Summary of major comments and responses

Cold treatment for *Ceratitis capitata* on *Prunus avium*, *Prunus domestica* and

*Prunus persica* (2017-022A)

 (Prepared by Mr Toshiyuki DOHINO)

A total of 35 (+4) comments were submitted from the member countries in the first consultation on July-September 2019. Categories includes SUBSTANTIVE (19 comments), TECHNICAL (9 comments) and EDITORIAL (7 comments).

About one-thirds of the comments (14/39) support this draft of phytosanitary cold treatment. The main comments and the responses to them are as follows. It is considered that the TPPT are invited to review the responses to the comments in 3 and 4. Regarding the other comments and the responses, see a document 08\_TPPT\_2020\_Feb (Compiled comments with Treatment Leads responses).

1. “The mortality rate should be taken as the treatment efficiency, otherwise, once the live larvae are detected in the port quarantine, the effectiveness of the treatment cannot be judged, which will lead to trade disputes.” (see comment-No. 6, 7, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24).

CONSIDERED BUT NOT INCORPORATED

Some adopted ISPM 28-PTs (PT 24-26, 30 and 31) have same criteria mentioned in “Other relevant information”. The TPPT decided to mention the end point of the schedules clearly (TPPT report June 2018, para 36). The detail action when the live larvae are detected in import-inspection should be determined in the work plan under the bilateral agreement.

2. “It is recommended not to mention varieties in this section, in order to avoid confusion when implementing the treatment scheme in the different species of Prunus.” (see comment-No. 4, 31, 32, 33).

CONSIDERED BUT NOT INCORPORATED

Some adopted ISPM 28-PTs (PT 15-18, 21, 25-32) have similar descriptions on varieties used in the mortality tests in the References.

3. “There are currently other required cold treatments against Ceratitits capitata in use in international trade, which can be considered as equivalent to the ones currently proposed in the draft Annexes of ISPM N 28. Their effectiveness have been proven. Neither interception nor non-compliances of any type have ever been recorded, which guarantees the continuity of their use in the international trade.” (see comment-No. 5).

CONSIDERED BUT NOT INCORPORATED

The comments from European Union and the drafts PTs (2017-022A and 2017-023A) should be considered separately because some member countries have used the cold treatments against *Ceratitis capitata* on agricultural commodities besides *Vitis vinifera*, *Prunus avium*, *P. domestica* and *P. persica* for their trade. Member countries will be able to use the EU-proposed cold treatments against *Ceratitis capitata* under bilateral negotiation.

4. “As defined in section 4.2 of ISPM 42, the fruit core temperature should be monitored during cold treatment, so add “core” to clarify the monitoring point. In TPs of cold treatment that have been adopted so far, “core” is not defined in their requirements. However, in TPs of vapor heat treatment (PT 21, 30-32), “core” is defined in their requirements as defined in ISPM 42 (Section 4.2.3). Therefore, TPs of cold treatment that have been adopted so far need to be revised where necessary.” (see comment-No.25).

INCORPORATED (see the revised draft)

FOR CONSIDERATION BY TPPT

Revision (“fruit temperature” to “fruit core temperature) as for PT 16-18, 24-29.