

Reconciliation report for 2023-019_DraftCS_Citrus_en.docx (2023-019_DraftCS_Citrus_en.docx)

Summary

Title	2026 First consultation-2023-019-Draft annex to ISPM 46: Movement of fresh Citrus spp. fruit in international trade (Id 1856)
Description	
Start Date	1 7 2026 12:46 午後
End Date	30 9 2026 11:45 午後
Closed Out Date	
Completed Date	
Review Status	In Progress

Participants

Name	Status	Role	Summary	Comments	Last Activity
Japan	In Progress	Reviewer		21	25 9 2026 9:15 午前

T (Type) - B = Bullet, C = Comment, P = Proposed Change, R = Rating
S (Status) - A = Accepted, C = Closed, O = Open, W = Withdrawn, M = Merged

Para	Text	T	Comment	S	Author Comment
G	(General Comment)	C	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> (859) Japan (25 9 2026 7:29 午前) We request that the scientific justification for the List of Pests (Table 1) and the List of Phytosanitary Measure Options (Table 2) be made available on the IPP through the link provided in Section 5.2, "Further Reading", before the second consultation. Without access to the scientific justification, it is difficult to adequately assess the appropriateness of the listed pests and phytosanitary measure options.	O	
G	(General Comment)	C	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> (858) Japan (25 9 2026 7:27 午前) For greater clarity and transparency, we request that references be provided for all pests and phytosanitary measures listed in Tables 1 and 3. Alternatively, we request that corresponding reference numbers be assigned both to the scientific justifications provided through the links in Section 5.2, "Further Reading", and to the individual pests and phytosanitary measures listed in Tables 1 and 3, so that each item can be clearly linked to its supporting references.	O	
2. Description of the commodity and its intended use					
104	The pests included in Table 1 are considered to be associated with fresh <i>Citrus</i> spp.	P	<i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>	O	

	fruit and are regulated in international trade by at least one contracting party based on technical justification. The list of pests is not exhaustive, nor country ~~specific~~ <u>specific and should not be interpreted as a list for regulated pests.</u>		(864) Japan (25 9 2026 7:34 午前) As this text has been added to the draft annexes for Musa and Colocasia for the second consultation, it should also be included in this annex, add the sentence.		
188	<i>Bactrocera caudata</i> (Fabricius, 1805)	C	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> (867) Japan (25 9 2026 7:36 午前) This species is known as a pest of cucurbit crops, especially Cucurbita moschata, and no literature has been identified indicating that Citrus spp. is a host of this species. Therefore, scientific justification for including Bactrocera caudatus in the pest list (Table 1) and in the list of phytosanitary measure options (Table 3) as a pest associated with Citrus spp. should be provided. The supporting references should also be included on the IPP page, and a link to that page should be provided in Section 5.2 "Further Reading" (see general comment).	O	
263	<i>Bactrocera umbrosa</i> (Fabricius, 1805)	C	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> (872) Japan (25 9 2026 7:47 午前) No literature has been identified reporting Citrus spp. as a host of this species. In addition, Lauciello et al. (2024) reported that this species reproduces only on Artocarpus spp. The authors evaluated larval development on sixteen fruit species. Although Citrus reticulata was included in the study, no larval development was observed. Therefore, scientific justification for including Bactrocera umbrosa in the pest list (Table 1) and in the list of phytosanitary measure options (Table 3) as a pest associated with Citrus spp. should be provided. The supporting references should also be included on the IPP page, and a link to that page should be provided in Section 5.2 "Further Reading" (see general comment). References; Lauciello, N., Mille, C.G., Hafsi, A., Jacob, V. and Duyck, P.-F. (2024) Comparative adult preference–larval performance relationship between a specialist and a generalist tephritid: Implication for predicting field host-range. Ecology and Evolution 14(8): e70170.	O	
278	<i>Ceratitis ~~catoir~~<u>catoirii</u></i> Guérin-Méneville, 1843	P	<i>Category : EDITORIAL</i> (873) Japan (25 9 2026 7:48 午前)	O	

			The scientific name is misspelled. It should be corrected to [Ceratitis catairii Guérin-Méneville, 1843].		
293	<i>Ceratitis quinaria</i> (Bezzi, 1918)	C	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> (874) Japan (25 9 2026 7:58 午前) The following literature suggests that this species may not infest Citrus spp. · EPPO categorizes Citrus spp. as a “doubtful host” based on Manrakhan et al. (2020). · Manrakhan et al. (2020) investigated the occurrence of this species in citrus-growing areas and its natural infestation of Citrus fruits. As the species was not found on Citrus, the authors concluded that their findings support the view that Citrus is not a host of this species. Therefore, scientific justification for including <i>Ceratitis quinaria</i> in the pest list (Table 1) and in the list of phytosanitary measure options (Table 3) as a pest associated with Citrus spp. should be provided. The supporting references should also be included on the IPP page, and a link to that page should be provided in Section 5.2 “Further Reading” (see general comment). References; Manrakhan A, Grout TG, Grove T, Daneel JH, Stephen PR, Weldon CW, De Meyer M, Carstens E, Hattingh V (2020) A survey of <i>Ceratitis quinaria</i> (Bezzi) (Diptera: Tephritidae) in citrus production areas in South Africa. African Entomology.	O	
305	<i>Dacus punctatifrons</i> Karsch, 1887	C	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> (875) Japan (25 9 2026 8:12 午前) This species is known to infest plants in the family Cucurbitaceae. No literature has been identified indicating that it infests Citrus spp. Furthermore, Romeo et al. (2021) reported that larvae of this species were unable to develop on oranges (<i>Citrus sinensis</i>) and eventually died. Therefore, scientific justification for including <i>Dacus punctatifrons</i> in the pest list (Table 1) and in the list of phytosanitary measure options (Table 3) as a pest associated with Citrus spp. should be provided. The supporting references should also be included on the IPP page, and a link to that page should be provided in Section 5.2 “Further Reading” (see general comment).	O	

			References; Roméo HC, Stephan EAP, Désirée AC, Pierre FN and Djieto-Lordon C (2021) Investigate factors that affect host suitability and host range of Tephritidae: Case of tomato fruit fly <i>Dacus punctatifrons</i> Karsch, Bambili, Cameroon.		
326	<i>Toxoptera citricida</i> (Kirkaldy, 1907)	C	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> (876) Japan (25 9 2026 8:22 午前) This species is not known to infest mature fruits, nor is it known to be able to maintain a population on mature fruits. According to Yokomi (2009) and other references, it infests young leaves, stems, flowers and growing points. In addition, no primary literature has been identified indicating that this species infests on fresh fruits, whether immature or mature. Therefore, scientific justification for including <i>Toxoptera citricida</i> in the pest list (Table 1) and in the list of phytosanitary measure options (Table 3) as a pest associated with <i>Citrus</i> spp. should be provided. The supporting references should also be included on the IPP page, and a link to that page should be provided in Section 5.2 "Further Reading" (see general comment). References; Yokomi RK (2009) The brown citrus aphid, <i>Toxoptera citricida</i>. United States Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Research Service (USDA-ARS), Parlier, CA, USA.	O	
491	<i>Diaphorina citri</i> Kuwayama, 1908	C	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> (877) Japan (25 9 2026 8:23 午前) While <i>Diaphorina citri</i> is known to be a vector of citrus greening disease (HLB), there are no reports indicating that it directly damages or infests fruit. In addition, according to paragraph [66] of this Annex, contaminating pests are not within the scope of this Annex. Therefore, scientific justification for including <i>Diaphorina citri</i> in the pest list (Table 1) and in the list of phytosanitary measure options (Table 3) as a pest associated with <i>Citrus</i> spp. should be provided. The supporting references should also be included through the links in Section 5.2 "Further Reading" (see general comment).	O	
647	Citrus tristeza virus (CTV; species <i>Closterovirus tristezae</i>)	C	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>	O	

			(878) Japan (25 9 2026 8:41 午前) While Citrus tristeza virus is known to spread through the movement of infected plants, grafting, or aphid vectors, there is no literature indicating that fresh fruit serves as a source of infection under natural conditions. Additionally, CABI indicates that the risk of fresh fruit acting as a pathway for the transmission of the virus is negligible. Furthermore, Toxoptera citricida, a vector of Citrus tristeza virus, is included in the pest list of this Annex. However, this aphid is not known to infest mature fruit. Therefore, the likelihood of its being present on fresh citrus fruit and transmitting Citrus tristeza virus is considered negligible. In addition, no primary literature has been identified indicating that this species infests on fresh fruits, whether immature or mature. Therefore, Scientific justification for including Citrus tristeza virus in the pest list (Table 1) and in the list of phytosanitary measure options (Table 3) as a pest associated with Citrus spp. should be provided. The supporting references should also be included on the IPP page, and a link to that page should be provided in Section 5.2 "Further Reading" (see general comment). References; Cambra, M. (2025). Citrus tristeza virus (citrus tristeza). CABI Compendium, Article 16705. CAB International. https://doi.org/10.1079/cabicompendium.16705		
4. Options for phytosanitary measures					
651	This section provides options for phytosanitary measures that may be relevant for the pests listed in Table 1. The options presented are not exhaustive and contracting parties may consider other ~~options~~ <u>options as phytosanitary measures</u> .	P	<i>Category : EDITORIAL</i> (879) Japan (25 9 2026 8:50 午前) Add the text to align it with the CS1 (commodity standard for mango) and draft commodity standards for banana, taro (Colocasia), and apple.	O	
654	The NPPO of the importing country should decide whether the options listed in Table 3 are effective at managing the pest risk to an acceptable level before selecting them as phytosanitary measures. The NPPO should also consider whether a measure for one pest will effectively manage the pest risk of other regulated pests of <i>Citrus</i> spp. fruit. In addition, when applying these options as phytosanitary measures, the NPPO should consider <u>and document</u> the procedures for successful application.	P	<i>Category : EDITORIAL</i> (880) Japan (25 9 2026 8:53 午前) In the Annex for Banana, text on documentation was added following comments received during the first consultation. Therefore, the same text should also be included in this Annex.	O	

