

2022 FIRST CONSULTATION

1 July – 31 August 2022

Compiled Comments for Draft Specification for ISPM: Revision of ISPM 26 (2021-010)

English

Summary

Participants

Name	Summary
European Union	The comments are submitted by the European Commission on behalf of the European Union (EU) and its 27 Member States.
Malawi	Completed
Singapore	Singapore supports this and has no further comment.

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S (Status) - A = Accepted, C = Closed, O = Open, W = Withdrawn, M = Merged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
G	(General Comment)	C	Category : SUBSTANTIVE (96) Peru (31 Aug 2022 11:33 PM) Peru supports the comments presented by COSAVE
G	(General Comment)	C	Category : TECHNICAL (95) Paraguay (31 Aug 2022 6:31 PM) Paraguay apoya los comentarios de COSAVE. Paraguay supports COSAVE comments.
G	(General Comment)	C	Category : SUBSTANTIVE (83) EPPO (30 Aug 2022 4:43 PM) Should the revised ISPM 26 stay as a separate Standard or become an annex to ISPM 4? as ISPM 4 acts as the 'concept' Standard and general framework to be used for all pests and pest groups.
G	(General Comment)	C	Category : SUBSTANTIVE (94) European Union (31 Aug 2022 4:32 PM) The European Union and its 27 Member States support the comments submitted in the OCS by the European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organisation (EPPO).
G	(General Comment)	C	Category : SUBSTANTIVE (91) Argentina (31 Aug 2022 3:56 AM) We support the comments from COSAVE
G	(General Comment)	C	Category : EDITORIAL (85) Barbados (30 Aug 2022 9:53 PM) Barbados supports the draft specification for the revision of ISPM 26.
G	(General Comment)	C	Category : SUBSTANTIVE (84) EPPO (30 Aug 2022 5:14 PM) There is no need to revise the whole ISPM 26. An option could be to limit the revision to the section 2.4 as this section lacks sufficient clarity to ensure adequate harmonization and hence need expanding.

G	(General Comment)	C	<p>Category : EDITORIAL (62) South Africa (30 Aug 2022 12:04 PM) Proposal for inclusion of Suspension, reinstatement and revocation in ISPM 4 for consistency with ISPM 26</p>
G	(General Comment)	C	<p>Category : SUBSTANTIVE  Mexico (55) Mexico (29 Aug 2022 5:49 PM) Mexico supports the DRAFT SPECIFICATION FOR ISPM: Revision of ISPM 26 (Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)) (2021-010)</p>
G	(General Comment)	C	<p>Category : SUBSTANTIVE (46) Australia (29 Aug 2022 4:13 AM) Australia has reviewed and does not propose any changes to the Specification.</p>
G	(General Comment)	C	<p>Category : SUBSTANTIVE (43) Guyana (25 Aug 2022 7:59 PM) Guyana has no objections at this time.</p>
G	(General Comment)	C	<p>Category : EDITORIAL (38) Eswatini (25 Aug 2022 11:06 AM) aspect</p>
G	(General Comment)	C	<p>Category : EDITORIAL (37) Eswatini (25 Aug 2022 11:04 AM) that</p>
G	(General Comment)	C	<p>Category : EDITORIAL (33) Nepal (22 Aug 2022 4:43 AM) Nepal is okay with the "DRAFT SPECIFICATION FOR ISPM: Revision of ISPM 26 (Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)) (2021-010) and has no comments.</p>
G	(General Comment)	C	<p>Category : TRANSLATION (21) Uruguay (18 Aug 2022 7:34 PM) Translation comments to this draft are made in the Spanish version of the OCS</p>
G	(General Comment)	C	<p>Category : TRANSLATION (19) COSAVE (12 Aug 2022 11:13 PM) General comment: COSAVE's translation comments to this draft are made in the Spanish version of the OCS</p>
G	(General Comment)	C	<p>Category : TECHNICAL (14) Brazil (8 Aug 2022 6:06 PM) Brazil supports COSAVE's comments in this draft.</p>
G	(General Comment)	C	<p>Category : SUBSTANTIVE (1) Malawi (28 Jul 2022 5:44 PM) We support the guide Malawi (28 Jul 2022 5:45 PM) We support the draft specification</p>
19	Revision of ISPM 26 (<i>Establishment and maintenance of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)</i>) (2021-010).	P	<p>Category : SUBSTANTIVE (44) China (28 Aug 2022 4:01 PM) The establishment and maintenance of pest free areas are different concepts and technology with different connotations, but this ISPM 26 contain maintenance contents of pest free areas</p>

