

ATTACHMENT 6:

CONSISTENCY CORRECTIONS IN RELATION TO HARMONIZATION OF FRUIT FLY STANDARDS

(Developed by the TPF, October 2015; approved by SC May 2016; revised and approved by SC November 2017 pending CPM-13 decision on reorganization)

INK AMENDMENTS TO ISPM 35 (SYSTEMS APPROACH FOR PEST RISK MANAGEMENT OF FRUIT FLIES (TEPHRITIDAE))

Text moved from ex ISPM 30 is indicated in red text. Black underlined or ~~strikethrough~~ text is changes to existing text or new text, with some extra changes in track changes.

Para. No.	Proposal for consistency change (underline = addition; strikethrough = deletion)	Explanation for change
[1]	Adoption	
[2]	This standard was adopted by the Seventh Session of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures in March 2012.	
[3]	INTRODUCTION	
[4]	Scope	
[5]	This standard provides guidance lines for the development, implementation and verification of integrated measures in a systems approach as an option for pest risk management of fruit flies (Tephritidae) of economic importance <u>to facilitate trade of fruit fly host products, or to minimize the spread of regulated fruit flies within an area.</u> <u>Annex 3, Appendix 1 and Appendix 2 of ISPM 26 also apply to this standard.</u>	The scope of ex- ISPM 30 was integrated into this scope to ensure that there are no overlaps and clarify the connection between the two. Editorial change to avoid the use of “guidelines”.

Para. No.	Proposal for consistency change (underline = addition; strikethrough = deletion)	Explanation for change
[6]	References [standard text to be inserted] <u>The present standard refers to International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPMs). ISPMs are available on the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP) at https://www.ippc.int/core-activities/standards-setting/ispm5.</u>	
[7]	Definitions	
[8]	Definition of phytosanitary terms used in this <u>the present</u> standard can be found in ISPM 5 (<i>Glossary of phytosanitary terms</i>).	Edits in line with ISPM template text.
[9]	Outline of Requirements	
[10]	For the development of a <u>fruit fly</u> systems approach for fruit flies (FF-SA), the relationship between host, target fruit fly species and the area of production of the host fruits and vegetables ¹ should be considered. The options for pest risk management measures should be determined by means of pest risk analysis (PRA).	Editorial corrections (grammar; hyphen added to FF-SA for clarity (that it's one term) and consistency with FF-ALPP and FF-PFA) – the change has been made throughout this document without being further noted).
[11]	An FF-SA includes at least two independent measures, which may be applied throughout various stages of the process, specifically during the growing period and harvest; post-harvest and transportation; and entry and distribution within the importing country. An FF-SA may be developed in an area of low pest prevalence or temporary or localized pest absence of the target fruit fly species in combination with other measures (such as selection of less susceptible hosts, crop management practices or post-harvest handling) to reduce pest risk to meet the phytosanitary requirements of the importing country. <u>Establishment and maintenance of a fruit fly area of low pest prevalence (FF-ALPP) should be considered one of the optional measures when developing a systems approach; however, it should not be considered mandatory.</u>	The Standards Committee in their November 2017 meeting agreed to the addition of the last sentence.
[12]	The general requirements <u>Guidance for the establishment and maintenance of an</u> a fruit fly area of low pest prevalence for fruit flies (FF-ALPP) is available in Annex 1. For the establishment of the FF-ALPP, p <u>Parameters used to estimate the level of fruit fly prevalence for the establishment of an FF-ALPP and the efficacy of trapping devices for surveillance should be determined following the information as stated in Annex 42.</u>	The general requirements of ex-ISPM 30 have been integrated and the numbers of the annexes and appendices present there which have been integrated into ISPM 35 renumbered where appropriate. Further editorial corrections (for consistency and clarity).

¹ Fruits and vegetables hereafter are referred to as fruits.