759	<i>Bactrocera caudata</i>	C	Category : <i>TECHNICAL</i> (881) Japan (25 9 2026 8:56 午前) As noted in the comment on Table 1, this species is known as a pest of cucurbit crops, especially Cucurbita moschata, and no literature has been identified indicating that Citrus spp. is a host of this species. Therefore, the scientific justification for including B. umbrosa in the pest list (Table 1) and in the list of phytosanitary measure options (Table 3) as a pest associated with Citrus spp. should be provided. The supporting references should also be included on the IPP page, and a link to that page should be provided in Section 5.2 "Further Reading" (see general comment).	O	
809	<i>Bactrocera umbrosa</i>	C	Category : <i>TECHNICAL</i> (882) Japan (25 9 2026 8:58 午前) As noted in the comment on Table 1, no literature has been identified reporting Citrus spp. as a host of this species. In addition, Lauciello et al. (2024) reported that this species reproduces only on Artocarpus spp. The authors evaluated larval development on sixteen fruit species. Although Citrus reticulata was included in the study, no larval development was observed. Therefore, scientific justification for including Bactrocera umbrosa in the pest list (Table 1) and in the list of phytosanitary measure options (Table 3) as a pest associated with Citrus spp. should be provided. The supporting references should also be included on the IPP page, and a link to that page should be provided in Section 5.2 "Further Reading" (see general comment).	O	
829	<i>Ceratitis quinaria</i>	C	Category : <i>TECHNICAL</i> (883) Japan (25 9 2026 8:59 午前) As noted in the comment on Table 1, the following literature suggests that this species may not infest Citrus spp. · EPPO categorizes Citrus spp. as a "doubtful host" based on Manrakhan et al. (2020). · Manrakhan et al. (2020) investigated the occurrence of this species in citrus-growing areas and its natural infestation of Citrus fruits. As the species was not found on Citrus, the authors concluded that their findings support the view that Citrus is not a host of this species. Therefore, scientific	O	

			justification for including Ceratitis quinaria in the pest list (Table 1) and in the list of phytosanitary measure options (Table 3) as a pest associated with Citrus spp. should be provided. The supporting references should also be included on the IPP page, and a link to that page should be provided in Section 5.2 "Further Reading" (see general comment).		
855	<i>Toxoptera citricida</i>	C	Category : TECHNICAL (884) Japan (25 9 2026 9:00 午前) As noted in the comment on Table 1, this species is not known to infest mature fruits, nor is it known to be able to maintain a population on mature fruits. According to Yokomi (2009) and other references, it infests young leaves, stems, flowers and growing points. In addition, no primary literature has been identified indicating that this species infests on fresh fruits, whether immature or mature. Therefore, scientific justification for including Toxoptera citricida in the pest list (Table 1) and in the list of phytosanitary measure options (Table 3) as a pest associated with Citrus spp. should be provided. The supporting references should also be included on the IPP page, and a link to that page should be provided in Section 5.2 "Further Reading" (see general comment).	O	
967	<i>Dialeurodes citri</i>	C	Category : TECHNICAL (885) Japan (25 9 2026 9:03 午前) As noted in the comment on Table 1, while Diaphorina citri is known to be a vector of citrus greening disease (HLB), there are no reports indicating that it directly damages or infests fruit. In addition, according to paragraph [66] of this Annex, contaminating pests are not within the scope of this Annex. Therefore, scientific justification for including Diaphorina citri in the pest list (Table 1) and in the list of phytosanitary measure options (Table 3) as a pest associated with Citrus spp. should be provided. The supporting references should also be included through the links in Section 5.2 "Further Reading" (see general comment).	O	
1075	<i>Pseudocercospora angolensis</i> ~~<i>angolensis</i>~~	P	Category : EDITORIAL (886) Japan (25 9 2026 9:04 午前) Correction of scientific name spelling.	O	

1087	Citrus tristeza virus	C	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> (887) Japan (25 9 2026 9:11 午前) As noted in the comment on Table 1, while Citrus tristeza virus is known to spread through the movement of infected plants, grafting, or aphid vectors, there is no literature indicating that fresh fruit serves as a source of infection under natural conditions. Additionally, CABI indicates that the risk of fresh fruit acting as a pathway for the transmission of the virus is negligible. Furthermore, <i>Toxoptera citricida</i>, a vector of Citrus tristeza virus, is included in the pest list of this Annex. However, this aphid is not known to infest mature fruit. Therefore, the likelihood of its being present on fresh citrus fruit and transmitting Citrus tristeza virus is considered negligible. In addition, no primary literature has been identified indicating that this species infests on fresh fruit, whether immature or mature. Therefore, Scientific justification for including Citrus tristeza virus in the pest list (Table 1) and in the list of phytosanitary measure options (Table 3) as a pest associated with Citrus spp. should be provided. The supporting references should also be included on the IPP page, and a link to that page should be provided in Section 5.2 "Further Reading" (see general comment).	O	
1560	SA 2	C	<i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i> (888) Japan (25 9 2026 9:13 午前) The independent measures comprising this systems approach should be described in detail in accordance with ISPM 35. Otherwise, this option should be removed. ISPM 35 provides guidelines for the development, implementation, and verification of systems approaches for fruit flies. As such, it is not considered a phytosanitary measure in itself that can be adopted by contracting parties.	O	

Reconciliation report for 2023-008_DraftCS_Phaseolus seeds_en.docx (2023-008_DraftCS_Phaseolus seeds_en.docx)

Summary

Title	2026 First consultation - 2023-008 - 2. Draft annex to ISPM 46: Movement of Phaseolus vulgaris seeds in international trade (Id 1857)
Description	
Start Date	1 7 2026 12:48 午後
End Date	30 9 2026 11:45 午後
Closed Out Date	
Completed Date	
Review Status	In Progress

Participants

Name	Status	Role	Summary	Comments	Last Activity
Japan	Completed	Reviewer		44	30 9 2026 7:51 午前

T (Type) - B = Bullet, C = Comment, P = Proposed Change, R = Rating
S (Status) - A = Accepted, C = Closed, O = Open, W = Withdrawn, M = Merged

Para	Text	T	Comment	S	Author Comment
G	(General Comment)	C	Category : <i>SUBSTANTIVE</i> (723) Japan (28 9 2026 4:27 午前) We understand that at the June 2025 Technical Panel meeting, it was agreed that pests "associated with" Phaseolus vulgaris seed should be included in the annex table without distinguishing between Seed-transmitted pests and other Seed-borne pests. However, ISPM 38 classifies seed-borne pests into the following three categories: Category 1(a): Seed-transmitted pests that are carried by the seed internally or externally by the seed and directly infest the host plant from the seed. Category 1(b): Non-seed-transmitted pests that are carried by the seed internally or externally and are transferred to the environment (e.g. water or soil) and then infest a host plant under natural conditions. Category 1(c): Pests carried by the seed, internally or externally, that do not transfer to a host plant under natural conditions. Of these categories, pests falling under	O	

			Categories 1(a) and 1(b) are subject to assessment with respect to establishment, spread, and related phytosanitary risks, whereas Category 1(c) pests are considered incapable of transferring to host plants and therefore unable to establish. Accordingly, we believe that a commodity standard for seeds intended for planting should not automatically include all seed-borne pests. Rather, it would be appropriate to verify whether any listed pests fall within Category 1(c) and, if so, exclude them from the annex table.		
G	(General Comment)	C	<i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i> (590) Japan (25 9 2026 9:22 午前) We request that the scientific justification for the List of Pests (Table 1) and the List of Phytosanitary Measure Options (Table 2) be made available on the IPP through the link provided in Section 5.2, "Further Reading", before the second consultation. Without access to the scientific justification, it is difficult to adequately assess the appropriateness of the listed pests and phytosanitary measure options.	O	
G	(General Comment)	C	<i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i> (589) Japan (25 9 2026 9:21 午前) For greater clarity and transparency, we request that references be provided for all pests and phytosanitary measures listed in Tables 1 and 3. Alternatively, we request that corresponding reference numbers be assigned both to the scientific justifications provided through the links in Section 5.2, "Further Reading", and to the individual pests and phytosanitary measures listed in Tables 1 and 3, so that each item can be clearly linked to its supporting references.	O	
3. Pests associated with Phaseolus vulgaris seeds					
111	The pests included in Table 1 are considered to be associated with <i>P. vulgaris</i> seeds and are regulated in international trade by at least one contracting party based on technical justification. The list of pests is not exhaustive, nor country ~~specifies~~ specific and should not be interpreted as a list for regulated pests.	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> (591) Japan (25 9 2026 9:24 午前) As this text has been added to the draft annexes for Musa and Colocasia for the second consultation, it should also be included in this annex.	O	
122	Bruchidae	C	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> (592) Japan (25 9 2026 9:27 午前) Bruchidae and Chrysomelidae should be treated as a single family throughout the document. The eight species listed in Table	O	

		1 as belonging to either Bruchidae or Chrysomelidae were formerly classified in the family Bruchidae. Under the currently accepted classification, they are generally placed to the subfamily Bruchinae within the family Chrysomelidae. Regardless of the taxonomic classification adopted, these species should be assigned consistently either to Bruchidae or to Chrysomelidae throughout the table. References; Haddad, S. & McKenna, D.D. (2016) Phylogeny and evolution of the superfamily Chrysomeloidea (Coleoptera: Cucujiformia). Systematic Entomology, 41, 697-716. https://doi.org/10.1111/syen.12179 Zhang, H., Song, N. & Yin, X. (2022) Higher-level phylogeny of Chrysomelidae based on expanded sampling of mitogenomes. PLoS ONE, 17(1), e0258587. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0258587		
143	Chrysomelidae	C <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> (593) Japan (25 9 2026 9:28 午前) Bruchidae and Chrysomelidae should be treated as a single family throughout the document. The eight species listed in Table 1 as belonging to either Bruchidae or Chrysomelidae were formerly classified in the family Bruchidae. Under the currently accepted classification, they are generally placed to the subfamily Bruchinae within the family Chrysomelidae. Regardless of the taxonomic classification adopted, these species should be assigned consistently either to Bruchidae or to Chrysomelidae throughout the table. References; Haddad, S. & McKenna, D.D. (2016) Phylogeny and evolution of the superfamily Chrysomeloidea (Coleoptera: Cucujiformia). Systematic Entomology, 41, 697-716. https://doi.org/10.1111/syen.12179 Zhang, H., Song, N. & Yin, X. (2022) Higher-level phylogeny of Chrysomelidae based on expanded sampling of mitogenomes. PLoS ONE, 17(1), e0258587. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0258587	O	