22	While the purpose of an ISPM is to provide guidance that allows a harmonized approach to international trade, the requirements set out in ISPM 26 are too open and broad and leave too much <u>room</u> for interpretation by countries.	P	<i>Category : EDITORIAL (86) Canada (30 Aug 2022 10:47 PM)</i>
22	While the purpose of an ISPM is to provide guidance that allows a harmonized approach to international trade, the requirements set out in ISPM 26 are too open and broad and leave too much for interpretation <u>by to</u> countries.	P	<i>Category : EDITORIAL (34) New Zealand (22 Aug 2022 6:49 AM)</i>
22	While the purpose of an ISPM is to provide <u>guidance that allows a framework for the development and application of</u> harmonized <u>approach to international trade</u> <u>phytosanitary measures</u> , the requirements set out in ISPM 26 <u>are too open and broad and leave too much for need to be further revised to avoid different</u> interpretation by countries.	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL (22) Uruguay (18 Aug 2022 7:45 PM)</i> Modified to better reflect the Preamble of the IPPC and to better explain the reasons for the revision of ISPM 26
22	While the purpose of an ISPM is to provide guidance that allows a harmonized approach to international trade, the requirements set out in ISPM 26 <u>are too open and broad and leave too much for need to be further revised to avoid different</u> interpretation by countries.	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL (3) COSAVE (2 Aug 2022 7:52 PM)</i> Modified to better explain the reasons for revision of ISPM 26
22	While the purpose of an ISPM is to provide <u>guidance that allows a framework for the development and application of</u> harmonized <u>approach to international trade</u> <u>phytosanitary measures</u> , the requirements set out in ISPM 26 are too open and broad and leave too much for interpretation by countries.	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL (2) COSAVE (2 Aug 2022 7:46 PM)</i> To better reflect the Preamble of the IPPC
23	Some key <u>parts sections</u> of ISPM 26 (e.g. section 2.4) lack sufficient clarity to ensure adequate harmonization and hence need expanding.	P	<i>Category : EDITORIAL (87) Canada (30 Aug 2022 10:47 PM)</i>
23	Some key parts of ISPM 26 (e.g. section 2.4) lack sufficient clarity to ensure adequate harmonization and hence need expanding.	C	<i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE (63) EPPO (30 Aug 2022 4:43 PM)</i> There is no need to revise the whole ISPM 26. An option could be to limit the revision to the section 2.4 as this section lacks sufficient clarity to ensure adequate harmonization and hence need expanding.
23	Some key parts of ISPM 26 (e.g. section 2.4) lack sufficient clarity to ensure adequate harmonization and hence need expanding.	C	<i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE (56) South Africa (30 Aug 2022 11:57 AM)</i> Proposal for modification of paragraph 1 in the standard (Suspension) and addition of the word: "surveillance" to cover trapping and Sampling in 2.4.1. of the standard.
23	Some key parts of ISPM 26 (e.g. section 2.4) lack sufficient clarity to ensure adequate harmonization and hence need expanding.	C	<i>Category : EDITORIAL (39) Eswatini (25 Aug 2022 11:26 AM)</i> some key aspects of ISPMS
24	Some aspects of the standard <u>are open to interpretation, particularly by countries that would normally could be free from fruit flies inconsistently interpreted. The standard To reduce ambiguity the Standard</u> therefore needs further linkages to <u>ISPM 4 (Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas) and ISPM 8 (Determination of pest status in an area)</u> to reduce <u>ambiguity ambiguity and the new version of ISPM 4</u> .	P	<i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE (64) EPPO (30 Aug 2022 4:43 PM)</i> Inconsistency in the interpretation by all county is relevant. The revised version of ISPM 4 should normally be adopted at CPM-17 in 2023.
24	Some aspects of the standard are open to interpretation, particularly by countries that would normally be free from fruit flies. The standard therefore needs further	C	<i>Category : TECHNICAL (58) South Africa (30 Aug 2022 12:00 PM)</i>