Para. No.	Proposal for consistency change (underline = addition; strikethrough = deletion)	Explanation for change
	<p><u>Surveillance, control measures and corrective action planning are required for both the establishment and the maintenance of an FF-ALPP. Corrective action planning is described in section 8 of Annex 1 in this standard.</u></p> <p><u>Other specific requirements include phytosanitary procedures, as well as suspension, reinstatement and loss revocation and reinstatement of the status of the FF-ALPP.</u></p>	<p>The Standards Committee in their November 2017 meeting agreed to the deletion of some proposed text:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “for the establishment of an FF-ALPP”; - The last three sentences.
[13]	For development, implementation and verification of an FF-SA, operational procedures are necessary. Conformity with these procedures should be ensured and verified by the national plant protection organization (NPPO) of the exporting country. Procedures should be monitored during the implementation and corrective actions should be taken in case of non-conformity.	
[14]	The development, implementation and verification of an FF-SA should be adequately documented and the documentation reviewed and updated when necessary by the NPPO of the exporting country.	
[15]	BACKGROUND	
[16]	Many species of fruit flies of the family Tephritidae are pests of economic importance and their introduction may pose a pest risk. To identify and manage the target fruit fly species risk, a PRA should be conducted by the NPPO of the importing country and phytosanitary measures may be applied (ISPM 2 (<i>Framework for pest risk analysis</i>);2007; ISPM 11 (<i>Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests</i>);2004).	<p>This editorial change was agreed to because the ISPM relates to this pest family.</p> <p>Editorial corrections (ISPM titles are given on first mention).</p>
[17]	Systems approaches have been developed as pest risk management measures in situations where a single measure is not available or practicable, or in cases where a systems approach is more cost-effective than the single measure available. The decision to implement a specific FF-SA depends on the particular relationship between the host fruit, the target fruit fly species and the specified fruit production area.	
[18]	A systems approach requires a combination of at least two measures that are independent of each other, and may include any number of measures that are dependent on each other	Text added to clarify the connection between ISPM 30 and the new

Para. No.	Proposal for consistency change (underline = addition; strikethrough = deletion)	Explanation for change
	<p>(ISPM 14 (<i>The use of integrated measures in a systems approach for pest risk management</i>);2002). <u>Areas of low pest prevalenceALPPs may also be used as part of a systems approach (see ISPM 14:2002, and; ISPM 22 (Requirements for the establishment of areas of low pest prevalence):2005, which describes different types of areas of low pest prevalenceALPPs and provides general guidance on their establishment of ALPPs).</u></p> <p>An FF-ALPP is often used in a systems approach to reach the necessary level of protection (Annex 1 of this standard). Treatments used in an FF-SA are those not considered sufficiently efficacious to be applied as a single measure. The measures may be applied in different places at different times and may therefore involve a number of organizations and individuals.</p> <p><u>IPPC pPhytosanitary treatments adopted as annexes to ISPM 28 (Phytosanitary treatments for regulated pests) may be useful tools in a systems approach (ISPM 28).</u></p>	<p>Annex 1.</p> <p>The panel also felt that a direct linkage with ISPM 28 and the use of PTs was essential to provide the necessary guidance to NPPOs – PTs should always be part of a systems approach.</p> <p>Editorial corrections (the text describing the content of ISPM 22 was removed because it could be understood as also referring to ISPM 14 and this was confusing).</p> <p>The Standards Committee in their November 2017 meeting agreed to the deletion of some proposed text:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “An FF-ALPP is often used in a systems approach to reach the necessary level of protection (Annex 1).” - The last sentence referring to phytosanitary treatments adopted as annexes to ISPM 28.
[19]	Often, countries have used phytosanitary measures such as treatments or <u>fruit fly</u> pest free areas for fruit flies (FF-PFAs) (ISPM 26 (<i>Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)</i>);2006) to support import or movement of host fruit. In other cases, prohibition has been applied. An FF-SA may be an alternative to facilitate the export and movement of fruit fly hosts into endangered areas. NPPOs may recognize FF-SAs as being equivalent to single measures. The exporting country may seek formal approval of equivalence of these measures with the importing country. In cases where an effective FF-SA has been implemented, components of those systems may be used by other importing and exporting countries to facilitate the movement of fruit from areas with similar conditions.	Editorial correction (for consistency, to define FF-PFA as it was in ISPM 26).
[20]	An FF-SA can be applied in an area of fruit production as small as a production site or as large as a country.	
[21]	REQUIREMENTS	<p>Inserted heading as per ISPM template sequence of headings.</p> <p>The Secretariat also notes that there is no section on IMPACTS ON BIODIVERSITY AND THE ENVIRONMENT” after the BACKGROUND section.</p>