159	<i>Phytophthora sojae</i> Kaufm. & Gerd., 1958	C	Category : <i>TECHNICAL</i> (726) Japan (28 9 2026 8:21 午前) Phytophthora sojae, the causal agent of soybean Phytophthora stem and root rot, can infect common bean (Phaseolus vulgaris) under artificial inoculation with a high inoculum pressure. However, common bean exhibits a hypersensitive response to the pathogen (Bi, 2022), and it has been used as a non-host resistant plant for P. sojae (Zhang et al., 2022). These findings indicate that common bean is not a host of this pathogen. Therefore, we propose that Phytophthora sojae be removed from the pest list and the list of phytosanitary measure options. Alternatively, if there is evidence supporting its inclusion in these lists, we would appreciate it if the IPPC could provide the reference materials and scientific basis on which that decision was made. References; Bi,X. (2022) Isoflavone phytoalexins in root exudates participate in mediating the resistance of common bean Phaseolus vulgaris to Phytophthora sojae. Plant Pathology 72,120-129. Zhang,Z.(2022) Maize and common bean seed exudates mediated part of nonhost resistance to Phytophthora sojae prior to infection.	O	
186	~~Elsinoe~~ - <i>Elsinoë</i> phaseoli Jenkins, 1933	P	Category : <i>TECHNICAL</i> (594) Japan (25 9 2026 9:38 午前) The scientific name is incorrectly formatted and should be corrected to Elsinoë phaseoli by adding the diaeresis over the letter "e".	O	
204	<i>Fusarium solani</i> f. ~~phaseoli~~ <i>phaseoli</i> sp W.C. Snyder & H.N. Hansen, 1941	P	Category : <i>TECHNICAL</i> (598) Japan (25 9 2026 10:09 午前) Correct the scientific name.	O	
207	<i>Olpidium brassicae</i> (Woronin) P.A. Dang., 1886	C	Category : <i>TECHNICAL</i> (597) Japan (25 9 2026 10:08 午前) No literature has been identified indicating that Olpidium brassicae is seed-borne in Phaseolus vulgaris seeds or causes damage to those seeds. Therefore, scientific justification for including O. brassicae in the pest list (Table 1) and in the list of	O	

			phytosanitary measure options (Table 3) as a pest associated with <i>Phaseolus vulgaris</i> should be provided. The supporting references should also be included on the IPP page, and a link to that page should be provided in Section 5.2 "Further Reading" (see general comment). References; CABI. 2026. <i>Olpidium brassicae</i> (<i>Olpidium seedling blight</i>). CABI Compendium, Datasheet 37321. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1079/cabicompendium.37321 Singh,S.L.(1977) <i>Olpidium brassicae</i> in cabbage roots. <i>Mycopathologia</i> 62,47-52 Pathogen Profile:<i>Olpidium brassicae</i>, in Healthy Hydroponics (https://www.healthyhydroponics.ca/2023/08/24/pathogen-profile-olpidium-brassicae/) This pest is not listed in the ISF Regulated Pest List as being associated with <i>Phaseolus vulgaris</i> seed as a pathway. (https://isfpestlist.worldseed.org/pest-name/?str=Olpidium%20brassicae&idp=816)		
210	<i>Verticillium dahlia</i> Kleb., 1913	C	Category : TECHNICAL (724) Japan (28 9 2026 4:50 午前) No literature has been identified indicating that <i>Verticillium dahliae</i> is seed-borne in <i>Phaseolus vulgaris</i> seeds or causes damage to those seeds. Therefore, scientific justification in the pest list (Table 1) and in the list of phytosanitary measure options (Table 3) as a pest associated with <i>Phaseolus vulgaris</i> should be provided. The supporting references should also be included on the IPP page, and a link to that page should be provided in Section 5.2 "Further Reading" (see general comment). References; CABI. 2026. <i>Verticillium dahliae</i> (<i>verticillium wilt</i>). CABI Compendium, Datasheet 56275. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1079/cabicompendium.56275 EPPO. 2026. EPPO Global Database, https://gd.eppo.int/taxon/VERTDA/hosts	O	

			This pest is not listed in the ISF Regulated Pest List as being associated with Phaseolus vulgaris seed as a pathway. (https://isfpestlist.worldseed.org/pest-name/?str=Verticillium%20dahliae&idp=1340)		
210	<i>Verticillium ~~dahlia~~-dahliae</i> Kleb., 1913	P	Category : <i>TECHNICAL</i> (596) Japan (25 9 2026 10:07 午前) Correct the spelling of the scientific name.	O	
213	<i>Alternaria brassicae</i> (Berk.) Sacc., 1880	C	Category : <i>TECHNICAL</i> (606) Japan (25 9 2026 10:28 午前) Alternaria brassicae is primarily known as a pest of Brassicaceae plants, and no literature has been identified indicating that it is seed-borne in Phaseolus vulgaris seeds or causes damage to those seeds. Therefore, Scientific justification for including A. brassicae in the pest list (Table 1) and in the list of phytosanitary measure options (Table 3) as a pest associated with Phaseolus vulgaris should be provided. The supporting references should also be included on the IPP page, and a link to that page should be provided in Section 5.2 "Further Reading" (see general comment). References; CABI. 2026. Alternaria brassicae (dark spot of crucifers). CABI Compendium, Datasheet 4482. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1079/cabicompndium.4482 This pest is not listed in the ISF Regulated Pest List as being associated with Phaseolus vulgaris seed as a pathway. (https://isfpestlist.worldseed.org/pest-name/?str=Alternaria%20brassicae&idp=44)	O	
225	<i>Ralstonia solanacearum</i> (Smith, 1896) Yabuuchi <i>et al.</i> , 1996	C	Category : <i>TECHNICAL</i> (725) Japan (28 9 2026 5:03 午前) (1) Scientific justification for including Ralstonia solanacearum in the pest list (Table 1) and in the list of phytosanitary measure options (Table 3) as a pest associated with Phaseolus vulgaris should be provided. The supporting references should also be included on the IPP page, and a link to that page should be provided in Section 5.2 "Further Reading" (see general comment).	O	

			(2) In addition, it should be clarified whether the scientific basis for its inclusion applies to the entire <i>Ralstonia solanacearum</i> species complex (RSSC) or is limited to specific phylotypes, sequevars, biovars, and/or races. References; CABI. 2026. <i>Ralstonia solanacearum</i> (bacterial wilt of potato). CABI Compendium, Datasheet 45009. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1079/cabicompedium.45009 EFSA Panel on Plant Health (EFSA PLH Panel). 2019. Pest categorisation of the <i>Ralstonia solanacearum</i> species complex. <i>EFSA Journal</i>, 17(2):5618. https://doi.org/10.2903/j.efsa.2019.5618 EPPO. 2026. EPPO Datasheet: <i>Ralstonia solanacearum</i>. EPPO Global Database. Available at: https://gd.eppo.int/taxon/RALSSO This pest is not listed in the ISF Regulated Pest List as being associated with <i>Phaseolus vulgaris</i> seed as a pathway. (https://isfpestlist.worldseed.org/pest-name/?str=Ralstonia%20solanacearum&idp=1084)		
236	~~Nocardiacea~~ <u>Nocardiaceae</u>	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> (595) Japan (25 9 2026 10:06 午前) Correct the spelling of the family name.	O	
237	<i>Rhodococcus fascians</i> (Tilford, 1936) Goodfellow, 1984	C	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> (727) Japan (28 9 2026 8:34 午前) Although <i>Rhodococcus fascians</i> has been reported to cause symptoms on <i>Phaseolus vulgaris</i> in artificial inoculation experiments (Lacey, 1939), there are no reports demonstrating that <i>P. vulgaris</i> is a natural host of this bacterium. Furthermore, <i>P. vulgaris</i> is not included in the host plant list for <i>R. fascians</i> in the EPPO Global Database (EPPO, 2026). As <i>R. fascians</i> appears not to infect <i>P. vulgaris</i> under natural conditions and therefore meets the exclusion criteria set out in paragraph 69, we propose that this bacterium and the corresponding	O	

			phytosanitary measures be removed from Tables 1 and 3. References; Lacey, M.S. (1939). Studies Est Bacteriosis XXIV: Studies on a bacterium associated with leafy galls, fasciations and "cauliflower" disease of various plants. Part ILL: Further isolations, inoculation experiments and cultural studies. Annals of Applied Biology 26(2):262-278. EPPO (2026). EPPO Global Database. https://gd.eppo.int/taxon/CORBFA/hosts		
263	Potyviridae	C	Category : EDITORIAL (599) Japan (25 9 2026 10:12 午前) Add Peanut mottle virus (PeMoV; species Potyvirus arachidis) to Table 1 because Peanut mottle virus is listed in Table 3 but not in Table 1.	O	
276	Arabis mosaic virus (ArMV; species <i>Nepovirus arabis</i>)	C	Category : TECHNICAL (728) Japan (28 9 2026 8:42 午前) Arabis mosaic virus has been reported to cause symptoms in Phaseolus vulgaris under artificial inoculation conditions (CABI and EPPO, 1990). However, there are no reports demonstrating that P. vulgaris is the natural host of this virus. Furthermore, the EPPO Global Database classifies P. vulgaris as an experimental host in the host plant list for Arabis mosaic virus (EPPO, 2026). As this virus is not considered to infect P. vulgaris under natural conditions and therefore appears to meet the exclusion criteria set out in paragraph 69, we propose that Arabis mosaic virus and the corresponding phytosanitary measures be deleted from Tables 1 and 3. References; CABI and EPPO (1990). Arabis mosaic nepovirus. Data sheets on quarantine pests. Prepared by CABI and EPPO for the EU under Contract 90/399003. EPPO (2026). EPPO Global Database. https://gd.eppo.int/taxon/ARMV00/hosts	O	
282	Broad bean stain virus (BBSV; species <i>Comovirus viciae</i>)	C	Category : TECHNICAL (600) Japan (25 9 2026 10:13 午前) No literature has been identified indicating that broad bean stain virus is seed-borne in	O	

			Phaseolus vulgaris seeds or causes damage to those seeds. Therefore, scientific justification for including broad bean stain virus in the pest list (Table 1) and in the list of phytosanitary measure options (Table 3) as a pest associated with P. vulgaris should be provided. The supporting references should also be included on the IPP page, and a link to that page should be provided in Section 5.2 "Further Reading" (see general comment). References; CABI (2026) https://www.cabidigitallibrary.org/doi/10.1079/cabicompndium.8672#sec-5 This pest is not listed in the ISF Regulated Pest List as being associated with Phaseolus vulgaris seed as a pathway. (https://isfpestlist.worldseed.org/pest-name/?str=Comovirus%20viciae&idp=356&sy=Broad%20bean%20stain%20virus)		
285	Cherry leaf roll virus (CLRV; species <i>Nepovirus avii</i>)	C	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> (729) Japan (28 9 2026 8:44 午前) No literature has been identified indicating that Cherry leaf roll virus is seed-borne in Phaseolus vulgaris seeds or causes damage to those seeds. Therefore, scientific justification for including Cherry leaf roll virus in the pest list (Table 1) and in the list of phytosanitary measure options (Table 3) as a pest associated with P. vulgaris should be provided. The supporting references should also be included on the IPP page, and a link to that page should be provided in Section 5.2 "Further Reading" (see general comment). References; EPPO (2026). EPPO Global Database. https://gd.eppo.int/taxon/CLRV00/hosts	O	
297	Soybean dwarf virus (SbDV; species <i>Luteovirus glycinis</i>)	C	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> (730) Japan (28 9 2026 8:47 午前) Soybean dwarf virus (<i>Luteovirus glycinis</i>) is known to infect common bean via aphid transmission. However, there are no reports demonstrating seed transmission in Phaseolus vulgaris or other hosts, and the virus has been described as non-seed-transmitted (DPV, 1977). As P. vulgaris seed	O	