	linkages to ISPM 4 (<i>Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas</i>) and ISPM 8 (<i>Determination of pest status in an area</i>) to reduce ambiguity.		Proposal that the use of the word "May" be avoided throughout the document to avoid giving options. Replacement of the phrase "to be Faulty" with "not to be in line with phytosanitary actions" in paragraph 2.4.1. of the standard.
24	Some aspects of the standard are open to interpretation, particularly by countries that would normally be free from fruit flies. The standard therefore needs further linkages to ISPM 4 (<i>Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas</i>) and ISPM 8 (<i>Determination of pest status in an area</i>) to reduce ambiguity.	C	Category : SUBSTANTIVE (57) South Africa (30 Aug 2022 11:58 AM) Proposal for modification of the following statement on paragraph one of the standard "Suspension may also be applied if procedures are not consistent with phytosanitary actions".
24	Some aspects of the standard are open to interpretation, particularly by countries that would normally be free from fruit flies. The standard therefore needs further linkages to be consistent with ISPM 4 (<i>Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas</i>) and ISPM 8 (<i>Determination of pest status in an area</i>) revised after ISPM26 was adapted to reduce ambiguity.	P	Category : SUBSTANTIVE (47) Japan (29 Aug 2022 11:02 AM) As noted in para 29, rather than an further linkage, it should be consistent with the concept of PFA in the revised ISPM4 and the definition of pest status in the revised ISPM8.
24	Some aspects of the standard are open to interpretation, particularly by countries that would normally be free from fruit flies. The standard therefore needs further linkages to ISPM 4 (<i>Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas</i>) and ISPM 8 (<i>Determination of pest status in an area</i>) to reduce ambiguity.	C	Category : EDITORIAL (40) Eswatini (25 Aug 2022 11:29 AM) Other aspects of the standard
24	Some aspects of the standard are open to interpretation, particularly may be interpreted differently by countries that would normally be where fruit flies are present and countries free from fruit fliesflies when an outbreak or incursion occurs . The standard therefore needs further linkages to ISPM 4 (<i>Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas</i>) and ISPM 8 (<i>Determination of pest status in an area</i>) to reduce ambiguity.	P	Category : TECHNICAL (23) Uruguay (18 Aug 2022 7:53 PM) Reworked to clarify which countries differ in interpretation. In addition the meaning of "countries that would normally be free from fruit flies" is unclear
24	Some aspects of the standard are open to interpretation may be interpreted, particularly differently by countries that would normally be where fruit flies are present and countries free from fruit fliesflies when an outbreak or incursion occurs . The standard therefore needs further linkages to ISPM 4 (<i>Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas</i>) and ISPM 8 (<i>Determination of pest status in an area</i>) to reduce ambiguity.	P	Category : TECHNICAL (4) COSAVE (2 Aug 2022 8:12 PM) Reworked to clarify which countries differ in interpretation. In addition the meaning of "countries that would normally be free from fruit flies" is unclear
26	The revised ISPM 26 should provide guidance for the establishment and maintenance of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae) of economic importance, including requirements that accommodate the needs of both countries with indigenous fruit flies and countries that are free from fruit flies.	P	Category : SUBSTANTIVE (65) EPPO (30 Aug 2022 4:43 PM) The reasons for the revision are already explained in the previous paragraph
26	The revised ISPM 26 should provide guidance for the establishment and maintenance of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae) of economic importance, including requirements that accommodate the needs of both countries with indigenous fruit flies and countries that are free from fruit flies.	C	Category : TECHNICAL (59) South Africa (30 Aug 2022 12:01 PM) Proposal for the removal of the word "fertility" in paragraph 1 of the standard since it cannot be detected. Proposal to for replacement of "a fault" with "non-conformity" in paragraph 2.4.2 of the standard.