Para. No.	Proposal for consistency change (underline = addition; strikethrough = deletion)	Explanation for change
[22]	1. Decision to Implement an FF-SA	
[23]	It is the responsibility of the importing country to establish and communicate its technically justified phytosanitary import requirements. A combination of pest risk management measures integrated into an FF-SA is one of the options that the importing country may select as the basis for phytosanitary import requirements (ISPM 14:2002).	
[24]	The development of an FF-SA is the responsibility of the NPPO of the exporting country. An FF-SA may be developed and implemented in cases where:	
[25]	(1) The importing country, in its phytosanitary import requirements, specifies a systems approach to be used in the exporting country.	
[26]	(2) The importing country does not explicitly require a systems approach, but the NPPO of the exporting country deems a systems approach to be a suitable and effective approach for achieving the importing country's phytosanitary import requirements. The exporting country may need to negotiate formal approval of the equivalence of measures with the importing country (ISPM 24 (Guidelines for the determination and recognition of equivalence of phytosanitary measures) :2005).	
[27]	An FF-SA should have the appropriate combination of measures to achieve the appropriate level of protection. They should be scientifically sound and be selected to meet the phytosanitary import requirements. Aspects of operational feasibility include cost-effectiveness of the measures to be applied while seeking to impose the least restrictive measures necessary to manage target fruit fly species risks.	Editorial correction.
[28]	The fruit production area proposed for implementing an FF-SA should be defined and the participating producers should be approved by the NPPO of the exporting country.	
[29]	It may be advisable that NPPOs involve other stakeholders in the development of an FF-SA (ISPM 2:2007).	
[30]	Basic information required for the development of an FF-SA includes the following:	
[31]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The host should be identified to the species level. In cases, where risk varies with the variety (e.g. because of varying tolerance to infestation), <u>the</u> hosts should be identified to <u>the</u> variety level (ISPM XX37 (Determination of host status of fruit to fruit fly (Tephritidae))). 	<p>The panel agreed that reference to the ISPM on host status would be helpful.</p> <p>Editorial corrections.</p>

Para. No.	Proposal for consistency change (underline = addition; strikethrough = deletion)	Explanation for change
[32]	- The stage of maturity of the fruit being examined is relevant (e.g. physiologically mature bananas are recognized as not being suitable hosts for fruit flies <u>ISPM 37</u>).	The panel agreed that reference to the ISPM on host status would be more helpful than the specific example because it elaborates on the host issue. This allows for enhanced consistency between this standard and the host status and avoids any confusion.
[33]	- Data on the target fruit fly species associated with the host should be available (such as scientific name, pest incidence and its fluctuation, and host preference <u>Annex 1</u>).	The information in this bullet is repeated and elaborated in ex- 1 ISPM 30 and the panel agreed to avoid overlap and duplication by only referring to Annex 1 (ex- 1 ISPM 30).
[34]	- The fruit production area defined for implementing an FF- SA should be described and adequately documented with particular attention to host distribution in commercial areas as well as non-commercial areas, if appropriate.	
[35]	In practice, FF- SAs may be applied to one or more hosts or target fruit fly species in the same fruit production area.	
[36]	2. Development of an FF-SA	
[37]	Measures may be applied at various stages from production of fruit within the exporting country to distribution within the importing country. The NPPO of the importing country may also implement one or more measures on arrival of the consignment. Measures applied at the different stages to prevent fruit fly infestation <u>may include those described below</u> . may include:	Editorial correction (to remove the colon, because the first level headings are not structured as first level list points).
[38]	Pre-planting:	Editorial correction.
[39]	- selecting planting sites with low pest incidence of target fruit fly species (e.g. FF-ALPPs <u>areas of low pest prevalence</u> , areas unsuitable because of geographical location, altitude, <u>or</u> climate)	Editorial corrections.
[40]	- select ing <u>ion</u> of less susceptible fruit species or varieties	Editorial correction.
[41]	- s Sanitation	Editorial correction.
[42]	- managing hosts other than the crop	
[43]	- intercropping with non-fruit fly host plants	
[44]	- growing host fruit during specific periods when the pest incidence of target fruit fly	

