



Food and Agriculture  
Organization of the  
United Nations



International  
Plant Protection  
Convention

# **Report**

## **Technical Panel on Commodity Standards**

**22, 23 & 30 January and 4 February 2025**

**Virtual Meetings**

**IPPC Secretariat**

**Required Citation:**

IPPC Secretariat. 2025. *Report of the meeting of the Technical Panel on Commodity Standards, 22, 23 & 30 January and 4 February 2025*. FAO on behalf of the Secretariat of the International Plant Protection Convention.

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, 2025



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 <https://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 (<https://www.fao.org/publications>) and can be purchased through [publications-sales@fao.org](mailto:publications-sales@fao.org). Requests for commercial use should be submitted via <https://www.fao.org/contact-us/licence-request>. Queries regarding rights and licensing should be submitted to: [copyright@fao.org](mailto:copyright@fao.org)

## Contents

1. Opening of the meeting .....	4
1.1 Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat .....	4
2. Meeting arrangements .....	4
2.1 Selection of chairperson .....	4
2.2 Selection of the rapporteur .....	4
2.3 Adoption of the agenda .....	4
3. Administrative matters .....	4
4. Review and finalization of draft annexes .....	5
4.1 International movement of fresh <i>Musa</i> spp. fruit (2023-028), priority 1 .....	5
4.2 International movement of fresh <i>Colocasia esculenta</i> corms (2023-023), priority 1 .....	9
5. Any other business.....	11
6. Next TPCS meeting .....	11
7. Close of the meeting .....	11
Appendix 1: Agenda.....	12

## 1. Opening of the meeting

### 1.1 Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat

- [1] Adriana MOREIRA, IPPC Standard Setting Officer and Deputy Lead of the Standard Setting Unit, opened the virtual meeting series of the Technical Panel on Commodity Standards (TPCS). She welcomed all participants, including the stewards of the two draft standards on the agenda for this meeting and the report writer from the previous face-to-face meeting who was attending on 22 and 23 January as an observer. She highlighted the aim of the meeting, which was to finalize the draft commodity standards on *Musa* spp. (banana) and *Colocasia esculenta* (taro) to forward to the Standards Committee (SC) for approval to submit to first consultation in 2025. She also confirmed that, following the panel's decision in December to request further information from some submitters, information had been received by all the relevant contracting parties.

## 2. Meeting arrangements

### 2.1 Selection of chairperson

- [2] As agreed at their meeting in June 2023,<sup>1</sup> the TPCS selected Lihong ZHU (New Zealand) as chairperson.

### 2.2 Selection of the rapporteur

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

### 2.3 Adoption of the agenda

- [4] The TPCS adopted the agenda (Appendix 1), agreeing to consider the information submitted from countries before the corresponding draft ISPM in agenda items 4.2 and 4.3.
- [5] Although the meeting was originally scheduled for 22 and 23 January, the panel agreed, during the course of the meeting, to extend it to 30 January and 4 February.

## 3. Administrative matters

- [6] The TPCS noted the absence of Alfayo OMBUYA (Kenya) and the TPCS Assistant Steward Eyad MOHAMMED (Syrian Arabic Republic) for the whole meeting. Donam KIM (Republic of Korea), Sun SHUANGYAN (China), the TPCS Steward Joanne WILSON (New Zealand) and the TPCS Assistant Steward Mariangela CIAMPITTI (Italy), were absent for part of the meeting. The steward for the draft standard being considered under agenda item 4.2, Sophie PETERSON (Australia), was present for all of the meeting except for part of agenda item 4.1. Members of the TPCS had submitted written comments on the draft commodity standards before the meeting.
- [7] The IPPC Secretariat (hereafter referred to as the “secretariat”) confirmed that Hideki TANIGUCHI (Japan) had now left the panel and the deadline for nominations for two new members of the panel was 31 January 2025. Later in the meeting (agenda item 5), the secretariat confirmed that the deadline had been extended to 15 February because of a lack of nominations received one day prior to the original deadline.
- [8] The secretariat and the chairperson encouraged TPCS members to solicit nominations from suitable potential candidates in their regions.

---

<sup>1</sup> TPCS 2023-06, agenda item 2.1.