26	The revised ISPM 26 should provide guidance for the establishment and maintenance of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae) of economic importance, including requirements that accommodate the needs of both countries with indigenous <u>populations of</u> fruit flies and countries that are free from fruit flies.	P	<i>Category : EDITORIAL (35) New Zealand (22 Aug 2022 6:51 AM)</i> to improve clarity
26	The revised ISPM 26 should provide guidance for the establishment and maintenance of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae) of economic importance, including requirements that accommodate the needs of both countries with <u>indigenous-the presence of</u> fruit flies and countries that are free from fruit flies.	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL (24) Uruguay (18 Aug 2022 7:54 PM)</i> More appropriate terminology in the context of ISPM 4 and 8
26	The revised ISPM 26 should provide guidance for the establishment and maintenance of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae) of economic importance, including requirements that accommodate the needs of both countries with indigenous fruit flies <u>present (based on any particular category of Pest Status Present in ISPM 8)</u> and countries that are free from fruit flies.	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL (15) United States of America (11 Aug 2022 3:34 PM)</i> To improve clarity and ensure consistency with ISPM 8, which is already referred to in the draft.
26	The revised ISPM 26 should provide guidance for the establishment and maintenance of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae) of economic importance, including requirements that accommodate the needs of both countries with <u>indigenous-the presence of</u> fruit flies and countries that are free from fruit flies.	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL (5) COSAVE (2 Aug 2022 8:14 PM)</i> More appropriate terminology in the context of ISPM 4 and 8
29	<u>- revising section 2.4 "Suspension, reinstatement or revocation of an FF-PFA status" clearly detailing the situations that necessarily lead to suspension of the PFA status, the criteria to be fulfilled for its reinstatement and finally, the conditions for the definitive revocation of the FF-PFA status and the procedures for decreeing it.</u> <u>- ensure consistency between the requirements in ISPM 26 and those in ISPM 4 and ISPM 8;</u>	P	<i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE (66) EPPO (30 Aug 2022 4:43 PM)</i> The specification should clearly indicate the review work to be performed.
29	<u>ensure consistency between the requirements in ISPM 26 and those in ISPM 4 and ISPM 8;</u>	C	<i>Category : EDITORIAL (60) South Africa (30 Aug 2022 12:02 PM)</i> The NPPOZA is in agreement to ensure consistency between these ISPMs.
30	<u>provide appropriate criteria for determining whether <u>an outbreak, i.e. a recently detected</u> pest <u>population-population</u>, constitutes an incursion or <u>an outbreak is established in the pest free area</u>;</u>	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL (67) EPPO (30 Aug 2022 4:43 PM)</i> Consistency with the definition of "outbreak" and "incursion" in ISPM 5.
30	<u>provide appropriate criteria for determining whether <u>a-pest-fruit flies</u> population constitutes an incursion or an outbreak;</u>	P	<i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE (48) Japan (29 Aug 2022 11:04 AM)</i> This standard is applied specifically to fruit flies.
31	<u>provide a better description of the criteria for suspension and reinstatement of pest free areas (sections 2.4.1 and 2.4.2 of ISPM 26) and corrective actions (sections 2.3.3. of ISPM 26) if it needs</u> , considering varying geographical scales and host densities to ensure a more harmonized approach; and	P	<i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE (93) Japan (31 Aug 2022 12:42 PM)</i> In addition to the criteria for suspension and reinstatement, the criteria for corrective action should be considered.
31	<u>provide a better description of the criteria for suspension and reinstatement of <u>the</u> pest free <u>areas-area status</u> (sections 2.4.1 and 2.4.2 of ISPM 26), considering</u>	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL (68) EPPO (30 Aug 2022 4:43 PM)</i> It is the status of the PFA that is suspended or reinstated, please see current title and content of section 2.4 (Suspension, reinstatement or revocation of anFF-PFA status) of ISPM 26.