Para. No.	Proposal for consistency change (underline = addition; strikethrough = deletion)	Explanation for change
	species is low or temporally absent.	
[45]	Growing period:	Editorial correction.
[46]	- flowering control and timing of fruit production	Editorial correction.
[47]	- chemical control such as insecticide bait treatments, bait stations <u>and</u> , male annihilation technique, and biological control such as natural enemies	Editorial correction.
[48]	- physical protection mechanisms (e.g. bagging fruit, fruit fly protected structures)	
[49]	- sterile insect technique	
[50]	- mass trapping	
[51]	- management of non-commercial hosts within the production area (e.g. elimination or replacement of other host plants by non-host plants where appropriate)	
[52]	- monitoring and survey of the target fruit fly species (e.g. using <u>trappings</u> or fruit sampling)	Editorial correction (for consistency of terminology).
[53]	- sanitation (i.e. collection, removal and appropriate disposal of fallen fruit from the orchard or removal of mature fruit from the tree)	
[54]	- fruit stripping.	
[55]	Harvest:	Editorial correction.
[56]	- harvest at a specific stage of fruit development or time of the year	
[57]	- safeguarding activities to prevent infestation at harvest	
[58]	- s Surveillance, including fruit cutting	Editorial corrections.
[59]	- sanitation (e.g. safe removal and disposal of fallen fruit).	
[60]	Post-harvest and handling:	Editorial correction.
[61]	- safeguarding activities to prevent infestation, for example chilling fruit, refrigerated transport, processing in screen-protected packing rooms, warehouses and transit	

Para. No.	Proposal for consistency change (underline = addition; strikethrough = deletion)	Explanation for change
	conveyances, using cold storage, wrapping of fruit	
[62]	- monitoring for target fruit fly species absence by trapping in and around packing houses	
[63]	- sanitation (e.g. removal of fruit with signs of infestation (culling) in packing houses)	
[64]	- sampling, inspection (e.g. by fruit cutting) or testing	
[65]	- treatments that are not considered sufficiently efficacious as a single measure	
[66]	- packing requirements (e.g. using insect-proof packag <u>inges</u>)	Editorial correction (Glossary term).
[67]	- ensuring traceability of lots.	
[68]	Transportation and distribution: <u>;</u>	Editorial correction.
[69]	- safeguarding activities to prevent target fruit fly species infestation	
[70]	- treatments that are not considered sufficiently efficacious as a single measure (<u>before</u> prior to , during or after transport)	Editorial correction.
[71]	- <u>limiting</u> distribution limited geographically or seasonally to areas where or periods when target fruit fly species cannot establish or where suitable hosts are not present.	Editorial correction.
[72]	Measures applied to several or all stages: <u>;</u>	Editorial correction.
[73]	- community awareness programmes to generate support from the public	
[74]	- movement control <u>of movement</u> of host fruit and other pathways into the area (e.g. requirements for production sites or islands).	Editorial correction.
[75]	3. Documentation and Record-Keeping	Editorial correction (remove hyphen).
[76]	The development, implementation and verification of an FF - SA should be properly documented by the NPPO of the exporting country. The roles and responsibilities of the NPPOs of the exporting and importing countries should be specified and documented. The documentation and records should be reviewed and updated regularly, maintained for at	

