



## 2020 SECOND CONSULTATION

1 July – 30 September 2020

### Compiled comments for Draft PT: Cold treatment of *Ceratitis capitata* on *Vitis vinifera* (2017-023A)

#### Summary of comments

Name	Summary
Cuba	No hay comentarios al documento propuesto.
European Union	The comments have been introduced by the European Commission on behalf of the European Union and its Member States.
Myanmar	Agree with the document
OIRSA	Revisión Completa
Singapore	Singapore is supportive of this.

T (Type) - B = Bullet, C = Comment, P = Proposed Change, R = Rating

FAO sequential number	Para	Text	T	Comment	SC Responses
1	G	(General Comment)	C	<i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i> <b>(28) Guyana (30 Sep 2020 10:05 PM)</b> Guyana has no reservation regarding the draft document at this point.	<b>NOTED</b>
2	G	(General Comment)	C	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(27) Peru (30 Sep 2020 4:40 PM)</b> Peru agrees with COSAVE's comments.	See response to comment No. 9 (COSAVE).
3	G	(General Comment)	C	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(26) Australia (30 Sep 2020 1:01 PM)</b> Australia has reviewed this phytosanitary treatment and is supportive of this treatment and the respective text.	<b>NOTED</b>
4	G	(General Comment)	C	<i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i> <b>(25) Brazil (29 Sep 2020 10:32 PM)</b> Brazil supports COSAVE's general comment.	See response to comment No. 9 (COSAVE).
5	G	(General Comment)	C	<i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i> <b>(24) Costa Rica (29 Sep 2020 8:28 PM)</b> no comment	<b>NOTED</b>
6	G	(General Comment)	C	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(20) Paraguay (29 Sep 2020 3:30 PM)</b> Paraguay agrees with Cosave's comments	See response to comment No. 9 (COSAVE).
7	G	(General Comment)	C	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(19) Slovenia (29 Sep 2020 1:59 PM)</b> Slovenia would like to formally endorse the EPPC comments submitted via the IPPC Online Comment System.	See response to comment No. 22, 25, 27 (EPPC).

8	G	(General Comment)	C	<p><i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>  <b>(18) Argentina (29 Sep 2020 1:47 PM)</b>  We fully support comments provided by COSAVE to this draft</p>	See response to comment No. 9 (COSAVE).
9	G	(General Comment)	C	<p><i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>  <b>(17) COSAVE (29 Sep 2020 4:02 AM)</b>  We noted the TPPT response to our comment submitted during the first consultation regarding mentioning cultivars in Section "other relevant information". However, we suggest do not include cultivars to avoid confusion when implementing treatment schedule.</p> <p>According to ISPM 28, a requirement for varietal testing should be based on evidence that the varietal differences affect treatment efficacy, and data should be provided to support the requirement. However, the information provided on cultivars in this draft does not show evidence about differences among cultivar treatments but it only mentions general information on which cultivars the treatments were performed. On the other hand, detailed information of cultivars used in developing treatment schedules can be found in the references listed in "References" section.</p> <p>Tomamos nota de la respuesta del PTF a nuestro comentario presentado durante la primera consulta con respecto a la mención de cultivares en la Sección "otra información relevante". Sin embargo, sugerimos no incluir cultivares para evitar confusiones al implementar el protocolo de tratamiento .</p> <p>De acuerdo con la NIMF 28, el requisito de pruebas varietales debe basarse en evidencia de que las diferencias varietales afectan la eficacia del tratamiento, y se deben proporcionar datos para respaldar el requisito. Sin embargo, la información sobre los cultivares que se detallan en este borrador, no ofrece evidencia de diferencias entre los tratamientos entre cultivares sino que sólo se trata de información general sobre los cuales se realizaron los ensayos. Por otro lado, la información detallada de los cultivares utilizados en el desarrollo de los protocolos de tratamiento se puede consultar en las referencias listadas en la sección "Referencias".</p>	<p><b>CONSIDERED BUT NOT INCORPORATED</b></p> <p>Consistent with the adopted PTs. It provides information on the varieties tested for the development of the PT and is not intended to show the difference in effect between the tested varieties or that it cannot be applied to other varieties.</p>
10	G	(General Comment)	C	<p><i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>  <b>(16) OIRSA (28 Sep 2020 7:08 PM)</b>  Sin comentarios de trascendencia para este documento.</p>	<b>NOTED</b>
11	G	(General Comment)	C	<p><i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>  <b>(15) Barbados (28 Sep 2020 6:26 PM)</b>  Barbados has no changes to make to this draft ISPM.</p>	<b>NOTED</b>
12	G	(General Comment)	C	<p><i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>  <b>(13) Mexico (26 Sep 2020 5:46 AM)</b>  Mexico supports the DRAFT ANNEX TO ISPM 28: Cold treatment for <i>Ceratitits capitata</i> on <i>Vitis vinifera</i> (2017-023A)</p>	<b>NOTED</b>
13	G	(General Comment)	C	<p><i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>  <b>(11) China (23 Sep 2020 8:37 AM)</b>  The treatment efficacy of cold treatment should be based the mortality of the most tolerant stage of target pest.</p>	<p><b>CONSIDERED BUT NOT INCORPORATED</b></p> <p>Based on the comments on the first consultation of 2019, we revised the draft PT and made it consistent with</p>