	varying geographical scales and host densities to ensure a more harmonized approach; and		
32	determine whether the <u>appendices-appendices</u> , and <u>annexes-if necessary certain annexes</u> , should remain as part of the ISPM or be removed to implementation material.	P	<p><i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE (69) EPPO (30 Aug 2022 4:43 PM)</i></p> <p>According to paragraph 67 of the SC May 2022 report, this task seems to concern the appendices of ISPM 26 (Appendix 1: Fruit fly trapping, Appendix 2: Fruit sampling). Are really the annexes (which are a prescriptive part of the standard) concerned?</p>
32	determine whether the appendices and annexes should remain as part of the ISPM or be removed to implementation material.	C	<p><i>Category : TECHNICAL (61) South Africa (30 Aug 2022 12:03 PM)</i></p> <p>Proposal to remove annex 1 and 2 from the standard (ISPM 26) and a suggestion to include them in ISPM 4 as generic guidelines.</p>
32	<u>determine-discuss</u> whether the appendices and annexes should remain as part of the ISPM or be removed to implementation material.	P	<p><i>Category : TECHNICAL (25) Uruguay (18 Aug 2022 7:55 PM)</i></p> <p>The EDG will not determine but will discuss having annexes in a document other than the ISPM</p>
32	<u>discuss determine</u> -whether the appendices and annexes should remain as part of the ISPM or be removed to implementation material.	P	<p><i>Category : TECHNICAL (6) COSAVE (2 Aug 2022 8:17 PM)</i></p> <p>The EDG will not determine but will discuss having annexes in a document other than the ISPM</p>
35	Revise the current text of <u>section 2.4 of</u> ISPM 26 to reduce <u>ambiguity in inconsistent interpretation by countries that would normally be free from fruit flies.</u>	P	<p><i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE (70) EPPO (30 Aug 2022 4:43 PM)</i></p> <p>'Ambiguity' does not need to be followed by a reference to interpretation</p> <p>The text to be clarified is that of Section 2.4 and it should be clear for all countries.</p>
35	Revise the current text of ISPM 26 to reduce ambiguity in interpretation <u>of establishment and maintenance of pest free areas</u> by countries that would normally be free from fruit flies: <u>- a PFA which is established in a part of the country;</u> <u>- a PFA is the entire country ("Absent: the entire country is pest free" defined in ISPM8); or</u> <u>- a country of which pest status is other absent statuses than " Absent: the entire country is pest free" (it is not established as a PFA)</u>	P	<p><i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE (50) Japan (29 Aug 2022 11:15 AM)</i></p> <p>For clarification of task in EWG, the examples of type of the countries which may have ambiguity in interpretation should be listed.</p> <p>The countries in the first and second indentations will respond to the event of an outbreak of the target fruit fly based on the requirements of the suspension and reinstatement of ISPM 26. However, countries in the third indentation do not need to use the requirements of ISPM 26 because they do not establish a PFA.</p>
35	<u>Revise the current text of ISPM 26 to reduce ambiguity in interpretation by countries that would normally be free from fruit flies.</u>	P	<p><i>Category : TECHNICAL (26) Uruguay (18 Aug 2022 7:56 PM)</i></p> <p>Reduce ambiguity specifically from what aspect? The task should be removed since it is vague and does not specify a clear task to be done.</p>
35	<u>Revise the current text of ISPM 26 to reduce ambiguity in interpretation by countries that would normally be free from fruit flies.</u>	P	<p><i>Category : TECHNICAL (8) COSAVE (2 Aug 2022 8:24 PM)</i></p> <p>Reduce ambiguity specifically from what aspect? The task should be removed since it is vague and does not specify a clear task to be done.</p>

36	Revise the <u>current</u> text of ISPM 26 so that it is more explicitly linked to ISPM 4 and ISPM 8 to ensure that it provides an effective, cohesive approach to the establishment of pest free areas for tephritid fruit flies. In addition, update the text as appropriate to reflect recent developments in the management of <u>such fruit fly</u> pest free areas.	P	Category : EDITORIAL (88) Canada (30 Aug 2022 10:49 PM)
36	Revise the current text of ISPM 26 <u>so that it is more explicitly linked to improve the alignment with</u> ISPM 4 and ISPM 8 to ensure that it provides an effective, cohesive approach to the establishment of pest free areas for tephritid fruit flies. In addition, update the text as appropriate to reflect recent developments in the management of such pest free areas.	P	Category : EDITORIAL (71) EPPO (30 Aug 2022 4:43 PM) More precise wording, consistent with paragraph 71 of the SC May 2022 meeting.
36	Revise the current text of ISPM 26 so that it <u>is more explicitly linked to is consistent with</u> ISPM 4 and ISPM 8 to ensure that it provides an effective, cohesive approach to the establishment of pest free areas for <u>tephritid</u> fruit flies. In addition, update the text as appropriate to reflect recent developments in the management of such pest free areas.	P	Category : SUBSTANTIVE (51) Japan (29 Aug 2022 11:17 AM) As noted in para 29, rather than an explicitly linkage, it should be consistent with the concept of PFA in the revised ISPM4 and the definition of pest status in the revised ISPM8.
37	Review the <u>current</u> text of ISPM 26, annexes and appendices and propose which sections or parts should remain as part of the ISPM and which, if any, should be moved to implementation material.	P	Category : EDITORIAL (89) Canada (30 Aug 2022 10:49 PM)
37	Review the <u>current text of ISPM 26</u> <u>appendices, annexes</u> and <u>appendices if necessary certain annexes</u> and propose which sections or parts should remain as part of the ISPM and <u>which, which if any, any</u> should be moved to implementation material.	P	Category : EDITORIAL (72) EPPO (30 Aug 2022 4:43 PM) Please see the substantive comment made on paragraph 32. Moreover in the latter, only the appendices and annexes seemed to be concerned, whereas in task (3) also the core text of ISPM 26 seems to be concerned.
38	<u>Propose what implementation material needs to be developed in a form that could be more easily updated with new information as it becomes available.</u>	P	Category : SUBSTANTIVE (74) EPPO (30 Aug 2022 4:43 PM) Not sure this is a task for an ISPM EWG. We do not think this is common practise. It could be part of bullet (7) but really it is better left to the IC. The focus of the EWG needs to be on standard setting.
39	Define the <u>situations that necessarily lead to suspension of the PFA status;</u> <u>(6) Define the</u> criteria for determining whether a <u>pest recently detected fruit fly</u> population constitutes an incursion or <u>an outbreak is established in the pest free area</u> . In developing these criteria, consider the biology of species, the number of detections, the life stages detected, indicators of population size, and the impacts of time frame, distance between detections, climate, season, generation, surveillance trapping grid, and so on, when appropriate. Take into account current knowledge, modelling, and existing arrangements, contingency protocols or export plans used internationally or agreed bilaterally.	P	Category : SUBSTANTIVE (75) EPPO (30 Aug 2022 4:43 PM) Please see the technical comment made on paragraph 30 for the explanation. it is better to specify the parts to be clarified as much as possible including triggers for suspension of the PFA
39	Define the criteria for determining whether a pest population constitutes an incursion or an outbreak. In developing these criteria, consider the biology of species, the number of detections, the life stages detected, indicators of population size, and the impacts of time frame, distance between detections, climate, season,	P	Category : SUBSTANTIVE (52) Japan (29 Aug 2022 11:19 AM) This should be added as a task as it is described in the purpose section (para 31). In addition to the criteria for suspension and reinstatement, the criteria for corrective action should be considered.