Para. No.	Proposal for consistency change (underline = addition; strikethrough = deletion)	Explanation for change
	least 24 months and made available to the NPPO of the importing country upon request.	
[77]	Documentation may include:	
[78]	- phytosanitary import requirements and, if available, a report of the <u>PRA</u> pest risk analysis	Editorial correction (abbreviation use – PRA was defined earlier in the standard and once an abbreviation is defined, it should be used).
[79]	- identification ing and description ing of the measures for reducing risk	Editorial correction (parallel list structure).
[80]	- description of the requirements for the <u>an FF-SA's</u> operational procedures <u>of an FF-SA</u>	Editorial correction (possessive abbreviations should be avoided).
[81]	- description of the area intended for an FF-SA	
[82]	- descriptions of host fruit to be exported and target fruit fly species	Editorial correction.
[83]	- details of the organizations involved and their roles and responsibilities and any linkages, including for example:	
[84]	· registration of organizations involved or stakeholders	
[85]	· agreement to cooperate in surveillance and control procedures	
[86]	· <u>evidence of</u> conformity with FF-SA requirements (origin of fruit, movement from place of production, selection and packing of fruit, transportation and safeguarding of the fruit)	Editorial correction (for sense, consistency).
[87]	· agreement to take appropriate corrective actions	
[88]	· keeping records <u>keeping and availability</u> and making them available	Editorial correction.
[89]	- <u>description of</u> pest surveillance and control programme	Editorial correction (for sense, to make it an item of documentation as per chapeau).
[90]	- survey results	
[91]	- training programme for FF-SA participants	

Para. No.	Proposal for consistency change (underline = addition; strikethrough = deletion)	Explanation for change
[92]	- traceability procedures	
[93]	- technical basis for specific procedures	
[94]	- survey, detection and diagnostic methodology	
[95]	- description of corrective actions and records of follow-up	
[96]	- reviews of the implementation of an FF-SA	
[97]	- contingency plans.	
[98]	4. Verification	
[99]	The measures in an FF-SA should be implemented in accordance with the <u>officially</u> approved <u>phytosanitary</u> procedures and should be monitored by the NPPO of the exporting country to ensure the system achieves its objectives.	Editorial corrections. On “official”, IPPC Style Guide says: “Anything “established, authorized or performed by an NPPO” is by definition “official”. Many Glossary terms are defined as “official” (e.g. area, inspection, phytosanitary action, phytosanitary measure, quarantine, surveillance, test, treatment). It is therefore recommended not to use the word “official” where it is redundant.”
[100]	The NPPO of the exporting country has the responsibility to monitor the implementation and the effectiveness of all stages of an FF-SA. In cases where the operational procedures of an FF-SA were properly implemented, but one or more of the components did not provide sufficient pest risk management to give the required effectiveness of all stages, a revision of <u>thean</u> FF-SA should be conducted to ensure that phytosanitary import requirements are met. This revision may not necessarily involve the suspension of trade. Other components of <u>thean</u> FF-SA may not need to be verified again. The frequency of verification should be influenced by the design of the FF-SA.	Editorial corrections.
[101]	The NPPO of the importing country may audit an FF-SA in agreement with the NPPO of the exporting country.	
[102]	5. Tolerance Level	
[103]	In many cases, the basis for developing an FF-SA may be that the target fruit fly species incidence is kept at or below a tolerance level (in connection with fruit flies, the term “specified pest population level” has sometimes been used instead of “tolerance level”) specified by the NPPO of the importing country in the defined area, for example an area of	Editorial correction.

Para. No.	Proposal for consistency change (underline = addition; strikethrough = deletion)	Explanation for change
	low pest prevalence (FF-ALPP). This may be as a result of a naturally low target fruit fly species incidence or as a result of the implementation of control measures <u>(Annex 2)</u> .	
[104]	Evidence to support that the target fruit fly species incidence <u>being</u> kept at or below the specified tolerance level may be required and, if so, should be obtained as a result of trapping <u>and</u> fruit sampling. Surveillance of target fruit fly species incidence may be conducted not only during the growing period of the host fruit but also during non-growing periods.	Editorial corrections.
[105]	6. Non-conformity and Non-compliance	
[106]	Non-conformity involves incorrect implementation or failure of an FF- <u>SA</u> . In such cases, the NPPO of the exporting country may suspend the trade from the non-conforming component of the FF- <u>SA</u> until corrective actions have been taken to address the non-conformity. Non-conformity may occur in one or more stages of an FF- <u>SA</u> . It is important to identify at which stage the non-conformity has occurred.	
[107]	The NPPO of the exporting country should notify the NPPO of the importing country of any non-conformity that may have affected a shipment or phytosanitary certification.	
[108]	The NPPO of the importing country should notify the NPPO of the exporting country of any <u>cases of non-compliance</u> (see ISPM 13 <u>(Guidelines for the notification of non-compliance and emergency action)</u> :2004).	Editorial correction.