## 4. Review and finalization of draft annexes

### 4.1 International movement of fresh *Musa* spp. fruit (2023-028), priority 1

#### *Information from countries*

[9] The TPCS noted that further information had been received from China and Ecuador.<sup>2</sup> The Steward, André Felipe C.P. da SILVA (Brazil), explained that although this included confirmation about the regulatory status of certain pests and the phytosanitary measures against those pests, there were still a few pests for which the regulatory status was not clear. The secretariat contacted relevant contracting parties between sessions of this meeting and further information was provided in response by Chile, Ecuador and Japan.<sup>3</sup>

[10] The TPCS considered the information submitted as they reviewed the draft standard.

#### *Review of draft standard*

[11] The TPCS reviewed the draft standard, which had been modified by the steward to take account of the further information submitted by countries and to correct any mistakes.<sup>4</sup> When reviewing the draft standard, the panel also considered the comments submitted by TPCS members before the meeting. The TPCS noted that there was no need to raise editorial issues, as these would be addressed by the IPPC editor during editing of the draft standard.

[12] **Status box.** The secretariat confirmed that they would update the status box, including the addition of the assistant stewards.

[13] **Scope.** The TPCS considered whether the Scope section should refer to “regulated pests” rather than simply “pests”, as all the pests included in commodity standards were regulated by at least one contracting party. However, they recognized that the pests may not be regulated in all countries and so “pests” was more appropriate. Furthermore, the section on pests referred to the pests being “regulated in international trade”, so there was no need to repeat that information in the Scope section; and the draft annex *International movement of fresh Mangifera indica fruit* (2021-011) to ISPM 46 (*Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures*) (hereafter referred to as the “draft mango standard”) referred to “pests” rather than “regulated pests” in the Scope.

[14] The secretariat highlighted the importance of retaining in the Scope the words “associated with [the commodity]”, so that it was clear that the pest association was with the commodity as described in the standard, rather than other parts of the host.

[15] The TPCS agreed that inclusion of the word “fruit” in the Scope section should be consistent with the draft mango standard and would provide a better description of the commodity.

[16] **Pests associated with fresh *Musa* spp. fruit.** One TPCS member had queried whether text relating to the technical justification of regulated pests should be omitted from the first paragraph. The TPCS returned to this later in the meeting, after considering the same issue under agenda item 4.2 (International movement of fresh *Colocasia esculenta* corms), and agreed to retain the text for the same reason discussed under agenda item 4.2.

[17] In the table of pests, the TPCS agreed to give the number of pests listed in each pest group and each family, as this would not only help the list of pests to be cross-checked with the list of pest-specific measures during drafting but would also make the standard easier to read, given the length of the list of pests.

---

<sup>2</sup> 02\_TPCS\_Tel\_2025.

<sup>3</sup> 02\_TPCS\_Tel\_2025.

<sup>4</sup> 2023-028.

- [18] **Pests excluded from the list of pests.** The TPCS omitted some pests at the request of the submitting country in response to the panel’s earlier queries (i.e. additional information requested after the 2025 face-to-face meeting). This included, for example, cases where the submitting country did not regulate the pest for *Musa* spp. in fruits but rather had recorded pest interceptions.
- [19] In accordance with the criteria in ISPM 46, the TPCS omitted pests that were not regulated. In accordance with the criteria for exclusion agreed by the TPCS at their December 2024 face-to-face meeting, the panel omitted pests for which no pest-specific measure had been submitted or for which insufficient information had been provided by the submitter.
- [20] The steward identified several species for which a specific measure was now available, and the TPCS agreed to retain these species.
- [21] **Regulation by another country.** The TPCS noted once again that some pests were not regulated by the submitting country but the submitting country applied measures to comply with the phytosanitary import requirements of other countries that did regulate the pest and required measures. In these cases, the TPCS recognized that it was beyond their scope to ask the importing country to provide a pest risk analysis for a pest that it did not submit. The panel acknowledged, therefore, that the best they could do was to work with the information submitted and to be transparent to the SC about the decisions made.
- [22] Based on this discussion, the TPCS retained the pests and measures concerned, as the pests met the ISPM 46 criterion of being regulated by at least one contracting party, trade consisted of both export and import, and countries would have the opportunity to comment on the pests and measures during consultation.
- [23] The panel acknowledged that this issue merited further consideration at a later meeting, so that the guidance to submitters could be revised to clarify the inclusion and exclusion criteria and what information was required (e.g. one possibility could be to ask for evidence of pest–host association). The TPCS also agreed to review the criteria for exclusion to confirm whether any adjustments were needed. In addition, the chairperson suggested that a session could perhaps be held during the IPPC regional workshops to provide guidance to countries on submitting information for commodity standards, and the secretariat confirmed that this would be incorporated into the 2025 workshops as part of the guidance on the 2025 IPPC Call for Topics: Standards and Implementation.
- [24] **Genus, species and race.** The panel recalled that they had agreed previously to list pests to the species level in the table of pests. However, they noted that, in the submissions from countries, *Succinea* spp. was only regulated at the genus level, because of the difficulty in identifying immature life stages to species. The panel therefore agreed to include this pest at the genus level.
- [25] The TPCS also agreed that it was appropriate to list *Fusarium oxysporum* f. *cubense* Tropical Race 4 (TR4) at the level of a race, because the submitting countries had all confirmed that their regulations specified TR4 rather than simply *Fusarium oxysporum* f. *cubense*.
- [26] For *Bactrocera*, the TPCS followed the same approach used for the draft mango standard and omitted “*Bactrocera* spp.”, because different measures may be required for different *Bactrocera* species.
- [27] **Species names.** The TPCS agreed to use *Zeugodacus tau* instead of *Bactrocera* (*Zeugodacus*) *tau* for consistency with the name used in Phytosanitary Treatment 42 (Irradiation treatment for *Zeugodacus tau*).
- [28] The TPCS retained *Dysmicoccus bispinosus* but deleted *Dysmicoccus texensis*, as some sources listed these as two separate species rather than synonyms and no pest-specific measure had been submitted for *D. texensis*. However, they asked the IPPC editor to check, during editing, the species names in the standard sources used for ISPMs.