	generation, surveillance trapping grid, and so on, when appropriate. Take into account current knowledge, modelling, and existing arrangements, contingency protocols or export plans used internationally or agreed bilaterally. <u>Consider the criteria for suspension and reinstatement of pest free areas (section 2.4.1 and 2.4.2 of ISPM 26) and the corrective actions according to the different situations (described in task no.1)</u>		
39	Define the criteria for determining whether a pest population constitutes an incursion or an outbreak. In developing these criteria, consider the biology of species, the number of detections, the life stages detected, indicators of population size, and the impacts of time frame, distance between detections, climate, season, generation, <u>geographical location</u> , surveillance trapping grid, and so on, when appropriate. Take into account current knowledge, modelling, and existing arrangements, contingency protocols or export plans used internationally or agreed bilaterally. <u>(6) Collect and collate the latest research progress materials on Tephritidae for reference.</u>	P	<i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i> (45) China (28 Aug 2022 4:02 PM) This makes the criteria more comprehensive.
39	Define the criteria for determining whether a pest population constitutes an incursion or an outbreak. In developing these criteria, consider the biology of species, the number of detections, the life stages detected, indicators of population size, and the impacts of time frame, distance between detections, climate, season, generation, surveillance trapping grid, and <u>host range and</u> so on, when appropriate. Take into account current knowledge, modelling, and existing arrangements, contingency protocols or export plans used internationally or agreed bilaterally.	P	<i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i> (42) Eswatini (25 Aug 2022 11:39 AM)
40	Consider whether the ISPM could affect in a specific way (positively or negatively) the protection of biodiversity and the environment. If this is the case, the impact should be identified, addressed and clarified in the draft ISPM.	C	<i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i> (36) Zambia (22 Aug 2022 12:39 PM) The draft standard seems fine, Zambia has no objection
40	Consider whether the ISPM could affect in a specific way (positively or negatively) the protection of biodiversity and the environment. If this is the case, the impact should be identified, addressed and clarified in the draft ISPM. <u>(7) Review all references to other ISPMs in the revised ISPM and amend as necessary</u>	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> (27) Uruguay (18 Aug 2022 7:58 PM) Moved from task (8)
40	Consider whether the ISPM could affect in a specific way (positively or negatively) the protection of biodiversity and the environment. If this is the case, the impact should be identified, addressed and clarified in the draft ISPM. <u>(7) Review all references to other ISPMs in the revised ISPM and amend as necessary.</u>	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> (11) COSAVE (2 Aug 2022 8:36 PM) Moved from task (8)