			is therefore not considered to pose a phytosanitary risk for this virus, we propose the removal of Soybean dwarf virus and the corresponding phytosanitary measures from Tables 1 and 3. References; DPV (1977) Soybean dwarf virus. Descriptions of viruses No.179		
300	Pea early-browning virus (PEBV; species <i>Tobravirus pisi</i>)	C	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> (601) Japan (25 9 2026 10:15 午前) No literature has been identified indicating that Pea early-browning virus is seed-borne in <i>Phaseolus vulgaris</i> seeds or causes damage to those seeds. Therefore, scientific justification for including Pea early-browning virus in the pest list (Table 1) and in the list of phytosanitary measure options (Table 3) as a pest associated with <i>P. vulgaris</i> should be provided. The supporting references should also be included on the IPP page, and a link to that page should be provided in Section 5.2 "Further Reading" (see general comment). This pest is not listed in the ISF Regulated Pest List as being associated with <i>Phaseolus vulgaris</i> seed as a pathway. (https://isfpestlist.worldseed.org/pest-name/?str=Tobravirus%20pisi&idp=841&sy=Pea%20early-browning%20virus)	O	
4. Options for phytosanitary measures					
304	This section provides options for phytosanitary measures that may be relevant for the pests listed in Table 1. The options presented are not exhaustive and contracting parties may consider other ~~options~~ <u>options as phytosanitary measures</u> .	P	<i>Category : EDITORIAL</i> (602) Japan (25 9 2026 10:17 午前) Add the text to align it with the CS1 (commodity standard for mango) and draft commodity standards for banana, taro (<i>Colocasia</i>), and apple.	O	
307	The NPPO of the importing country should decide whether the options listed in Table 3 are effective at managing the pest risk to an acceptable level before selecting them as phytosanitary measures. The NPPO should also consider whether a measure for one pest will effectively manage the pest risk of other regulated pests of <i>P. vulgaris</i> seeds. In addition, when applying these options as phytosanitary measures, the NPPO should consider <u>and document</u> the procedures for successful application.	P	<i>Category : EDITORIAL</i> (603) Japan (25 9 2026 10:19 午前) In the Annex for Banana, text on documentation was added following comments received during the first consultation. Therefore, the same text should also be included in this Annex.	O	
310	Seeds may be treated to reduce the pest risk. <u>Treatments selected for use should be effective at managing the pest and have regulatory approval</u> . Table 3 lists only those seed treatments for which specific details were submitted by contracting	C	<i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i> (604) Japan (25 9 2026 10:22 午前) The corresponding text is not included in the other draft annexes to ISPM 46. Based on	O	

	parties.		the current wording, it is unclear why this statement is necessary specifically for <i>Phaseolus vulgaris</i> . Therefore, additional explanation of the rationale for including this text and its intended application is requested.		
378	<i>Phytophthora sojae</i>	C	Category : TECHNICAL (733) Japan (28 9 2026 10:17 午前) As commented on table1, we propose that <i>Phytophthora sojae</i> be removed from the pest list and the list of phytosanitary measure options. Alternatively, if there is evidence supporting its inclusion in these lists, we would appreciate it if the IPPC could provide the reference materials and scientific basis on which that decision was made.	O	
382	<i>Alternaria brassicae</i>	C	Category : TECHNICAL (605) Japan (25 9 2026 10:26 午前) As commented on Table 1, <i>Alternaria brassicae</i> is primarily known as a pest of Brassicaceae plants, and no literature has been identified indicating that it is seed-borne in <i>P. vulgaris</i> seeds or causes damage to those seeds. Therefore, Scientific justification for including <i>A. brassicae</i> in the pest list (Table 1) and in the list of phytosanitary measure options (Table 3) as a pest associated with <i>Phaseolus vulgaris</i> should be provided. The supporting references should also be included on the IPP page, and a link to that page should be provided in Section 5.2 "Further Reading" (see general comment).	O	
404	~~<i>Elsinoë</i>~~ - <i>Elsinoë phaseoli</i>	P	Category : TECHNICAL (610) Japan (25 9 2026 11:06 午前) The scientific name is incorrectly formatted and should be corrected to <i>Elsinoë phaseoli</i> by adding the diaeresis over the letter "e".	O	
408	<i>Fusarium oxysporum</i> f.sp. ~~<i>phaseol</i>~~ <i>phaseoli</i>	P	Category : TECHNICAL (608) Japan (25 9 2026 11:03 午前) Correct the spelling of the scientific name.	O	
410	<i>Fusarium solani</i> f. ~~<i>sp.</i>~~ <i>phaseoli</i>	P	Category : TECHNICAL (714) Japan (28 9 2026 3:50 午前) Correct the spelling of the scientific name.	O	
414	<i>Olpidium brassicae</i>	C	Category : TECHNICAL (609) Japan (25 9 2026 11:04 午前) As commented on Table 1, no literature has been identified indicating that <i>Olpidium brassicae</i> is seed-borne in <i>P. vulgaris</i> seeds	O	

			or causes damage to those seeds. Therefore, scientific justification for including <i>O. brassicae</i> in the pest list (Table 1) and in the list of phytosanitary measure options (Table 3) as a pest associated with <i>Phaseolus vulgaris</i> should be provided. The supporting references should also be included on the IPP page, and a link to that page should be provided in Section 5.2 "Further Reading" (see general comment).		
417	Field inspection; PFA; seed inspection	C	<i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i> (715) Japan (28 9 2026 3:52 午前) Clarify the differences between "seed inspection," "export inspection," and "testing." While the definition of "testing" is provided in ISPM 5, definitions for "seed inspection" and "export inspection" are not provided. In particular, the distinction between "seed inspection" and "export inspection" is unclear. Therefore, an explanation of these terms and how they differ from one another is needed.	O	
419	Field inspection; field inspection and parent plant testing; PFA; PFPP; seed inspection; testing	C	<i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i> (716) Japan (28 9 2026 3:53 午前) Clarify the differences between "seed inspection," "export inspection," and "testing." While the definition of "testing" is provided in ISPM 5, definitions for "seed inspection" and "export inspection" are not provided. In particular, the distinction between "seed inspection" and "export inspection" is unclear. Therefore, an explanation of these terms and how they differ from one another is needed.	O	
422	<i>Verticillium dahliae</i>	C	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> (734) Japan (28 9 2026 10:20 午前) As commented on Table1, no literature has been identified indicating that <i>Verticillium dahliae</i> is seed-borne in <i>P. vulgaris</i> seeds or causes damage to those seeds. Therefore, scientific justification in the pest list (Table 1) and in the list of phytosanitary measure options (Table 3) as a pest associated with <i>Phaseolus vulgaris</i> should be provided. The supporting references should also be included on the IPP page, and a link to that page should be provided in Section 5.2 "Further Reading" (see general comment).	O	
422	<i>Verticillium dahliae</i>	C	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> (717) Japan (28 9 2026 4:10 午前) As commented on Table 1, no literature has	O	

			been identified indicating that <i>Verticillium dahliae</i> is seed-borne in <i>P. vulgaris</i> seeds or causes damage to those seeds. Therefore, scientific justification for including <i>V. dahliae</i> in the pest list (Table 1) and in the list of phytosanitary measure options (Table 3) as a pest associated with <i>Phaseolus vulgaris</i> should be provided. The supporting references should also be included on the IPP page, and a link to that page should be provided in Section 5.2 "Further Reading" (see general comment).		
434	<i>Ralstonia solanacearum</i>	C	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> (718) Japan (28 9 2026 4:11 午前) As commented on Table 1, no literature has been identified indicating that <i>Ralstonia solanacearum</i> is seed-borne in <i>P. vulgaris</i> seeds or causes damage to those seeds. Therefore, Scientific justification for including <i>R. solanacearum</i> in the pest list (Table 1) and in the list of phytosanitary measure options (Table 3) as a pest associated with <i>Phaseolus vulgaris</i> should be provided. The supporting references should also be included on the IPP page, and a link to that page should be provided in Section 5.2 "Further Reading" (see general comment).	O	
436	<i>Rhodococcus fascians</i>	C	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> (735) Japan (28 9 2026 10:30 午前) As commented on table1, although <i>Rhodococcus fascians</i> has been reported to cause symptoms on <i>Phaseolus vulgaris</i> in artificial inoculation experiments (Lacey, 1939), there are no reports demonstrating that <i>P. vulgaris</i> is a natural host of this bacterium. Furthermore, <i>P. vulgaris</i> is not included in the host plant list for <i>R. fascians</i> in the EPPO Global Database (EPPO, 2026). As <i>R. fascians</i> appears not to infect <i>P. vulgaris</i> under natural conditions and therefore meets the exclusion criteria set out in paragraph 69, we propose that this bacterium and the corresponding phytosanitary measures be removed from Tables 1 and 3.	O	
446	Arabis mosaic virus	C	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> (736) Japan (28 9 2026 10:32 午前) As commented on table1, <i>Arabis mosaic virus</i> has been reported to cause symptoms in <i>Phaseolus vulgaris</i> under artificial	O	

			inoculation conditions (CABI and EPPO, 1990). However, there are no reports demonstrating that <i>P. vulgaris</i> is the natural host of this virus. Furthermore, the EPPO Global Database classifies <i>P. vulgaris</i> as an experimental host in the host plant list for Arabis mosaic virus (EPPO, 2026). As this virus is not considered to infect <i>P. vulgaris</i> under natural conditions and therefore appears to meet the exclusion criteria set out in paragraph 69, we propose that Arabis mosaic virus and the corresponding phytosanitary measures be deleted from Tables 1 and 3.		
456	Broad bean stain virus	C	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> (719) Japan (28 9 2026 4:11 午前) As commented on Table 1, no literature has been identified indicating that broad bean stain virus is seed-borne in <i>P. vulgaris</i> seeds or causes damage to those seeds. Therefore, scientific justification for including broad bean stain virus in the pest list (Table 1) and in the list of phytosanitary measure options (Table 3) as a pest associated with <i>P. vulgaris</i> should be provided. The supporting references should also be included on the IPP page, and a link to that page should be provided in Section 5.2 "Further Reading" (see general comment).	O	
458	Cherry leaf roll virus	C	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> (737) Japan (28 9 2026 10:35 午前) As commented on Table1, no literature has been identified indicating that Cherry leaf roll virus is seed-borne in <i>Phaseolus vulgaris</i> seeds or causes damage to those seeds. Therefore, scientific justification for including Cherry leaf roll virus in the pest list (Table 1) and in the list of phytosanitary measure options (Table 3) as a pest associated with <i>P. vulgaris</i> should be provided. The supporting references should also be included on the IPP page, and a link to that page should be provided in Section 5.2 "Further Reading" (see general comment).	O	
464	Pea early-browning virus	C	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> (720) Japan (28 9 2026 4:12 午前) As commented on Table 1, no literature has been identified indicating that Pea early-browning virus is seed-borne in <i>P. vulgaris</i> seeds or causes damage to those seeds.	O	