- [29] Following confirmatory information from the submitting country, the TPCS listed individual species of the *Bactrocera dorsalis* complex rather than the complex as a whole, as the regulation was only for certain species, not the whole complex.
- [30] **Synonyms.** The TPCS noted that, although the SC had decided not to include any synonyms in the draft mango standard, the inclusion of synonyms may be necessary for some commodity standards, so it was important to retain some flexibility of approach. The TPCS also recognized that, although countries may strive to always use the latest accepted scientific names in their regulations, updates to regulations may not always keep pace with changes to species names, so it was likely that some discrepancies between submitted names and the latest accepted names would occur.
- [31] The TPCS therefore agreed the following general approach:
- The panel would use the names as submitted by contracting parties, unless a different name was used in an annex to ISPM 27 (*Diagnostic protocols for regulated pests*) or ISPM 28 (*Phytosanitary treatments for regulated pests*) or unless there was a more recent, accepted scientific name. Where two names had been submitted, the most recent, accepted name of the two would be used.
  - In cases of doubt, the TPCS would ask the submitting country to confirm that the name preferred by the panel related to the same organism as the submitted name.
  - Where confusion could arise by giving only one name, the TPCS may consider, on a case-by-case basis, whether to give the superseded name in parentheses.
- [32] The TPCS agreed to revise its working procedures to include these points, to be presented to the SC.
- [33] The TPCS noted that annexes to ISPM 27 listed synonyms, as would the pest risk analyses conducted by contracting parties when regulating pests, so there was no need for commodity standards to also list synonyms except where essential to avoid confusion.
- [34] This approach resulted in the following changes:
- *Aspidiotus excisus* was retained and the synonym *Temnaspidotus excisus* was deleted; and
  - *Pseudocercospora fijiensis* was retained and the synonym *Mycosphaerella fijiensis* was deleted.
- [35] **Contaminating pests.** The TPCS recognized the risk of contaminating pests entering a country with the commodity and considered, therefore, whether to add general text about relevant measures in the body text, as in the draft annex *International movement of fresh Colocasia esculenta corms* (2023-023) to ISPM 46. The TPCS agreed, however, not to include such text at this stage of drafting, but that the steward would raise the issue with the SC.
- [36] **Stage of maturity.** The TPCS recalled that they had omitted the stage of maturity from the standard at their meeting in December 2024, because some panel members considered that it was not a phytosanitary measure. However, the TPCS noted that some contracting parties included it as a stand-alone measure, with a phytosanitary import requirement that only fruit at a certain stage of maturity could be imported. It could also be part of a systems approach according to ISPM 35 (*Systems approach for pest risk management of fruit flies (Tephritidae)*). The TPCS therefore considered listing it in both the table of general options for phytosanitary measures and the table of pest-specific measures, with a footnote to the former explaining that some contracting parties apply it as a stand-alone measure whereas others include it as a systems approach. Ultimately, however, reference to stage of maturity was removed from the table of general options and the pest-specific table but retained as part of a systems approach in the table on systems approaches.
- [37] **Measures that have not been submitted by a country but are in an adopted ISPM.** The TPCS referred to the core text of ISPM 46, which said that “a measure may be considered ... for inclusion in a commodity standard when it is, or has been, set as a phytosanitary import requirement by at least one contracting party and hence in operation between at least two contracting parties”. They also noted that ISPM 46 gave a list of supporting criteria, one of which was inclusion of the measure “in an