42	Review all references to ISPM 26 in other ISPMs to ensure that they are still relevant and propose consequential changes if necessary. Review all references to other ISPMs in the revised ISPM 26 and amend as necessary.	P	<i>Category : EDITORIAL (76) EPPO (30 Aug 2022 4:43 PM)</i> Simplification
42	Review all references to ISPM 26 in other ISPMs to ensure that they are still relevant and propose consequential changes if necessary. Review all references to other ISPMs in the revised ISPM and amend as necessary.	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL (28) Uruguay (18 Aug 2022 7:59 PM)</i> First sentence is outside the scope of the EDG. Second sentence moved after task (6)
42	Review all references to ISPM 26 in other ISPMs to ensure that they are still relevant and propose consequential changes if necessary. Review all references to other ISPMs in the revised ISPM and amend as necessary.	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL (10) COSAVE (2 Aug 2022 8:34 PM)</i> This part of the sentence is outside the scope of the EDG
50	Experts with a wide knowledge and experience in <u>FF management and in</u> the development or maintenance of pest free areas, including:	P	<i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE (77) EPPO (30 Aug 2022 4:43 PM)</i>
51	at least one <u>person expert</u> knowledgeable in the biology of tephritid fruit flies; - at least one expert knowledgeable in FF management; and	P	<i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE (78) EPPO (30 Aug 2022 4:43 PM)</i> Consistency with paragraphs 50 and 53.
51	at least one person knowledgeable in the biology of tephritid fruit flies;	P	<i>Category : EDITORIAL (53) Japan (29 Aug 2022 11:20 AM)</i> editorial change
52	at least one person knowledgeable in risk management in <u>tradetrade of fruits that are hosts of fruit flies</u> ; and	P	<i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE (90) Canada (30 Aug 2022 10:50 PM)</i>
52	at least one <u>person expert</u> knowledgeable in risk management in trade; and - at least one expert from a national plant protection organization (NPPO) of a country that established one or more FF-PFAs	P	<i>Category : EDITORIAL (79) EPPO (30 Aug 2022 4:43 PM)</i> Consistency with paragraphs 50 and 53.
52	at least one person knowledgeable in <u>fruit fly</u> risk management in trade; and	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL (29) Uruguay (18 Aug 2022 8:02 PM)</i> Expertise more appropriate to the tasks to be developed by the EDG
52	at least one person knowledgeable in <u>risk management in trade</u> ; and	C	<i>Category : TECHNICAL (16) United States of America (11 Aug 2022 3:40 PM)</i> Clarify if "expertise with risk management in trade" meant to be general or related to risk management of fruit flies.
52	at least one person knowledgeable in <u>fruit fly</u> risk <u>management in trademanagement</u> ; and	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL (12) COSAVE (2 Aug 2022 8:38 PM)</i> Expertise more appropriate to the tasks to be developed by the EDG
53	at least one expert from a national plant protection organization (NPPO) of a country that is <u>normally</u> free from tephritid fruit flies (either because such pests have never been recorded or through establishment of PFAs), to ensure that the interests and interpretation of such NPPOs are represented.	P	<i>Category : EDITORIAL (80) EPPO (30 Aug 2022 4:43 PM)</i> Consistency with paragraphs 24 and 35. not needed
53	at least one expert from a national plant protection organization (NPPO) of a country that is free from tephritid fruit flies (either because such pests have never been recorded or through establishment of PFAs), to ensure that the interests and interpretation of such NPPOs are represented.	P	<i>Category : EDITORIAL (54) Japan (29 Aug 2022 11:21 AM)</i> editorial change

53	at least one expert from a national plant protection organization (NPPO) of a country that is free from tephritid fruit flies (either because such pests have never been recorded or through establishment of PFAs), to ensure that the interests and interpretation of such NPPOs are <u>well</u> represented.	P	<i>Category : EDITORIAL (41) Eswatini (25 Aug 2022 11:35 AM)</i>
53	at least one expert from a national plant protection organization (NPPO) of a country that is free from tephritid fruit flies (either because such pests have never been recorded or through establishment of PFAs), to ensure that the interests and interpretation of such NPPOs are represented. <u>- at least one expert in fruit fly risk management from a national plant protection organization (NPPO) of a country where fruit flies are present, to ensure that the interests and interpretation of such NPPOs are represented.</u>	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL (30) Uruguay (18 Aug 2022 8:04 PM)</i> These interests should also be represented at the EDG
53	at least one expert from a national plant protection organization (NPPO) of a country that is free from tephritid fruit flies (either because such pests have never been recorded or through establishment of PFAs), to ensure that the interests and interpretation of such NPPOs are represented. <u>- at least one expert in fruit fly management from a national plant protection organization (NPPO) of a country where fruit flies are present to ensure that the interests and interpretation of such NPPOs are represented.</u>	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL (13) COSAVE (2 Aug 2022 8:43 PM)</i> These interests should also be represented at the EDG
63	ISPM 4. <u>1995.</u> Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas. Rome, IPPC Secretariat, FAO.	P	<i>Category : EDITORIAL (81) EPPO (30 Aug 2022 4:43 PM)</i> Date of adoption added for consistency with the other references.
64	ISPM 8. <u>2021.</u> Determination of pest status in an area. Rome, IPPC Secretariat, FAO.	P	<i>Category : EDITORIAL (82) EPPO (30 Aug 2022 4:43 PM)</i> Date of adoption added for consistency with the other references.