			Therefore, scientific justification for including Pea early-browning virus in the pest list (Table 1) and in the list of phytosanitary measure options (Table 3) as a pest associated with <i>P. vulgaris</i> should be provided. The supporting references should also be included on the IPP page, and a link to that page should be provided in Section 5.2 "Further Reading" (see general comment).		
474	Soybean dwarf virus	C	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> (738) Japan (28 9 2026 10:38 午前) As commented on Table1, Soybean dwarf virus (Luteovirus glycinis) is known to infect common bean via aphid transmission. However, there are no reports demonstrating seed transmission in <i>Phaseolus vulgaris</i> or other hosts, and the virus has been described as non-seed-transmitted (DPV, 1977). As <i>P. vulgaris</i> seed is therefore not considered to pose a phytosanitary risk for this virus, we propose the removal of Soybean dwarf virus and the corresponding phytosanitary measures from Tables 1 and 3.	O	
480	Notes: * Field inspection targeting the pest of concern and the application of a corrective action if the pest is detected.	C	<i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i> (721) Japan (28 9 2026 4:13 午前) Propose including details of the corrective action.	O	
483	Table 4. Options for chemical seed treatment with fungicides (FNG) <u>IMPORTANT: The chemical treatments listed in this table represent options for phytosanitary measures only. They do not imply that these products are registered or approved for use in any country. Users must verify compliance with national pesticide regulations before application.</u>	P	<i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i> (722) Japan (28 9 2026 4:15 午前) The chemical substances listed in Table 4 are commercially available as pesticide products. As a result, there is a risk that producers or consumers may use such products without first confirming the pesticide regulations in their country. Therefore, it is proposed that a clearly visible disclaimer, such as the one below, be included in a prominent location (e.g. beneath the title) to encourage producers and consumers to verify compliance with national pesticide regulations.	O	

Reconciliation report for 2023-024_DraftCS_MalusDomestica_en.docx (2023-024_DraftCS_MalusDomestica_en.docx)

Summary

Title	2026 First consultation- 2023-024 - Draft annex to ISPM 46: Movement of Malus domestica fruit in international trade (Id 1858)
Description	
Start Date	1 7 2026 12:50 午後
End Date	30 9 2026 11:45 午後
Closed Out Date	
Completed Date	
Review Status	In Progress

Participants

Name	Status	Role	Summary	Comments	Last Activity
Japan	In Progress	Reviewer		43	25 9 2026 10:18 午前

T (Type) - B = Bullet, C = Comment, P = Proposed Change, R = Rating
S (Status) - A = Accepted, C = Closed, O = Open, W = Withdrawn, M = Merged

Para	Text	T	Comment	S	Author Comment
G	(General Comment)	C	Category : TECHNICAL (572) Japan (25 9 2026 7:01 午前) We request that the scientific justification for the List of Pests (Table 1) and the List of Phytosanitary Measure Options (Table 2) be made available on the IPP through the link provided in Section 5.2, "Further Reading", before the second consultation. Without access to the scientific justification, it is difficult to adequately assess the appropriateness of the listed pests and phytosanitary measure options.	O	
G	(General Comment)	C	Category : TECHNICAL (571) Japan (25 9 2026 7:00 午前) For greater clarity and transparency, we request that references be provided for all pests and phytosanitary measures listed in Tables 1 and 3. Alternatively, we request that corresponding reference numbers be assigned both to the scientific justifications provided through the links in Section 5.2, "Further Reading", and to the individual pests and phytosanitary measures listed in Tables 1 and 3, so that each item can be clearly linked to its supporting references.	O	
Synonyms of pest names submitted but omitted from the draft CS					
19	Amphitetranychus viennensis (Zacher, 1920) (= Tetranychus ~~viennensis~~ viennensis)	P	Category : TECHNICAL	O	

			(573) Japan (25 9 2026 7:02 午前) Correct the spelling of the scientific name.		
49	<i>Thaumatotibia leucotreta</i> (Meyrick, 1913) (= <i>Cryptophlebia leucotreta</i>)	C	Category : TECHNICAL (574) Japan (25 9 2026 7:16 午前) The following literature suggests that this species may not infest <i>Malus domestica</i>. · De Jager (2013) reported that, in egg inoculation experiments, larvae were unable to penetrate apples and subsequently died. · EPPO (2026) regards <i>Malus domestica</i> as a doubtful host because there are no reports of infested apple fruits, although the species has been detected in orchard trapping surveys. Therefore, scientific justification for including <i>T. leucotreta</i> in the pest list (Table 1) and in the list of phytosanitary measure options (Table 3) as a pest associated with <i>M. domestica</i> should be provided. The supporting references should also be included on the IPP page, and a link to that page should be provided in Section 5.2 "Further Reading" (see general comment). References: de Jager ZM. 2013. Biology and ecology of the false codling moth, <i>Thaumatotibia leucotreta</i> (Meyrick). PhD thesis, Stellenbosch University, South Africa. 98 pp. EPPO. 2026. EPPO Global Database, <i>Thaumatotibia leucotreta</i> hosts. Available at: https://gd.eppo.int/taxon/ARGPLE/hosts	O	
3. Pests associated with fresh <i>Malus domestica</i> fruit					
137	The pests included in Table 1 are considered to be associated with fresh <i>M. domestica</i> fruit and are regulated in international trade by at least one contracting party based on technical justification. The list of pests is not exhaustive, nor country ~~specific~~ <u>specific and should not be interpreted as a list for regulated pests.</u>	P	Category : SUBSTANTIVE (575) Japan (25 9 2026 7:28 午前) As this text has been added to the draft annexes for <i>Musa</i> and <i>Colocasia</i> for the second consultation, it should also be included in this annex, add the sentence.	O	
155	<i>Brevipalpus chilensis</i> Baker, 1949	C	Category : TECHNICAL (576) Japan (25 9 2026 7:43 午前) This species is known to infest plants in <i>Vitis</i> spp. and <i>Citrus</i> spp. No literature has been identified indicating that it infests <i>Malus</i> spp. Therefore, scientific justification for including <i>Brevipalpus chilensis</i> in the pest list (Table 1) and in the list of phytosanitary measure options (Table 3) as a pest associated with	O	

			Malus domestica should be provided. The supporting references should also be included on the IPP page, and a link to that page should be provided in Section 5.2 "Further Reading" (see general comment). References: CABI. 2026. Brevipalpus chilensis (Chilean false red mite). CABI Compendium.		
245	<i>Rhagoletis cerasi</i> (Linnaeus, 1758)	C	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> (577) Japan (25 9 2026 7:49 午前) This species is known to be a major pest of cherry trees. Many species in the genus <i>Rhagoletis</i>, including this species, have a narrow host range. No literature has been identified indicating that it infests <i>Malus</i> spp. Therefore, Scientific justification for including <i>Rhagoletis cerasi</i> in the pest list (Table 1) and in the list of phytosanitary measure options (Table 3) as a pest associated with <i>Malus domestica</i> should be provided. The supporting references should also be included on the IPP page, and a link to that page should be provided in Section 5.2 "Further Reading" (see general comment). References: Boller EF, Prokopy RJ. 1976. Bionomics and management of <i>Rhagoletis</i>. Annual Review of Entomology 21: 223-246. CABI. 2026. <i>Rhagoletis cerasi</i> (European cherry fruit fly). CABI Compendium. Available at: https://www.cabidigitallibrary.org/doi/full/10.1079/cabicompendium.47050	O	
260	~~<i>Rhopalosiphum insertum</i> (Walker, 1849)~~ <i>Rhopalosiphum oxyacanthae</i> (Schrank, 1801)	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> (578) Japan (25 9 2026 7:51 午前) A search of ZooBank did not return any records for <i>Rhopalosiphum insertum</i>. Although <i>Rhopalosiphum oxyacanthae</i> was also not found in ZooBank, both CABI and EPPO recognize <i>Rhopalosiphum oxyacanthae</i> as the accepted scientific name. Furthermore, Catalogue of Life (2026) does not recognize <i>Rhopalosiphum insertum</i> as a valid name and lists it as an ambiguous synonym of <i>Aphis annuae</i>, <i>Rhopalosiphum oxyacanthae</i> and <i>Rhopalosiphum sanguinarium</i>. The use of <i>R. insertum</i> may	O	

			therefore create ambiguity regarding the taxonomic identity of the species concerned. In addition, <i>Rhopalosiphum oxyacanthae</i> is adopted as the accepted scientific name in major aphid taxonomic databases, including Blackman & Eastop's Aphids on the World's Plants and Aphid Species File. Therefore, it is recommended that the scientific name used in this draft be revised to <i>Rhopalosiphum oxyacanthae</i>, which is the currently accepted name widely used in authoritative taxonomic references. References: CABI. 2026. <i>Rhopalosiphum oxyacanthae</i> (apple-grass aphid). CABI Compendium. Available at: https://www.cabidigitallibrary.org/doi/full/10.1079/cabicompendium.47316 EPPO. 2026. EPPO Global Database, <i>Rhopalosiphum oxyacanthae</i>. Available at: https://gd.eppo.int/taxon/RHOPIN Catalogue of Life. 2026. <i>Rhopalosiphum oxyacanthae</i> (Schrank, 1801). Available at: https://www.catalogueoflife.org/data/taxon/797VN Blackman & Eastop's Aphids on the World's Plants. 2026. <i>Rhopalosiphum</i>. Available at: https://aphidsonworldsplants.info/d_APHIDS_R/#Rhopalosiphum Aphid Species File. 2026. <i>Rhopalosiphum oxyacanthae</i>. Available at: https://aphid.speciesfile.org/otus/909548/overview		
359	~~<i>Adris tyrannus amurensis</i> Staudiger, 1892~~ <i>Eudocima tyrannus</i> (Guenée, 1852)	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> (579) Japan (25 9 2026 8:07 午前) A search of ZooBank did not return any records for <i>Adris tyrannus amurensis</i> Staudinger. Although <i>Eudocima tyrannu</i> was also not found in ZooBank, both CABI and EPPO recognize <i>Eudocima tyrannus</i> as the accepted scientific name. Furthermore, Catalogue of Life (2026) does not list <i>Adris tyrannus amurensis</i>. However, <i>Adris tyrannus</i> is treated as a synonym of	O	

			Eudocima tyrannus. As Adris tyrannus amurensis has been regarded as a subspecies of Adris tyrannus, the use of Eudocima tyrannus is considered more appropriate and consistent with current taxonomic usage. References: CABI. 2026. Eudocima tyrannus. CABI Compendium. Available at: https://www.cabidigitallibrary.org/doi/full/10.1079/cabicompendium.3298 EPPO. 2026. EPPO Global Database, Eudocima tyrannus (ADRITY). Available at: https://gd.eppo.int/taxon/ADRITY Catalogue of Life. 2026. Eudocima tyrannus (Guenée, 1852). Available at: https://www.catalogueoflife.org/data/taxon/93ZPK		
401	~~Adoxophyes reticulana (Hübner, 1796)~~	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> (580) Japan (25 9 2026 8:10 午前) A search of ZooBank did not return any records for Adoxophyes reticulana (Hübner, 1796). Although Adoxophyes orana (Fischer von Röslerstamm, 1834) was also not found in ZooBank, both CABI and EPPO recognize Adoxophyes orana (Fischer von Röslerstamm, 1834) as the accepted scientific name. Furthermore, Catalogue of Life (2026) lists Adoxophyes reticulana as a synonym of Adoxophyes fasciata. Yasuda (1998) treated A. fasciata as a subspecies of A. orana. These references support the treatment of A. reticulana within the taxonomic concept of A. orana. Therefore, Adoxophyes reticulana should be treated as a synonym of Adoxophyes orana, and the two names should be consolidated into a single species. References: CABI. 2026. Adoxophyes orana (summer fruit tortrix moth). CABI Compendium. Available at: https://www.cabidigitallibrary.org/doi/full/10.1079/cabicompendium.11253	O	