adopted ISPM relevant to the pest or commodity that falls within the scope of the standard”. However, the TPCS recognized that, as ISPMs have been adopted by all contracting parties, the measures in them have been globally accepted and this should take precedence over whether the measure has been used in trade; otherwise, there is a risk that ISPMs could be perceived as being unacceptable. The panel therefore agreed that they would include measures from adopted ISPMs in commodity standards even if there was no country submission listing the measure as having been set as a phytosanitary import requirement. They noted that this could perhaps be addressed in a future revision of ISPM 46.

- [38] The TPCS therefore agreed that the first systems approach listed, which related to ISPM 35, applied to all fruit flies listed in the standard.
- [39] **Measures that are generic to a particular pest group.** The TPCS considered whether pest free areas (PFAs) for fruit flies (ISPM 26 (*Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)*)) and systems approaches for fruit flies (ISPM 35) should be listed in the table of general options for phytosanitary measures, the tables of pest-specific options for phytosanitary measures (including the table of pests and measures and the table on systems approaches), or both. The TPCS agreed to use the latter approach for consistency with the draft mango standard, recalling that the SC had decided on this approach in response to consultation comments, even though it resulted in duplication (i.e. with some measures listed as being both a general and a pest-specific option for phytosanitary measures). The TPCS noted that one alternative solution would be to have a new table for measures that were specific to particular pest groups, but they recognized that this was a matter for discussion in the future rather than at this meeting.
- [40] As they had agreed to include PFAs for fruit flies (ISPM 26) as both a general and a pest-specific option, the TPCS considered whether to extrapolate this to all fruit fly species in the table of pest-specific options or just list it against those species for which a contracting party had set a PFA as a phytosanitary import requirement. They agreed on the latter, to avoid implying that a PFA was being used in trade to manage a specific pest, when this was not what had been submitted by contracting parties. The TPCS noted that, by including ISPM 26 in the general options table, it was also clear that a PFA was an option for trade if required.
- [41] **Measures for *Bactrocera musae*.** The TPCS noted that, in one case, the phytosanitary import requirements for *B. musae* provided for three alternatives: for countries that were free from *B. musae*, the requirement was a declaration that the consignment had been produced in an area free of *B. musae*; for countries where *Bactrocera* species other than *B. musae* were present, the requirement was either for a declaration that the consignment had been produced in an area free of *Bactrocera* spp. or a declaration that the consignment had been produced in a country free of *B. musae* and harvested in the hard green maturity stage. The TPCS considered how best to represent this in the table of pest-specific measures. Noting that the country appeared to require export inspection for *Bactrocera* spp. but not for *B. musae*, the TPCS considered whether to list export inspection against all *Bactrocera* species except *B. musae*. However, they concluded that it was preferable, at least in the interim, to simply list the measure as “PFA or export inspection” against *B. musae* and await consultation comments.
- [42] **Systems approaches.** In the case of some mealybugs and scales, the TPCS noted that one contracting party had provided an expanded list of corresponding measures to replace “monitoring and washing”. The TPCS considered that this expanded combination of measures was consistent with one of the systems approaches listed in the draft standard and hence changed the measure for these pests to be that systems approach.
- [43] In cases where a contracting party had submitted “field inspection and export inspection” as a combination of measures, the TPCS agreed to retain these as a combination rather than listing them as a systems approach comprising only two components.
- [44] One TPCS member suggested integrating two of the systems approaches listed, if the submitting countries agreed, as the component measures were very similar. However, the TPCS kept them separate, as one was for bacteria and the other for fungi.



