR - Discipline lead notes - Checklist for discipline leads and referees	2023-029 14_TPDP_2025_July	GOLDSMITH
6.3	<i>Amaranthus palmeri</i> (2019-006), priority 2 Discipline lead: Vijayasankar RAMAN Referee: Juliet GOLDSMITH - Discipline lead notes - Checklist for discipline leads and referees	2019-006 17_TPDP_2025_July 13_TPDP_2025_July	RAMAN
7.	TPDP Work Programme – Review of draft DPs updated after Expert Consultation, previously reviewed by TPDP in 2024		
7.1	<i>Dickeya</i> spp. (2021-014), priority 2 Discipline lead: Robert TAYLOR Referee: Géraldine ANTHOINE - <i>Dickeya</i> spp. on potato (2021-014) pictures - Summary of EC comments - Discipline lead notes	2021-014 08_TPDP_2025_July 10_TPDP_2025_July 11_TPDP_2025_July TPDP 2024 meeting report	TAYLOR
8.	TPDP work programme: Review of topics in the work programme		
8.1	Update on draft DPs in the work programme	06_TPDP_2025_July Link to List of topics for IPPC Standards Link to IPPC DPs drafting groups list	MARTINO / ALL
9.	TPDP and IPPC activities		
9.1	Updates from IPPC secretariat	15_TPDP_2025_July	MOREIRA/ MARTINO
9.2	Discussion on “Rethinking ISPMs”	Link to the CPM-19 paper	MOREIRA/ MARTINO

Agenda Item		Document No.	Presenter
9.3	TPDP and Diagnostic Laboratory Networking DAI: examples of existing plant health diagnostic networks (Scheduled to Thursday 24 July – afternoon)	Link to the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020-2030 CPM Focus Group on Diagnostic Laboratory Networking	AFRICANDER/ ALL
9.4	TPDP and Africa Phytosanitary Programme (APP): potential synergies	Link to the Africa Phytosanitary Programme (APP)	MOREIRA/ MARTINO
9.5	TPDP and International Forestry Quarantine Research Group (IFQRG)	Link to the International Forestry Quarantine Research Group	MOREIRA/ MARTINO
9.6	Communication material: review of IPPC video script for TPDP activities	09_TPDP_2025_July	MOREIRA/ MARTINO
9.7	New procedure for hosting TPDP meetings	07_TPDP_2025_July	MOREIRA/ MARTINO
10.	Any other business	--	Chairperson
11.	Recommendations to the Standards Committee (SC) or IPPC Secretariat	--	IPPC Secretariat / Chairperson
12.	Tentative dates for upcoming meetings - Virtual meetings - 2026 face to face meeting	--	Chairperson / IPPC Secretariat
13.	Evaluation of the meeting	Online survey	Chairperson
14.	Closing of the meeting	--	MOREIRA / Chairperson

APPENDIX 2: DOCUMENTS LIST

DOCUMENT NO.	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE	POSTED
05_TPDP_2025_July	5.1	Instructions to authors	2025-07-07
06_TPDP_2025_July	8.1	Update on draft DPs in the work programme	2025-07-07
07_TPDP_2025_July	9.7	New procedure for hosting TPDP meetings	2025-07-07
08_TPDP_2025_July	7.1	<i>Dickeya</i> spp. on potato (2021-014) pictures	2025-07-08
09_TPDP_2025_July	9.6	Review of IPPC video script for TPDP activities	2025-07-11
10_TPDP_2025_July	7.1	Summary of EC comments on <i>Dickeya</i> spp. on potato (2021-014)	2025-07-14
11_TPDP_2025_July	7.1	Discipline lead notes – <i>Dickeya</i> spp. on potato (2021-014)	2025-07-14
12_TPDP_2025_July	6.1	Checklist for discipline leads and referees - Tomato brown rugose fruit virus (2021-025)	2025-07-15
13_TPDP_2025_July	6.3	Checklist for discipline leads and referees - <i>Amaranthus palmeri</i> (2019-006)	2025-07-16
03_TPDP_2025_July	3.2	Participants List	2025-07-16
14_TPDP_2025_July	6.2	Discipline lead notes – <i>Thaumatotibia leucotreta</i> (2023-029)	2025-07-17
15_TPDP_2025_July	9.1	Updates from IPPC secretariat	2025-07-17
16_TPDP_2025_July	6.1	Discipline lead notes – Tomato brown rugose fruit virus (2021-025)	2025-07-18
17_TPDP_2025_July	6.3	Discipline lead notes – <i>Amaranthus palmeri</i> (2019-006)	2025-07-19
02_TPDP_2025_July	3.1	Documents list	2025-07-19

List of draft DPs

DOCUMENT NO.	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE	POSTED
2021-014	7.1	<i>Dickeya</i> spp. on potato (2021-013)	2025-07-08
2023-029	6.2	<i>Thaumatotibia leucotreta</i> (2023-029)	2025-07-10
2021-025	6.1	Tomato brown rugose fruit virus (2021-025)	2025-07-10
2019-006	6.3	<i>Amaranthus palmeri</i> (2019-006)_REV	2025-07-16

Additional resources

- [IPPC standard setting procedure: video](#)
- [Link to adopted ISPMs](#)
- [IPPC Strategic Framework 2020-2030](#)

- [Link to SC meeting reports](#)
- IPPC procedure manual for standard setting: <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/ippc-standard-setting-procedure-manual/>
- IPPC style guide: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/81329/>
- [Standard setting main page](#): <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/standards-setting/>
- TPDP main page: <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/standards-setting/expert-drafting-groups/technical-panels/technical-panel-diagnostic-protocols/>