			<p>1. Cold treatment should apply to achieve pest mortality in treatment objective in ISPM 42, all the PTs adopted after April of 2018 should be consensus as its requirements.</p> <p>2. The pest mortality is the key standard for temperature treatment according the outline of requirements and requirements in ISPM 42. The measure of treatment efficacy for eggs and larvae in the drafts of 2017-022A, 2017-022B, 2017-023A, 2017-023B is not comply with the requirements. Even though those words like "kill" and "failure to pupariate" are used in the revision drafts, the endpoint for efficacy is preventing pupation in fact.</p> <p>3. The TPPT response of "failure to pupariate" is accepted in ISPM 28 PT24, PT25, PT26, PT30 and PT31, but the PTs had published before the adoption of ISPM 42. It can not be the cases for the new PTs of temperature treatment. The endpoint of "failure to pupariate" have been accepted in the published PTs (PT24, PT25, PT26, PT30 and PT31), as the TPPT explained, but all these TPs endorsed before the adoption of ISPM 42, then, this cannot be regard as the reason for the inconsistency with the new criteria for temperature treatment.</p> <p>4. Preventing successful development or inability to reproduce is only applied to irradiation treatment. The endpoint standard is also one of obstacles for using irradiation treatment. So as to facility the application of this standards, failure to pupariate should not be used in cold treatments. The annex of ISPM 28 is important as the guideline of the technology for phytosanitary treatment. once failure to pupariate is accepted as endpoint for cold treatment, is meaning failure to pupariate can be used in the other researches of cold treatment? The ISPM 28 and its annexes have an important guiding role in the development of phytosanitary treatment technology. If the prevention of pupation can be regarded as the criteria for judging the effect of cold treatment, there will be a lot of research to follow this criterion in the future, which will be difficult to apply in practice. If exceptions are still allowed, is the prevention of fruit fly emergence acceptable as a criterion for determining the effect of cold treatment?</p>	<p>the adopted PTs. The purpose of ISPM42 is to smoothly operate the PTs adopted under ISPM28, and the intended purpose of the Annexes to ISPM28 has not changed before and after the adoption of the ISPM42. The endpoint, failure to pupariate, has been recognized by international experts as a valid outcome to be used in efficacy trials of a treatment and is a way to measure mortality (see the 2020-02 TPPT report: The outcome, however, of any cold treatment as stated must be larvae mortality ("to result in the mortality of eggs and larvae of <i>Ceratitis capitata</i> at the stated efficacy"). Therefore any presence of live larvae found during import inspection may be regarded as a failure of treatment in line with ISPM42.</p>
14	G	(General Comment)	<p><i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>  <b>(10) Uruguay (22 Sep 2020 5:20 PM)</b>                  We noted the TPPT response to our comment submitted during the first consultation regarding mentioning cultivars in Section "other relevant information". However, we suggest do not include cultivars to avoid confusion when implementing treatment schedule.</p> <p>According to ISPM 28, a requirement for varietal testing should be based on evidence that the varietal differences affect treatment efficacy, and data should be provided to support the requirement. However, the</p>	<p><b>CONSIDERED BUT NOT INCORPORATED</b></p> <p>Consistent with the adopted PTs. It provides information on the varieties tested for the development of the PT and is not intended to show the difference in effect between the</p>