## [45] The TPCS:

- (1) *agreed* that the steward would review the draft annex *International movement of fresh Musa spp. fruit* (2023-028) to ISPM 46 (*Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures*) after this meeting and circulate a revised version to the TPCS;
- (2) *agreed* that TPCS members would provide any further comments on the draft standard to the secretariat within one week, for subsequent review by the steward;
- (3) *recommended* the draft annex *International movement of fresh Musa spp. fruit* (2023-028) to ISPM 46, as modified by the TPCS at this meeting and subsequently revised by the steward, to the SC for approval for first consultation starting July 2025;
- (4) *requested* that the secretariat circulate again the criteria for exclusion of pests or measures to the TPCS;
- (5) *agreed* to apply the approach discussed at this meeting regarding the use of synonyms in commodity standards and to revise the TPCS working procedures accordingly for approval by the SC;
- (6) *agreed* to include measures from adopted ISPMs in draft commodity standards, even if there is no country submission listing the measure as having been set as a phytosanitary import requirement, and to revise the TPCS working procedures accordingly for approval by the SC;
- (7) *agreed* to review the criteria for exclusion of pests or measures, the TPCS working procedures and the guidance provided to submitters at a future meeting; and
- (8) *suggested* that the criteria for inclusion of measures in commodity standards be amended, so that inclusion of a measure in an adopted ISPM is a primary criterion rather than a supporting criterion, and *requested* that the secretariat archive this suggestion until ISPM 46 is opened for revision.

## 4.2 International movement of fresh *Colocasia esculenta* corms (2023-023), priority 1

[46] The Steward, Sophie PETERSON (Australia), referred the TPCS to the comments submitted on the draft standard by TPCS members in advance of the meeting and informed the panel that further information had also been provided by some contracting parties upon request. She explained that she had revised the draft in response to these comments and information.<sup>5</sup>

[47] The TPCS reviewed the version revised by the steward and referred, where necessary, to the information submitted by countries.

[48] **Scope.** The TPCS agreed that the wording should be consistent with the Scope section of the draft *Musa* spp. standard.

[49] **Description of the commodity and its intended use.** The TPCS agreed to include peeled and cooked corms in the list of examples of processed corms, recognizing that peeling will remove most of the pests present. They omitted chopped corms from this list, as the scope of the standard was for whole taro corms and cutting, by itself, did not mitigate pest risk.

[50] **Pests associated with fresh *Colocasia esculenta*.** The TPCS considered the first paragraph, which explained that the pests listed in the standard are considered to be associated with the commodity and are regulated in international trade by at least one contracting party based on technical justification. One TPCS member had queried whether the reference to technical justification should be omitted, but the TPCS agreed to retain it for consistency with ISPM 46, which specified that regulation “by at least one contracting party based on technical justification” was a criterion for inclusion of a pest in a commodity standard. This wording also matched that in the draft mango standard.

---

<sup>5</sup> 2023-023.

- [51] **Pests excluded from the list of pests.** In accordance with the criteria in ISPM 46, the TPCS omitted pests that were not regulated (e.g. submissions based solely on interception data). In accordance with the criteria for exclusion agreed by the TPCS, the panel also omitted pests for which there was no pest-specific measure. The latter included cases where there was no pest-specific measure because the pest risk analysis conducted by the submitting country had demonstrated that the appropriate level of protection was met without the need for a measure.
- [52] The panel considered whether pests that were associated with the petiole should be omitted but agreed that these pests should be retained, as the traded commodity often included the attached petiole.
- [53] **Genus vs species.** For species of the beetle *Papuana*, the TPCS noted that one contracting party regulated to species level but did not require specific measures, whereas another contracting party required specific measures but only regulated the pest to the level of the genus (i.e. *Papuana* spp.). Recognizing that commodity standards list pests and measures as regulated and required by countries, the TPCS listed the individual species in the table of pests but the genus in the table of pest-specific options for phytosanitary measures. They agreed that this was appropriate in the case of *Papuana*, as the measure would be the same for all species of *Papuana* and the draft standard included all the main pest species of this genus. This contrasted with the approach used in the draft mango standard, where the TPCS had agreed not to list genera in the list of pests, as the measures for different species of *Bactrocera* were not all the same and the list of *Bactrocera* species included was not exhaustive.
- [54] **Species names.** The TPCS updated virus names to the latest scientific names.
- [55] **Free from soil.** The TPCS noted that “free from soil” was a phytosanitary import requirement for taro in some importing countries. However, unlike other options for phytosanitary measures listed in the standard, “free from soil” was the outcome of action rather than the action itself and there were no requirements on how to achieve soil freedom. For consistency with other measures in the standard, the TPCS therefore adjusted the wording of the text to refer to thorough cleaning of the corms to make them free from soil. Furthermore, the panel amended the table of general options for phytosanitary measures to refer to post-harvest operations rather than simply “free from soil” and to add ISPM 32 (*Categorization of commodities according to their pest risk*) as a reference, as the latter mentioned washing and brushing. The TPCS recognized, however, the difficulty in identifying suitable references for “free from soil”.
- [56] **Pest-specific options for phytosanitary measures.** The secretariat confirmed the order in which the options for phytosanitary measures were listed in the table of pest-specific options in the draft mango standard: codes in alphabetical order, followed by options that do not have codes in the order of their footnote number. The TPCS agreed to continue using the same approach.
- [57] The TPCS recalled that the code “MB1” had been used in the draft mango standard rather than simply “MB”, even though only one treatment was listed in the standard, in case additional methyl bromide treatments were added at a later date. The TPCS agreed to follow this approach in the draft taro standard.
- [58] The TPCS noted that the table of pest-specific options no longer included export inspection as an option and hence there was no need for a footnote about export inspection.
- [59] **Further information needed.** The TPCS noted that it was not clear from the submission whether the measure submitted by one contracting party for *Radopholus similis* was used in international trade. Lihong ZHU (New Zealand) agreed to contact the submitter to confirm. The TPCS agreed that, if the measure was not used in international trade, then the species, the corresponding measure and the footnote related to that measure should all be omitted from the standard.
- [60] The TPCS noted that the fungal pathogen *Marasmiellus colocasiae* might qualify for inclusion in the standard. Douglas KERRUISH (Australia) agreed to check the relevant submission and inform the steward for this standard subsequently.

