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| **Cold treatment for *Ceratitis capitata* on *Citrus* reticulata (2007-212)** | | | |
| **Contracting Party** | **Formal objection and Explanation**  **2012** | **SC Responses** |
| Australia | With reference to the adoption of international standards under the special process that have been presented for consideration at the 7th meeting of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures, I wish to notify a formal objection for one phytosanitary treatment, paper CPM 2012/07/ Attachment06. Australia provided technical data in support of cold treatments at 2° and 3°C for citrus for both *Bactrocera tryoni* and *Ceratitis capitata.* The submitted data was supported by the reference to De Lima, C P F, Jessup, A J, Cruickshank, L, Walsh L, and Mansfield, E R (2007) 'Cold disinfestations of citrus *(Citrus* spp) for Mediterranean fruit fly *(Ceratitis capitata)* and Queensland fruit fly *Bactrocera tryoni)* (Diptera: Tephritidae), New Zealand Journal of Crop and Horticultural Science, 35: 39-50. Whilst the data provided has been accepted for the cold treatment for *B. tryoni,* it is not apparent that it has been used for C. *capitata.* Based on this technical evidence presented which supports a different, but effective, fruit fly treatment, Australia believes that the proposed treatment (agenda item 8.1.3 Attachment 6 for cold treatment *C. capitata* on *Citrus reticulata* cultivars and hybrids) is not the least restrictive measure available. The requirement for minimal impact is made clear in ISPM No 1 'Phytosanitary principles for the protection and the application of phytosanitary measures in international trade' and under the WTO Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures. In providing supporting information to the Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments, Australia proposed cold treatments for *C.capitata* with a 100% mortality of the most tolerant stage (that is 2ndinstar stage) obtained after 18 days at 2°C and 20 days at 3°C in oranges and mandarins and 16 days at 2°C and 18 days at 3°C in lemons. These treatments are accepted by a number of trading partners based on the technical data provided. We understand that the same treatments are used by other exporting countries and that this acceptance is based on separate but consistent technical evidence. Australia therefore provides this letter as a formal objection to the phytosanitary cold treatment for *C. capitata* on *Citrus reticulata* cultivars and hybrids (paper CPM 2012/ 07/ Attachment06). Australia does not object to the proposed treatment standard for *C. capitata* in grapefruit, but new data generated by Australia that supports a reduced period for treatment will be forwarded to the IPPC Secretariat with a request that the treatment, if adopted by CPM, be reviewed on the basis of the new data provided. | This objection is not based on technical issues and therefore the TPPT does not have a response to this objection.  NB: the TPPT evaluates a variety of treatments at any one time, sometimes many of the same treatment type, like cold treatment, for example. Not all treatments progress through the evaluation process at the same rate. Often, follow-up requests must be made of the submitter for clarification, additional information, or other technical issue relating to a submission. For example, some member countries were concerned about potential population differences in *Ceratitis capitata* that may affect the efficacy of the cold treatment. The TPPT considered a recent scientific study (see 2016-09 TPPT meeting report) undertaken to investigate possible differences in cold toleranceamong populations of *Ceratitis capitata* from geographically separate regions.  Based on the assessment of the findings, the TPPT concluded that there is no evidence to support there are significant differences in cold tolerance among populations of *C. capitata* and the TPPT recommended the cold treatments discussed by the member country for adoption (2007-206a, 2007-206b, 2007-206c).  The TPPT and the IPPC Secretariat have taken steps to include more of the rationale and validity for the draft treatments to satisfy these suggestions  The TPPT for consistency has adopted a single directory for citrus taxonomy (Cottin (2002) Citrus of the World. SRA INRA-CIRAD.) Under this taxonomy the cultivars tested by De lima etal (2007) and therefore submitted by Australia included Orange (*Citrus sinensis*) as cultivars Valencia and Nova, Lemon (*Citrus limon*) as cultivar Lisbon, and Tangor (*Citrus sinensis* X *reticulata*) as cultivars Ellendale and Murcott. The TPPT has now submitted cold treatments based on all of the data submitted by Australia, and where appropriate removed any schedules that were more stringent. |
| European Union | The EU and its 27 Member States hereby express their formal objection with regards to the draft cold treatment for Ceratitis capitata on Citrus reticulata cultivars and hybrids (2007-212).  Although we accept the efficacy data supporting the treatments, we are concerned about the practical and operational feasibility of adopting only one cold treatment for a pest/host combination at this time, while alternative schedules of cold treatment for Ceratitis capitata are accepted and applied by Contracting Parties in existing trades with citrus fruits. EU (namely Spain) has submitted to the IPPC/TPPT, prior to its meeting in 2010, scientific evidence on the efficacy and operational feasibility of some of those alternative schedules. We do believe that, if there had been a regular TPPT meeting in 2011, more alternatives of cold treatments for Ceratitis capitata on specific hosts would have been submitted for approval in CPM-7. Accepting only one schedule for a specific pest/host combination at this time is considered misleading. It may have a confusing or even negative impact on existing practices as trade in citrus fruits is a highly sensitive domain.  The EU suggests that the adoption of the two treatments be suspended until a range of cold treatments for a pest/host combination can be adopted at the same time. It would allow Contracting Parties to choose from several options the one(s) they wish to implement.  We also believe that our rationale is in line with our member comment (Country Consultation 2009), where we proposed that cold treatments for Ceratitis capitata were suspended until additional schedules could be added. Our then argument was as follows: "The current proposal seems to be too restrictive in terms of the schedules included therein. In our view, the number of schedules should be expanded to include others that achieve sufficient efficacy with shorter treatment periods, which are successfully used in international trade. Examples include cold treatment of Citrus sinensis fruit at 2°C for 16 or 17 days. A possible broader choice of schedules would allow for more flexible applicability of the cold treatments as well as enhancing their practical use." | This objection is not based on technical issues and therefore the TPPT does not have a response to this objection.  NB: the TPPT evaluates a variety of treatments at any one time, sometimes many of the same treatment type, like cold treatment, for example. Not all treatments progress through the evaluation process at the same rate. Often, follow-up requests must be made of the submitter for clarification, additional information, or other technical issue relating to a submission. For example, some member countries were concerned about potential population differences in *Ceratitis capitata* that may affect the efficacy of the cold treatment. The TPPT considered a recent scientific study (see 2016-09 TPPT meeting report) undertaken to investigate possible differences in cold toleranceamong populations of *Ceratitis capitata* from geographically separate regions.  Based on the assessment of the findings, the TPPT concluded that there is no evidence to support there are significant differences in cold tolerance among populations of *C. capitata* and the TPPT recommended the cold treatment discussed by the member country for adoption.  Therefore there are now a range of cold treatment schedules being presented for the various fruit fly/host combinations. These schedules offer a range of temperature/time combinations that are currently in use in international trade. Note that the SC reiterated that IPPC phytosanitary treatments in ISPM 28 (Phytosanitary treatments for regulated pests) are optional for countries, and provide treatment options with a stated level of efficacy that is supported by data. |