				<p>information provided on cultivars in this draft does not show evidence about differences among cultivar treatments but it only mentions general information on which cultivars the treatments were performed. On the other hand, detailed information of cultivars used in developing treatment schedules can be found in the references listed in "References" section.</p> <p>Tomamos nota de la respuesta del PTF a nuestro comentario presentado durante la primera consulta con respecto a la mención de cultivares en la Sección "otra información relevante". Sin embargo, sugerimos no incluir cultivares para evitar confusiones al implementar el protocolo de tratamiento .</p> <p>De acuerdo con la NIMF 28, el requisito de pruebas varietales debe basarse en evidencia de que las diferencias varietales afectan la eficacia del tratamiento, y se deben proporcionar datos para respaldar el requisito. Sin embargo, la información sobre los cultivares que se detallan en este borrador, no ofrece evidencia de diferencias entre los tratamientos entre cultivares sino que sólo se trata de información general sobre los cuales se realizaron los ensayos. Por otro lado, la información detallada de los cultivares utilizados en el desarrollo de los protocolos de tratamiento se puede consultar en las referencias listadas en la sección "Referencias".</p>	tested varieties or that it cannot be applied to other varieties.
15	G	(General Comment)	C	<p><i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>  <b>(6) Qatar (9 Sep 2020 9:41 AM)</b>  we don't have any comment</p>	<b>NOTED</b>
16	G	(General Comment)	C	<p><i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>  <b>(5) Malawi (5 Sep 2020 2:00 PM)</b>  we agree with annex</p>	<b>NOTED</b>
17	G	(General Comment)	C	<p><i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>  <b>(4) Thailand (2 Sep 2020 10:50 AM)</b>  Thailand has no objection on the proposed draft Cold treatment for <i>Ceratitis capitata</i> on <i>Vitis vinifera</i>.</p>	<b>NOTED</b>
18	G	(General Comment)	C	<p><i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>  <b>(1) Venezuela (18 Aug 2020 12:40 AM)</b>  La parte técnica del Organismo Fitosanitario de Venezuela, al analizar el proyecto de NIMF: normas para medidas fitosanitarias para productos, concluyo estar de acuerdo con lo planteado por el Grupo de debate sobre normas</p>	<b>NOTED</b>
19	1	<b>DRAFT ANNEX TO ISPM 28: Cold treatment for <i>Ceratitis capitata</i> on <i>Vitis vinifera</i> (2017-023A)</b>	C	<p><i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>  <b>(14) Nepal (28 Sep 2020 7:38 AM)</b>  We have no comments on the draft annex to ISPM 28</p>	<b>NOTED</b>
20	1	<b>DRAFT ANNEX TO ISPM 28: Cold treatment for <i>Ceratitis</i></b>	C	<p><i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>  <b>(2) Kenya (27 Aug 2020 12:35 PM)</b>  No comment Kenya in agreement with the standard</p>	<b>NOTED</b>