[61] The TPCS noted that the steward was still seeking two references from contracting parties. The panel recognized that it might be difficult to identify publicly available references but noted that ISPM 46 did not specify a requirement for multiple references.

[62] The TPCS:

- (9) *agreed* to confirm whether *Radopholus similis* and *Marasmiellus colocasiae* should be included in the draft annex *International movement of fresh Colocasia esculenta corms* (2023-023) to ISPM 46 (*Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures*) and to inform the steward for the standard accordingly;
- (10) *noted* that the steward for the above standard would continue to seek the two missing references;
- (11) *recommended* the draft annex *International movement of fresh Colocasia esculenta corms* (2023-023) to ISPM 46, as modified by the TPCS at this meeting and subject to the above confirmation and the inclusion (if possible) of the missing references, to the SC for approval for first consultation starting July 2025; and
- (12) *agreed* that Douglas KERRUISH (Australia) would update the spreadsheet of pests and measures for this draft standard, used by the panel for internal record-keeping purposes, and would add a column with an explanation for any pests or measures excluded from the standard.

## 5. Any other business

[63] The secretariat confirmed that a few nominations had been received since the deadline for the call for experts for the TPCS had been extended. The TPCS was informed that all nominations received, following the procedures, would be presented to the SC for the SC to select the new TPCS members.

## 6. Next TPCS meeting

[64] The next face-to-face meeting is tentatively scheduled for 9–13 June 2025 in Auckland, New Zealand. The next meeting in virtual mode will be confirmed by the secretariat after this meeting.

## 7. Close of the meeting

[65] The chairperson thanked the participants and closed the meeting.

## Appendix 1: Agenda

(Meeting documents are available only to TPCS members)

Agenda Item		Document No.	Presenter
<b>1.</b>	<b>Opening of the Meeting</b>		
1.1	Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat	--	IPPC Secretariat (MOREIRA)
<b>2.</b>	<b>Meeting Arrangements</b>		
2.1	Selection of Chairperson	--	MOREIRA
2.2	Selection of the Rapporteur	--	Chairperson
2.3	Adoption of the Agenda	01_TPCS_Tel_2025_Jan	Chairperson
<b>3.</b>	<b>Administrative Matters</b>		
3.1	TPCS membership list	<a href="#">TPCS membership list</a>	KRAH
3.2	Connections to Zoom and virtual meetings	<a href="#">Short guidelines for participants</a>	
<b>4.</b>	<b>Review and finalization of draft annexes</b>		
4.2	<b>International movement of fresh banana (<i>Musa spp</i>) fruit (2023-028), priority 1</b> ❖ Draft ISPM ❖ Information request from countries	2023-028  02_TPCS_Tel_2025	<b>PERALTA DA SILVA / ALL</b>
4.3	<b>International movement of fresh taro (<i>Colocasia esculenta</i>) for consumption (2023-023), priority 1</b> ❖ Draft ISPM ❖ Information request from countries	2023-023  02_TPCS_Tel_2025	<b>PETERSON / ALL</b>
<b>6.</b>	<b>Any other business</b>	--	Chairperson
<b>7.</b>	<b>Next TPCS meeting</b>		MOREIRA / Chairperson
<b>8.</b>	<b>Closing of the meeting</b>	--	IPPC Secretariat / Chairperson