			EPPO. 2026. EPPO Global Database, Adoxophyes orana (CAPURE). Available at: https://gd.eppo.int/taxon/CAPURE Catalogue of Life. 2026. Adoxophyes reticulana. Available at: https://www.catalogueoflife.org/data/taxon/9BC8Q Yasuda, T. 1998. Geographic variation of Adoxophyes orana and related taxa in Japan and neighbouring regions. Lepidoptera Science 49(3). Available at: https://www.jstage.jst.go.jp/article/lepid/49/3/49_KJ00006419781/_article/-char/en		
533	<i>Botryosphaeria berengeriana</i> f.sp. <i>pyricola</i> ~~Kogan~~ , <u>Koganezawa</u> & Sakuma, 1984	P	Category : TECHNICAL (581) Japan (25 9 2026 8:11 午前) Correct the scientific name.	O	
551	~~<i>Peyronellaea obtusa</i> (Fuckel) Aveskamp, Gruyter & Verkley, 2010~~ <u><i>Didymella protuberans</i> (Lév.) Qian Chen & L. Cai, 2015</u>	P	Category : TECHNICAL (582) Japan (25 9 2026 8:12 午前) In Index Fungorum, the current name of <i>Peyronellaea obtusa</i> is <i>Didymella protuberans</i>.	O	
578	~~<i>Gibberella baccata</i> (Wallr.) Sacc., 1878~~ <u><i>Fusarium lateritium</i> Nees, 1816</u>	P	Category : TECHNICAL (583) Japan (25 9 2026 8:13 午前) In Index Fungorum, the current name of <i>Gibberella baccata</i> is <i>Fusarium lateritium</i>.	O	
584	~~<i>Sphaeropsis pyriputrescens</i> C.L. Xiao & J.D. Rogers, 2004~~ <u><i>Xenosphaeropsis pyriputrescens</i> (C.L. Xiao & J.D. Rogers) F. Liu, Crous & L. Cai, 2021</u>	P	Category : TECHNICAL (584) Japan (25 9 2026 8:13 午前) In Index Fungorum, the current name of <i>Sphaeropsis pyriputrescens</i> is <i>Xenosphaeropsis pyriputrescens</i>.	O	
602	~~<i>Phialophora malorum</i> (Kidd & Beaumont) McColloch, 1942~~ <u><i>Cadophora malorum</i> (Kidd & Beaumont) W. Gams, 2000</u>	P	Category : TECHNICAL (585) Japan (25 9 2026 8:14 午前) In Index Fungorum, the current name of <i>Phialophora malorum</i> is <i>Cadophora malorum</i>.	O	
4. Options for phytosanitary measures					
636	The NPPO of the importing country should decide whether the options listed in Table 3 are effective at managing the pest risk to an acceptable level before selecting them as phytosanitary measures. The NPPO should also consider whether a measure for one pest will effectively manage the pest risk of other regulated pests of <i>M. domestica</i> fruit. In addition, when applying these options as phytosanitary measures, the NPPO should consider <u>and document</u> the procedures for successful application.	P	Category : SUBSTANTIVE (586) Japan (25 9 2026 8:16 午前) In the Annex for Banana, text on documentation was added following comments received during the first consultation. Therefore, the same text should also be included in this Annex.	O	
701	<i>Brevipalpus chilensis</i>	C	Category : TECHNICAL (587) Japan (25 9 2026 8:18 午前)	O	

			As commented on Table 1, no literature has been identified indicating that it infests Malus spp. Therefore, scientific justification for including Brevipalpus chilensis in the pest list (Table 1) and in the list of phytosanitary measure options (Table 3) as a pest associated with Malus domestica. should be provided. The supporting references should also be included on the IPP page, and a link to that page should be provided in Section 5.2 "Further Reading" (see general comment).		
754	CT 33; MBCT 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11; PFA; SA 1	P	Category : TECHNICAL (588) Japan (25 9 2026 8:21 午前) MBCT3 is the import requirement for apples exported from New Zealand to Japan, and MBCT4 is the import requirement for apples exported from France to Japan. Neither measure targets Bactrocera dorsalis, both are intended to address Cydia pomonella.	O	
765	<i>Rhagoletis cerasi</i>	C	Category : TECHNICAL (589) Japan (25 9 2026 8:21 午前) As commented on Table1, no literature has been identified indicating that Rhagoletis cerasi infests Malus spp. Therefore, Scientific justification for including Rhagoletis cerasi in the pest list (Table 1) and in the list of phytosanitary measure options (Table 3) as a pest associated with Malus domestica. should be provided. The supporting references should also be included on the IPP page, and a link to that page should be provided in Section 5.2 "Further Reading" (see general comment).	O	
768	CT 1, 2, 3, 7, 12, 14, 25, 29, 30, 31; export inspection;* IRDN 1; PFA; PFPP; PFPS; SA 1, 9	C	Category : TECHNICAL (590) Japan (25 9 2026 8:23 午前) As PT 8 (Irradiation treatment for Rhagoletis pomonella) is available as an irradiation treatment for R. pomonella, propose adding PT 8.	O	
779	~~Rhopalosiphum insertum~~ <i>Rhopalosiphum oxyacanthae</i>	P	Category : TECHNICAL (591) Japan (25 9 2026 8:24 午前) A search of ZooBank did not return any records for Rhopalosiphum insertum. Although Rhopalosiphum oxyacanthae was also not found in ZooBank, both CABI and EPPO recognize Rhopalosiphum oxyacanthae as the accepted scientific name. Please see the corresponding comment on Table 1.	O	
851	<i>Adoxophyes reticulana</i>	P	Category : TECHNICAL (592) Japan (25 9 2026 8:26 午前)	O	

			A search of ZooBank did not return any records for Adoxophyes reticulana (Hübner, 1796). Although Adoxophyes orana (Fischer von Röslerstamm, 1834) was also not found in ZooBank, both CABI and EPPO recognize Adoxophyes orana (Fischer von Röslerstamm, 1834) as the accepted scientific name. Therefore, Adoxophyes reticulana should be treated as a synonym of Adoxophyes orana, and the two names should be consolidated into a single species. Please see the corresponding comment on Table 1.		
853	~~Adris tyrannus amurensis~~ <u>Eudocima tyrannus</u>	P	Category : TECHNICAL (593) Japan (25 9 2026 8:32 午前) A search of ZooBank did not return any records for Adris tyrannus amurensis Staudniger. Although Eudocima tyrannu was also not found in ZooBank, both CABI and EPPO recognize Eudocima tyrannu as the accepted scientific name. Please see the corresponding comment on Table 1.	O	
995	~~Gibberella baccata~~ <u>Fusarium lateritium</u>	P	Category : TECHNICAL (594) Japan (25 9 2026 8:33 午前) In Index Fungorum, the current name of Gibberella baccata is Fusarium lateritium.	O	
1021	~~Peyronellaea obtusa~~ <u>Didymella protuberans</u>	P	Category : TECHNICAL (595) Japan (25 9 2026 8:34 午前) In Index Fungorum, the current name of Peyronellaea obtusa is Didymella protuberans.	O	
1023	~~Phialophora malorum~~ <u>Cadophora malorum</u>	P	Category : TECHNICAL (596) Japan (25 9 2026 8:36 午前) In Index Fungorum, the current name of Phialophora malorum is Cadophora malorum.	O	
1035	~~Sphaeropsis pyriputrescens~~ <u>Xenosphaeropsis pyriputrescens</u>	P	Category : TECHNICAL (597) Japan (25 9 2026 8:36 午前) In Index Fungorum, the current name of Sphaeropsis pyriputrescens is Xenosphaeropsis pyriputrescens.	O	
1287	CTMB 9	C	Category : TECHNICAL (599) Japan (25 9 2026 8:38 午前) Japan proposes that the minimum concentration-time (CT) product for methyl bromide fumigation be explicitly indicated in Table 6 for CTMB 9, as the CT product is required to ensure treatment efficacy.	O	

			A footnote should be added below Table 6 stating: "The concentration-time (CT) product, calculated as the concentration of methyl bromide in the fumigation chamber (g/m ³) multiplied by the fumigation duration (h), should be at least 85.5. For information on CT product, refer to ISPM 43."		
1293	MAFF ~~(2022)~~ (2005)	P	<i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i> (598) Japan (25 9 2026 8:37 午前) The most recent amendment to Japan's import requirements for fresh apple fruit from the United States was made in 2005. Alternatively, if the year of entry into force is intended to be cited, it should be corrected to 1997.	O	
1298	Table 7. Options for irradiation (IRDN)	C	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> (600) Japan (25 9 2026 8:38 午前) As <i>Rhagoletis pomonella</i> is included in the List of Pests (Table 1) and PT 8 (Irradiation treatment for <i>Rhagoletis pomonella</i>) is available as an irradiation treatment for <i>R. pomonella</i>, PT 8 should also be included in the Options for Irradiation (Table 7).	O	
1317	~~MB 1~~	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> (601) Japan (25 9 2026 8:39 午前) MB 1 appears to have been derived from information provided by Japan on the import requirements for fresh apples from New Zealand. However, the methyl bromide fumigation and cold treatment components constitute a single integrated measure and should not be separated. Therefore, it is not appropriate to list the methyl bromide fumigation component alone as an independent MB treatment. The combined treatment is already included as MBCT 3 in Table 9.	O	
1346	MB 6	C	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> (602) Japan (25 9 2026 8:41 午前) Japan proposes that the minimum CT product for methyl bromide fumigation be explicitly indicated in Table 8, as it is required to ensure treatment efficacy. A note should be added below Table 8 stating: "The concentration-time (CT) product, calculated as the concentration of methyl bromide in the fumigation chamber (g/m³) multiplied by the fumigation duration (h), should be at least 76.4. For information on CT product, refer to ISPM 43."	O	
1350	MAFF ~~(2005)~~ (2006)	P	<i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>	O	