APPENDIX 3: PARTICIPANTS LIST

	Participant role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address	Term begins	Term ends
✓	Steward	Mr Prudence Tonator ATTIPOE Deputy Director, Head Plant Quarantine Division. Plant Protection and Regulatory Services Directorate (PPRSD), Ministry of Food and Agriculture (MoFA) P.O. Box M37, Accra GHANA Tel: 0209793292, 0262235397	tonattipoe@yahoo.co.uk		
	Assistant Steward	Ms Mi Chi YEA Department of Plant Quarantine, Animal and Plant Quarantine Agency 177, Hyeoksin 8-ro Gimcheon-si, Gyeongsangbuk-do, REP. OF KOREA Tel: 82-54-912-0627 Fax: 82-54-912-0635, Mobile: 82-10-8405-9278	kittymc@korea.kr		
✓	Bacteriology and back up for mycology	Mr Robert TAYLOR Plant Health & Environment Laboratory New Zealand Ministry for Primary Industries 231 Morrin Road St Johns PO Box 2095 Auckland 1140 NEW ZEALAND Tel: (+64) 9 909 3548 Fax: (+64) 9 909 5739	robert.taylor@mpi.govt.nz	May 2011	May 2026 (3 rd term)
	Botany	Mr Vijayasankar RAMAN Botanist, National Identification Services, APHIS USDA, Beltsville, MD-20705, USA Tel: +13013139332	vijay.raman@usda.gov	October 2023	October 2028 (1 st term)

	Participant role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address	Term begins	Term ends
	Entomology	Mr Norman B. BARR National Identification Services Pest Exclusion and Import Programs United States Department of Agriculture 4700 River Road, Riverdale, MD 20737 USA Tel. (+1) 956 205 7658 Fax: (+1) 956 205 7680	norman.b.barr@aphis.usda.gov	July 2012	July 2027 (3 rd term)
✓	Entomology	Ms Juliet GOLDSMITH Plant Health Specialist Caribbean Agricultural Health and Food Agency (CAHFSA) Letitia Vriesdelaan 10 Paramaribo SURINAME Tel: (+597) 422 546 Mobile: (+597) 725 2922	juliet.goldsmith@cahfsa.org	November 2014	May 2029 (3 rd term)
✓	Entomology	Mr David OUVRARD Deputy Head of Unit ANSES/Plant Health Laboratory/Entomology and Botany Unit, Montpellier-France 755 avenue du campus Agropolis – CS 30016 – 34988 Montferrier-sur-Lez Cedex FRANCE Mobile: +33675003904	david.ouvrard@anses.fr	May 2024	May 2029 (1 st term)
✓	Nematology	Ms Géraldine ANTHOINE Directrice adjointe / Deputy head Chef d'unité coordination de la référence / Head of unit "coordination of reference activities" 7 rue Jean Dixméras 49044 ANGERS cedex 01 FRANCE Tel: (33) 241207431 Fax: (33) 240207430	geraldine.anthoine@anses.fr	April 2009	May 2029 (4 th term)
✓	Mycology	Mr Adrian DINSDALE Director, Plant Import Operations, Plant Innovation Centre Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry (DAFF) AUSTRALIA Tel: +61 421 237 569	adrian.dinsdale@aff.gov.au	April 2025	April 2030 (1 st term)

	Participant role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address	Term begins	Term ends
✓	Virology	Mr Andrew Sarkodie APPIAH Senior Research Scientist Biotechnology and Nuclear Agriculture Research Institute, Ghana Atomic Energy Commission P. O. Box LG 80, Legon, Accra GHANA Tel: +233 249166128	andysark2000@gmail.com andrew.appiah@gaec.gov.gh	November 2022	November 2027 (1 st term)
✓	Mycology	Mr Sietse VAN DER LINDE Head of mycology, Scientific officer Netherlands Institute for Vectors, Invasive plants and Plant health (NVWA-NIVIP) Geertjesweg 15 6706 EA, Wageningen THE NETHERLANDS Tel: +31 (0)882230348	s.vanderlinde@nvwa.nl	April 2025	April 2030 (1 st term)
✓	IPPC Secretariat Lead to TPDP	Ms Adriana MOREIRA Standards Officer / Deputy Assistant to Unit Leader IPPC Secretariat / FAO Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00153 Rome ITALY Tel: (+39) 06 570 55809	adriana.moreira@fao.org		
✓	IPPC Secretariat Support to TPDP	Ms Marina Elena MARTINO Phytosanitary Standard Setting Specialist IPPC Secretariat / FAO Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00153 Rome ITALY Tel: (+39) 3687347674	marina.martino@fao.org		

Other participants		
✓	Host – Anses	Mr Philippe Reignault Director of the Plant Health Laboratory ANSES
✓	Host – Anses	Mr Pascal Gentit Head of Unit for Bacteriology, Virology and GMO detection ANSES
✓	Host – Anses	Ms Sandrine Paillard Plant Health Unit, Bacteriology ANSES

✓	Host – Anses	Ms Valerie Olivier Plant Health Unit, Bacteriology ANSES
✓	Host – Anses	Ms Carene Rivoal Plant Health Unit, Bacteriology ANSES
✓	Host – Anses	Ms Marianne Loiseau Plant Health Unit, Phytoplasmology ANSES
✓	Invited expert	Ms Olga Tikka Director General European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization (EPPO)
✓	Invited expert	Mr Yassine Aoutil Scientific Officer European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization (EPPO)