Compiled Comments for Draft Specification for ISPM: Revision of ISPM 26 (2021-010)

Spanish

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
G	(General Comment)	C	Category : SUBSTANTIVE (92) Argentina (31 Aug 2022 3:57 AM) We support the comments from COSAVE
26	La NIMF 26 revisada debería proporcionar orientación para el establecimiento y mantenimiento de áreas libres de plagas <u>de para</u> moscas de la fruta (Tephritidae) de importancia económica, en especial los requisitos que satisfacen las necesidades de los países, tanto los que tienen moscas de la fruta como <u>de los que no países libres de moscas de la fruta</u> .	P	Category : TRANSLATION (31) Uruguay (18 Aug 2022 8:08 PM) To better reflect English version
26	La NIMF 26 revisada debería proporcionar orientación para el establecimiento y mantenimiento de áreas libres de plagas <u>de para</u> moscas de la fruta (Tephritidae) de importancia económica, en especial los requisitos que satisfacen las necesidades de los países, tanto los que tienen moscas de la fruta como <u>de los que no países libres de moscas de la fruta</u> .	P	Category : TRANSLATION (17) COSAVE (12 Aug 2022 11:09 PM)
39	definir los criterios para determinar si la población de una plaga constituye una incursión o un brote. Al elaborar estos criterios, se considerarán la biología de la especie, el número de detecciones, las etapas de desarrollo detectadas, los indicadores del tamaño de la población y las consecuencias del marco temporal, la distancia entre detecciones, el clima, la estación, la generación, la cuadrícula de <u>muestrado-trampeo</u> para la vigilancia, entre otras cosas, según proceda. Tomar en consideración los conocimientos disponibles, los modelos y los mecanismos, protocolos de contingencia o planes de exportación existentes utilizados a escala internacional o acordados bilateralmente;	P	Category : TRANSLATION (32) Uruguay (18 Aug 2022 8:09 PM) To better reflect English version
39	definir los criterios para determinar si la población de una plaga constituye una incursión o un brote. Al elaborar estos criterios, se considerarán la biología de la especie, el número de detecciones, las etapas de desarrollo detectadas, los indicadores del tamaño de la población y las consecuencias del marco temporal, la distancia entre detecciones, el clima, la estación, la generación, la cuadrícula de <u>muestrado-trampeo</u> para la vigilancia, entre otras cosas, según proceda. Tomar en consideración los conocimientos disponibles, los modelos y los mecanismos, protocolos de contingencia o planes de exportación existentes utilizados a escala internacional o acordados bilateralmente;	P	Category : TRANSLATION (18) COSAVE (12 Aug 2022 11:11 PM)

1 July – 31 August 2022

Compiled Comments for Draft Specification for ISPM: Revision of ISPM 26 (2021-010)

French

Summary

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
24	Certains aspects de la norme peuvent être interprétés de diverses manières, en particulier par des pays qui sont normalement exempts de mouches des fruits. La norme doit donc expliciter les liens avec la NIMP 4 (<i>Exigences pour l'établissement de zones indemnes</i>) et la NIMP 8 (<i>Détermination de la situation d'un organisme nuisible dans une zone</i>) afin de réduire l'ambiguïté..	P	<i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i> (20) Congo (18 Aug 2022 3:44 PM) -- la révision de la NIMP 26 bénéficierait de nouvelles informations et orientations des versions révisées des NIMPs 4 et 8
25	Champ d'application	C	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> (97) Gabon (1 Sep 2022 1:07 AM) Nous sommes d'accord pour la révision de la norme 26;