			(603) Japan (25 9 2026 8:41 午前) The most recent amendment to Japan's import requirements for fresh apple fruit from Tasmania in Australia was made in 2006. Alternatively, if the year of entry into force is intended to be cited, it should be corrected to 1998.		
1387	MBCT 3	C	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> (604) Japan (25 9 2026 8:42 午前) Japan proposes that the minimum CT product for methyl bromide fumigation be explicitly indicated in Table 8, as it is required to ensure treatment efficacy. A note should be added below Table 9 stating: "The concentration-time (CT) product, calculated as the concentration of methyl bromide in the fumigation chamber (g/m ³) multiplied by the fumigation duration (h), should be at least 34.2. For information on CT product, refer to ISPM 43".	O	
1393	MAFF ~~(2024)~~ (2012)	P	<i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i> (605) Japan (25 9 2026 8:42 午前) The most recent amendment to Japan's import requirements for fresh apple fruit from New Zealand was made in 2012. Alternatively, if the year of entry into force is intended to be cited, it should be corrected to 1997.	O	
1394	MBCT 4	C	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> (606) Japan (25 9 2026 8:43 午前) For MBCT 4, add the following conditions: (1) This treatment must be conducted under reduced pressure (150 mmHg or less). (2) The treatment is applicable only to Golden Delicious variety. (3) The volume of fresh fruit treated in a single fumigation shall not exceed 49% of the chamber volume (loading ratio ≤ 49%). This measure appears to be based on information provided by Japan on the import requirements for fresh apples from France. However, the treatment must be conducted under reduced pressure (150 mmHg or less). As Table 9 assumes that treatments are applied at normal atmospheric pressure, additional information should be included to ensure fumigation efficacy. Furthermore, the treatment applies only to Golden Delicious variety, and specifies a maximum loading ratio (fruit volume per chamber volume).	O	

			These conditions should be explicitly included.		
1467	Reference not in public domain	C	<i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i> (607) Japan (25 9 2026 8:44 午前) Request details of the reference. The citation "Reference not in public domain" does not provide sufficient information to verify that these measures have been established as phytosanitary import requirements by at least one contracting party.	O	
1580	Reference not in public domain	C	<i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i> (608) Japan (25 9 2026 8:45 午前) Request details of the reference. The citation "Reference not in public domain" does not provide sufficient information to verify that these measures have been established as phytosanitary import requirements by at least one contracting party.	O	
1605	Reference not in public domain	C	<i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i> (609) Japan (25 9 2026 8:45 午前) Request details of the reference. The citation "Reference not in public domain" does not provide sufficient information to verify that these measures have been established as phytosanitary import requirements by at least one contracting party.	O	
1614	Reference not in public domain	C	<i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i> (610) Japan (25 9 2026 8:46 午前) Request details of the reference. The citation "Reference not in public domain" does not provide sufficient information to verify that these measures have been established as phytosanitary import requirements by at least one contracting party.	O	
5.1.2 Tables					
1653	MAFF (Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries, Japan). ~~2005~~2006. [Standards set by the Minister of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries for the fresh fruit of Fuji apples shipped from Tasmania, Australia. Notification No. 1943, December 25, 10. In: <i>Plant Protection Station, Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries of Japan</i>] (in Japanese). [Cited 14 January 2026]. https://www.maff.go.jp/pps/j/law/houki/kokuji_joken/kokuji_joken_38_html_38.html	P	<i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i> (611) Japan (25 9 2026 8:47 午前) The most recent amendment to Japan's import requirements for fresh apple fruit from Tasmania in Australia was made in 2006. Alternatively, if the year of entry into force is intended to be cited, it should be corrected to 1998.	O	
1654	MAFF. ~~2022~~2005. [Standards set by the Minister of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries for the fresh fruit of golden delicious and red delicious apples shipped from the United States. Notification No. 354, March 10, Heisei 9. In: <i>Plant Protection Station, Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries of Japan</i>] (in Japanese). [Cited 14 January 2026].	P	<i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i> (612) Japan (25 9 2026 8:48 午前) The most recent amendment to Japan's import requirements for fresh apple fruit from the United States was made in 2005. Alternatively, if the year of entry into force	O	

	https://www.maff.go.jp/pps/j/law/houki/kokuji_joken/kokuji_joken_32_html_32.html		is intended to be cited, it should be corrected to 1997.		
1655	MAFF. ~~2024~~2012. [Standards set by the Minister of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries for the fresh fruit of gala, Granny Smith, Fuji, Blackburn, red delicious, and royal gala apples shipped from New Zealand. Notification No. 353, March 10, Heisei 9. In: <i>Plant Protection Station, Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries of Japan</i>] (in Japanese). [Cited 14 January 2026]. https://www.maff.go.jp/pps/j/law/houki/kokuji_joken/kokuji_joken_30_html_30.html	P	<i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i> (613) Japan (25 9 2026 8:48 午前) The most recent amendment to Japan's import requirements for fresh apple fruit from New Zealand was made in 2012. Alternatively, if the year of entry into force is intended to be cited, it should be corrected to 1997.	O	

Reconciliation report for 2024-003_DraftPT_CT_C_capitata_Actinidia_eng.docx (2024-003_DraftPT_CT_C_capitata_Actinidia_eng.docx)

Summary

Title	2026 Consultation- 2024-003 - Draft annex to ISPM 28: Cold treatment for Ceratitis capitata on Actinidia deliciosa and Actinidia (Id 1859)
Description	
Start Date	1 7 2026 12:53 午後
End Date	30 9 2026 11:45 午後
Closed Out Date	
Completed Date	
Review Status	In Progress

Participants

Name	Status	Role	Summary	Comments	Last Activity
Japan	In Progress	Reviewer		1	25 9 2026 10:35 午前

T (Type) - B = Bullet, C = Comment, P = Proposed Change, R = Rating
S (Status) - A = Accepted, C = Closed, O = Open, W = Withdrawn, M = Merged

Para	Text	T	Comment	S	Author Comment
Other relevant information					
37	The efficacy of this schedule was calculated based on an estimated 515 513 treated third-instar larvae, using failure to pupariate as the measure of mortality.	C	Category : TECHNICAL (103) Japan (25 9 2026 10:33 午前) In Brown et al. (2024), which is cited in the References section, the number of treated individuals was estimated to be 515,461 using Equation 3 of Wright et al. (2023) and 515,926 using the formula provided by the IPPC (2023, p 113). However, the basis for the figure of 515,513 treated individuals stated in this draft annex cannot be identified from Brown et al. (2024). As this figure is important for evaluating the efficiency of the treatment, the method used to estimate the figure of 515,513 treated individuals should be clearly explained.	O	

Reconciliation report for 2018-001_DraftPT_Ir_LiriomyzaSpp_eng.docx (2018-001_DraftPT_Ir_LiriomyzaSpp_eng.docx)

Summary

Title	2026 Consultation-2018-001- Draft annex to ISPM 28: Irradiation treatment for Liriomyza huidobrensis, Liriomyza sativae and Liri (Id 1860)
Description	Draft annex to ISPM 28: Irradiation treatment for Liriomyza huidobrensis, Liriomyza sativae and Liriomyza trifolii (2018-001)
Start Date	1 7 2026 12:55 午後
End Date	30 9 2026 11:45 午後
Closed Out Date	
Completed Date	
Review Status	In Progress

Participants

Name	Status	Role	Summary	Comments	Last Activity
Japan	In Progress	Reviewer		2	30 9 2026 3:27 午前

T (Type) - B = Bullet, C = Comment, P = Proposed Change, R = Rating
S (Status) - A = Accepted, C = Closed, O = Open, W = Withdrawn, M = Merged

Para	Text	T	Comment	S	Author Comment
Treatment description					
33	Target regulated articles All vegetables and ornamental plants that are hosts of the above leaf miners	C	<i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i> (101) Japan (25 9 2026 10:46 午前) In the Other relevant information section, it is stated that "Extrapolation of treatment efficacy to all host plants was based on knowledge and experience that radiation dosimetry system measure the actual radiation dose absorbed by the target pest independent of host commodity" as justification for extrapolating treatment efficacy to all host plants. However, it is unclear what specific knowledge and experience this statement refers to. Furthermore, the relationship between the validation of the dosimetry methodology and the conclusion that treatment efficacy can be extrapolated to different host plants has not been sufficiently explained from either a logical or scientific perspective. Therefore, it is recommended that either additional scientific evidence be provided to support the application of the treatment to all host plants, or that the regulated commodities be restricted to those commodities for which supporting evidence is available in the scientific literature (e.g. leafy vegetables).	O	

Other relevant information				
46	The efficacy of schedules 1, 2 and 3 was calculated based on a total of 10 700, 10 804 and 10 533 pharate adults, respectively; the overall control mortality was 6.55%.	C	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> (100) Japan (25 9 2026 10:37 午前) In this draft annex, the numbers of treated individuals used as the basis for calculating the efficacy of the treatment schedule are stated as 10,700 for <i>Liriomyza bryoniae</i>, 10,804 for <i>Liriomyza sativae</i>, and 10,533 for <i>Liriomyza trifolii</i>. However, Ozyardimci et al. (2016), which is cited in the References section, reports 10,419, 10,583, and 10,280 treated individuals, respectively. Therefore, the numbers of treated individuals stated in the draft annex do not correspond to those reported in the cited reference. In addition, although the draft annex states that the overall control mortality was 6.55%, the basis for this figure cannot be verified because Ozyardimci et al. (2016) does not report the control mortality. Since both the number of treated individuals and the overall control mortality are important parameters for evaluating treatment efficacy, the methods used to derive these figures should be clearly explained.	O

Reconciliation report for 2023-028_DraftCS_FreshMusa.docx (2023-028_DraftCS_FreshMusa.docx)

Summary

Title	2026 Second consultation- 2023-028- Draft annex to ISPM 46: Movement of fresh Musa spp. fruit in international trade (Id 1853)
Description	
Start Date	1 7 2026 12:57 午後
End Date	30 9 2026 11:45 午後
Closed Out Date	
Completed Date	
Review Status	In Progress

Participants

Name	Status	Role	Summary	Comments	Last Activity
Japan	In Progress	Reviewer		14	25 9 2026 6:58 午前

T (Type) - B = Bullet, C = Comment, P = Proposed Change, R = Rating
S (Status) - A = Accepted, C = Closed, O = Open, W = Withdrawn, M = Merged