		<b><i>capitata</i> on <i>Vitis vinifera</i> (2017-023A)</b>			
21	13	2018-05 <a href="#">SC-Standards Committee (SC)</a> added the topic <i>Cold treatment of Ceratitidis capitata on table grapes</i> (2017-023A) to the TPPT work programme with priority 1.	P	Category : EDITORIAL <b>(21) European Union (29 Sep 2020 5:23 PM)</b> Acronym to be developed for its first use.	<b>INCORPORATED</b>  Revised the draft PT.
22	13	2018-05 <a href="#">SC-Standards Committee (SC)</a> added the topic <i>Cold treatment of Ceratitidis capitata on table grapes</i> (2017-023A) to the TPPT work programme with priority 1.	P	Category : EDITORIAL <b>(7) EPPO (15 Sep 2020 1:34 PM)</b> Acronym to be developed for its first use.	<b>INCORPORATED</b>  Revised the draft PT.
23	43	For all three schedules, the fruit must reach the treatment temperature before treatment exposure time commences. The fruit core temperature should be monitored and <del>recorded</del> <a href="#">recorded in intervals</a> , and the temperature should not exceed the stated level throughout the duration of the treatment. <a href="#">The treatment should be repeated if failed to reach the scheduled temperature for certain time.</a>	P	Category : EDITORIAL <b>(3) Egypt (28 Aug 2020 6:10 PM)</b>	<b>CONSIDERED BUT NOT INCORPORATED</b>  Bilateral agreements can be used to determine where the fruit core temperature is measured, the temperature recording interval, and what to do if the temperature exceeds the stated level.
24	46	In evaluating this treatment, the Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments ( <a href="#">TPPT</a> ) considered issues associated with temperature regimes and thermal conditioning, taking into account the work of Hallman and Mangan (1997).	P	Category : EDITORIAL <b>(22) European Union (29 Sep 2020 5:24 PM)</b> Because of the addition proposed after [48].	<b>INCORPORATED</b>  Revised the draft PT.
25	46	In evaluating this treatment, the Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments ( <a href="#">TPPT</a> ) considered issues associated with temperature regimes and thermal conditioning, taking into account the work of Hallman and Mangan (1997).	P	Category : EDITORIAL <b>(8) EPPO (15 Sep 2020 1:34 PM)</b> Because of the addition proposed after [48].	<b>INCORPORATED</b>  Revised the draft PT.

26	48	<p>Schedules 1, 2 and 3 were based on the work of De Lima (2007) and De Lima <i>et al.</i> (2011) and were developed using the cultivars ‘Red Globe’, ‘Crimson Seedless’ and ‘Thompson Seedless’, and using failure to pupariate as the measure of mortality.</p> <p><a href="#">The TPPT also considered De Lima et al. (2017).</a></p>	P	<p>Category : EDITORIAL <b>(23) European Union (29 Sep 2020 5:25 PM)</b> This addition is proposed because this reference is not mentioned in the text (please see the the SC response to the EPP0/EU comment made during first consultation: "This reference is not mentioned in the draft but the TPPT has reviewed it for making this draft PT"). It is consistent with the draft PT 2017-011 sent for first consultation.</p>	<b>INCORPORATED</b>  Revised the draft PT.
27	48	<p>Schedules 1, 2 and 3 were based on the work of De Lima (2007) and De Lima <i>et al.</i> (2011) and were developed using the cultivars ‘Red Globe’, ‘Crimson Seedless’ and ‘Thompson Seedless’, and using failure to pupariate as the measure of mortality.</p> <p><a href="#">The TPPT also considered De Lima et al. (2017).</a></p>	P	<p>Category : EDITORIAL <b>(9) EPP0 (15 Sep 2020 1:34 PM)</b> This addition is proposed because this reference is not mentioned in the text (please see the the SC response to the EPP0/EU comment made during first consultation: "This reference is not mentioned in the draft but the TPPT has reviewed it for making this draft PT"). It is consistent with the draft PT 2017-011 sent for first consultation.</p>	<b>INCORPORATED</b>  Revised the draft PT.
28	53	<p><b>De Lima C.P.F., Mansfield E.R. &amp; Poogoda S.R.</b> 2017. International market access for Australian tablegrapes through cold treatment of fruit flies with a review of methods, models and data for fresh fruit disinfestation. <i>Australian Journal of Grape and Wine Research</i>, 23: 306–317.</p>	P	<p>Category : EDITORIAL <b>(12) China (23 Sep 2020 8:38 AM)</b> It should be consistent with requirement of reference.</p>	<b>INCORPORATED</b>  Revised the draft PT.