Para	Text	T	Comment	S	Author Comment
2. Pests associated with fresh Musa spp. fruit					
236	Whiteflies ~~and blackflies~~ (Hemiptera)	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> (414) Japan (25 9 2026 6:45 午前) The term "blackfly" is used as part of the common name for certain dark-colored species within the family Aleyrodidae (e.g. Aleurocanthus woglumi, citrus blackfly). However, "blackfly" is not generally used as a common name for the family Aleyrodidae as a whole. Therefore, the pest group name for Aleyrodidae should be "whitefly" rather than "whitefly and blackfly". Furthermore, there is concern that the term "blackfly" could be associated with other insects, such as aphids, leading to confusion.	O	
3. Options for phytosanitary measures					
394	~~Aspidiotus coryphae~~	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> (416) Japan (25 9 2026 6:46 午前) Since Aspidiotus coryphae belongs to the family Diaspididae, it would be more appropriate to place this species in the scales group rather than the mealybugs group.	O	
396	~~Aspidiotus destructor~~	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> (417) Japan (25 9 2026 6:47 午前) Since Aspidiotus destructor belongs to the family Diaspididae, it would be more	O	

			appropriate to place this species in the scales group rather than the mealybugs group.		
398	~~Aspidiotus excisus~~	P	Category : TECHNICAL (418) Japan (25 9 2026 6:47 午前) Since Aspidiotus excisus belongs to the family Diaspididae, it would be more appropriate to place this species in the scales group rather than the mealybugs group.	O	
410	~~Hemiberlesia cyanophylli~~	P	Category : TECHNICAL (419) Japan (25 9 2026 6:47 午前) Since Hemiberlesia cyanophylli belongs to the family Diaspididae, it would be more appropriate to place this species in the scales group rather than the mealybugs group.	O	
412	~~Hemiberlesia lataniae~~	P	Category : TECHNICAL (420) Japan (25 9 2026 6:48 午前) Since Hemiberlesia lataniae belongs to the family Diaspididae, it would be more appropriate to place this species in the scales group rather than the mealybugs group.	O	
414	~~Hemiberlesia palmae~~	P	Category : TECHNICAL (421) Japan (25 9 2026 6:49 午前) Hemiberlesia palmae should be moved from the mealybugs group to the scales group.	O	
422	~~Pinnaspis musae~~	P	Category : TECHNICAL (422) Japan (25 9 2026 6:49 午前) Since Pinnaspis musae belongs to the family Diaspididae, it would be more appropriate to place this species in the scales group rather than the mealybugs group.	O	
436	~~Selenaspidus articulatus~~	P	Category : TECHNICAL (423) Japan (25 9 2026 6:49 午前) Since Selenaspidus articulatus belongs to the family Diaspididae, it would be more appropriate to place this species in the scales group rather than the mealybugs group.	O	
443	Field and export inspection + removing any ~~infected-infested~~ fruit at packing	P	Category : TECHNICAL (424) Japan (25 9 2026 6:51 午前) Since the definition of "infestation (of a commodity)" in ISPM 5 states that "infestation includes infection," the term "infested" is more appropriate than "infected."	O	
4.1 References					

546	GACC (General Administration of Customs of the People's Republic of China). 2018. [Protocol of phytosanitary requirements for export of fresh banana fruits from Camboja to China.] In: <i>GACC</i> (in Chinese). [Cited 24 June 2025]. www.customs.gov.cn	C	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> (425) Japan (25 9 2026 6:51 午前) Propose that the hyperlink be revised to the webpage containing the detailed phytosanitary import requirements, rather than to the GACC portal page. In the References section, four documents issued by the GACC (General Administration of Customs of the People's Republic of China) are cited. However, the hyperlinks for all of them lead to the GACC portal page. As the portal page does not provide sufficient information on specific phytosanitary requirements, it is difficult for readers to access or verify the relevant details based on the links provided.	O	
547	GACC. 2019. [Protocol of phytosanitary requirements for export of fresh banana fruits from Mexico to China.] In: <i>GACC</i> (in Chinese). [Cited 24 June 2025]. www.customs.gov.cn	C	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> (426) Japan (25 9 2026 6:52 午前) Propose that the hyperlink be revised to the webpage containing the detailed phytosanitary import requirements, rather than to the GACC portal page. In the References section, four documents issued by the GACC (General Administration of Customs of the People's Republic of China) are cited. However, the hyperlinks for all of them lead to the GACC portal page. As the portal page does not provide sufficient information on specific phytosanitary requirements, it is difficult for readers to access or verify the relevant details based on the links provided.	O	
548	GACC. 2022a. [Protocol of phytosanitary requirements for export of fresh banana fruits from Indonesia to China.] In: <i>GACC</i> (in Chinese). [Cited 24 June 2025]. www.customs.gov.cn	C	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> (427) Japan (25 9 2026 6:52 午前) Propose that the hyperlink be revised to the webpage containing the detailed phytosanitary import requirements, rather than to the GACC portal page. In the References section, four documents issued by the GACC (General Administration of Customs of the People's Republic of China) are cited. However, the hyperlinks for all of them lead to the GACC portal page. As the portal page does not provide sufficient information on specific phytosanitary requirements, it is difficult for readers to access or verify the relevant details based on the links provided.	O	
549	GACC. 2022b. [Protocol of phytosanitary requirements for export of fresh bananas from Viet Nam to China.] In: <i>GACC</i> (in Chinese). [Cited 24 June 2025].	C	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> (428) Japan (25 9 2026 6:53 午前) Propose that the hyperlink be revised to the	O	

	www.customs.gov.cn		webpage containing the detailed phytosanitary import requirements, rather than to the GACC portal page. In the References section, four documents issued by the GACC (General Administration of Customs of the People's Republic of China) are cited. However, the hyperlinks for all of them lead to the GACC portal page. As the portal page does not provide sufficient information on specific phytosanitary requirements, it is difficult for readers to access or verify the relevant details based on the links provided.	
--	--	--	---	--

Reconciliation report for 2023-023_DraftCS_FreshColocasia.docx (2023-023_DraftCS_FreshColocasia.docx)

Summary

Title	2026 Second consultation - 2023-023- Draft annex to ISPM 46: Movement of fresh Colocasia esculenta corms in international trade (Id 1854)
Description	
Start Date	1 7 2026 12:58 午後
End Date	30 9 2026 11:45 午後
Closed Out Date	
Completed Date	
Review Status	In Progress

Participants

Name	Status	Role	Summary	Comments	Last Activity
Japan	In Progress	Reviewer		10	28 9 2026 4:18 午前

T (Type) - B = Bullet, C = Comment, P = Proposed Change, R = Rating
S (Status) - A = Accepted, C = Closed, O = Open, W = Withdrawn, M = Merged

Para	Text	T	Comment	S	Author Comment
G	(General Comment)	C	Category : <i>TECHNICAL</i> (207) Japan (25 9 2026 10:22 午前) For the following reasons, we propose excluding the four viruses listed in Table 1, 'Pests considered to be associated with fresh Colocasia esculenta corms', from the annex. Reason - 1 (1) This commodity standard provides NPPOs with guidance on the international movement of fresh taro corms intended for consumption or processing. Criteria have been established for including and excluding pests in the commodity standards (see the core text of ISPM 46 and the cover note of this annex). However, these viruses may not clearly fulfil either of the existing criteria. (2) Many countries opposed the inclusion of these viruses in the annex during the first round of consultations in 2025 (see comments No. 17, 24, 42, 43, 93, 100, 179, 180, 181, 182, 185 and 186), whereas the proposing country regulates them based on its own PRA. This indicates differing technical interpretations among contracting parties regarding the relevance of these viruses to the commodity pathway. (3) The PRA conducted by the submitted country indicates that these viruses pose a	O	

		pest risk only under specific conditions (i.e., when the materials are disposed and wasted). As there are no technical statements within the Annex for including these viruses in the pest list, there is a risk that all pests on the list might be perceived as posing the same level of risk under the same conditions. Although ISPM 46 requires individual countries to conduct PRAs and make their own decisions, the inclusion of these controversial pests without a statement in the standard raises concerns from the perspective of international standards. Reason - 2 If we focus on taro corm as a specific plant part, we can mainly classify four scenarios in which this plant part becomes a pathway for the entry of pests: (1) Taro corms intended for ordinary consumption (including processing). (2) Disposal/waste of corms intended for consumption; (3) Conversion of corms intended for consumption into planting (4) Corms intended for planting. When considering the range of the target pests in terms of the process and likelihood of their entry under these scenarios, they can be categorised into two groups: one group is (1), and another group is (2), (3), and (4). In other words, the targeted pests covered differ between "(1) Taro corms intended for ordinary consumption" and "(2) Disposal/waste of corms intended for consumption"(i.e. pest risks are also different), with category (2) covering a broader range. Note that the range of the targeted pests for category (2) are almost the same as that for categories (3) and (4). Furthermore, since the target pests differ, the measures applicable to "(2) Disposal/waste of corms intended for consumption" include options that are more stringent than those for "(1) Taro corms intended for ordinary consumption." Especially, the measures for (2) are the same as those for "(3) Conversion of corms intended for consumption into planting," which is outside the scope of the commodity	
--	--	--	--

		standard for consumption. Therefore, without explicitly stating a statement that pest risks are different because of its different range of target pests between (1) and (2), the pests targeted will expand the pests of (2) in the 'commodity standards for consumption', which would distort the assessment of pest risks associated with the commodities' original intended use. Furthermore, this would result in the strengthening of the measures being raised beyond what is necessary. Therefore, the pests associated with '(2) Disposal/waste of corms intended for consumption' should not be included in the 'commodity standards for consumption'. Regarding commodities intended for consumption, we propose excluding pests associated with risks from waste caused by the intended (i.e., part of manufacturing process) or inadvertent disposal of the commodity. We also propose adding this type of pest to the exclusion criteria. If pests and measures related to "(2) Disposal/waste of corms intended for consumption" need to be included in the "commodity standards for consumption," the presence of the difference in pest risk must be stated within the standard. Also, if the standard covers pests in category (2), the relevant pests and measures should be clearly distinguished from those in category (1) (e.g., a mark should be put in pest name, and notes should be added below the relevant tables). We think the submitted country has information about this difference because they submitted these viruses based on their PRA. In addition, a statement regarding the risks associated with the disposal and waste of the commodity should be included in the main text. For example: If the plant parts of the target commodity for consumption possess the capacity for vegetative propagation, the disposal and waste of these parts may pose pest risks that exceed those associated with the	
--	--	---	--

			original intended use. Risk assessments or measures may be additionally necessary.		
2. Pests associated with fresh Colocasia esculenta corms					
141	~~French Polynesian strain of dasheen mosaic virus (FP-DsMV; species Potyvirus dasheenii)~~	P	Category : TECHNICAL (208) Japan (25 9 2026 10:24 午前) See general comment.	O	
144	~~Colocasia bobone disease virus (CBDV; Cytorhabdovirus colocasiae)~~	P	Category : TECHNICAL (209) Japan (25 9 2026 10:25 午前) See general comment.	O	
147	~~Taro vein chlorosis virus (TaVVCV; species Alphaviridae colocasiae)~~	P	Category : TECHNICAL (210) Japan (25 9 2026 10:25 午前) See general comment.	O	
150	~~Tomato zonate spot virus (TZSV; species Orthotospovirus tomatozonae)~~	P	Category : TECHNICAL (211) Japan (25 9 2026 10:25 午前) See general comment.	O	
3. Options for phytosanitary measures					
208	~~Colocasia bobone disease virus~~	P	Category : TECHNICAL (212) Japan (25 9 2026 10:27 午前) See general comment.	O	
210	~~French Polynesian strain of dasheen mosaic virus~~	P	Category : TECHNICAL (213) Japan (25 9 2026 10:27 午前) See general comment.	O	
212	~~Taro vein chlorosis virus~~	P	Category : TECHNICAL (214) Japan (25 9 2026 10:27 午前) See general comment.	O	
214	~~Tomato zonate spot virus~~	P	Category : TECHNICAL (215) Japan (25 9 2026 10:27 午前)	O	
228	31 and above	C	Category : SUBSTANTIVE (216) Japan (25 9 2026 10:28 午前) In Table 4, no treatment conditions are currently provided for the "26 - 30" temperature range. If treatment conditions for this temperature range exist, they should be explicitly presented in this draft annex.	O	