SPECIFICATION 75

Revision of ISPM 26 (*Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)*)

(Approved 2022, published 2022)

Title

Revision of ISPM 26 (*Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)*) (2021-010).

Reason for the revision of the standard

ISPM 26 should be revised for the following reasons:

- While the purpose of an ISPM is to provide a framework for the application of harmonized phytosanitary measures, the requirements set out in ISPM 26 are too broad and leave too much room for interpretation by countries.
- The standard needs consistent linkages to the new version of ISPM 4 (*Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas*) and ISPM 8 (*Determination of pest status in an area*) to reduce ambiguity.

Scope

The revised ISPM 26 should provide guidance for the establishment and maintenance of pest free areas (PFAs) for fruit flies (Tephritidae) of economic importance, including requirements that accommodate the needs of both countries with indigenous or endemic populations of fruit flies and countries that are free from fruit flies, based on the pest status categories in ISPM 8.

Purpose

The purpose of the revision of ISPM 26 is to:

- ensure consistency between the requirements in ISPM 26 and those in ISPM 4 and ISPM 8;
- provide appropriate criteria for determining whether an outbreak of fruit flies constitutes an incursion or an established population;
- provide a better description of the criteria for suspension, reinstatement and revocation of PFA status (sections 2.4.1 and 2.4.2 of ISPM 26) and corrective actions (sections 2.3.3 of ISPM 26), considering varying geographical scales and host densities to ensure a more harmonized approach; and
- determine whether the appendices and annexes should remain as part of the ISPM or be removed to implementation material.

Tasks

The expert working group (EWG) should undertake the following tasks:

(1) Revise the text of ISPM 26 to improve consistency with ISPM 4 and ISPM 8 to ensure that it provides an effective, cohesive approach to the establishment of PFAs for tephritid fruit flies. In

addition, update the text as appropriate to reflect recent developments in the maintenance of fruit fly PFAs.

(2) Revise the text of ISPM 26 to reduce ambiguity and hence promote consistent interpretation of the pest status of an area when a fruit fly is detected, or an incursion occurs, within fruit fly free countries and countries with indigenous or endemic fruit fly populations that operate a surveillance system.

(3) Define the criteria for determining whether a recently detected fruit fly population constitutes an incursion or an established population. 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, geographical location, surveillance trapping grid, host range and so on, when appropriate. Take into account current knowledge, modelling, contingency protocols, and existing arrangements used internationally.

(4) Define the criteria for suspension, reinstatement and revocation of fruit fly PFAs (sections 2.4.1, 2.4.2 and 2.4.3 of ISPM 26) and for corrective actions.

(5) Review the 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.

(6) 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 ISPM 26 and amend as necessary.

(7) 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.

(8) Consider implementation of the ISPM by contracting parties and identify potential operational and technical implementation issues and any other implementation material to be developed. Provide information and possible recommendations on these issues to the Standards Committee.

Provision of resources

Funding for the meeting may be provided from sources other than the regular programme of the IPPC (FAO). As recommended by ICPM-2 (1999), whenever possible, those participating in standard setting activities voluntarily fund their travel and subsistence to attend meetings. Participants may request financial assistance, with the understanding that resources are limited and the priority for financial assistance is given to developing country participants. Please refer to the *Criteria used for prioritizing participants to receive travel assistance to attend meetings organized by the IPPC Secretariat* posted on the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP) (see www.ippc.int/en/core-activities).

Collaborator

To be determined.

Steward

Please refer to the *List of topics for IPPC standards* posted on the IPP (see www.ippc.int/core-activities/standards-setting/list-topics-ippc-standards).

Expertise

Experts with a wide knowledge and experience in fruit fly management and in the development or maintenance of PFAs, including at least:

- one expert knowledgeable in the biology or population modelling of fruit flies;
- one expert from a national plant protection organization (NPPO) knowledgeable in risk management related to trade in fruits that are hosts of fruit flies;
- one expert, preferably from an NPPO, from a country that is free from fruit flies (either because such pests have never been recorded or through establishment of PFAs); and

- one expert, preferably from an NPPO, from a country with indigenous or endemic populations of fruit flies and where one or more fruit fly PFAs have been established and maintained.

The participation of a member of the EWG for the revision of ISPM 4 (2009-002) would also be advantageous to ensure alignment with the revised ISPM 4.

Participants

Seven to nine experts.

In addition, a member of the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC) should be invited to attend. This may be as either an invited expert or an IC representative.

References

The IPPC, relevant ISPMs and other national, regional and international standards and agreements as may be applicable to the tasks, and discussion papers submitted in relation to this work.

Clarke, A.R., Powell, K.S., Weldon, C.W. & Taylor, P.W. 2011. The ecology of *Bactrocera tryoni* (Diptera: Tephritidae): what do we know to assist pest management? *Annals of Applied Biology*, 158: 26–54.

Dominiak, B.C. & Fanson, B.G. 2014. Revised quarantine distances for domestic and international trading. Presentation to the Ninth International Symposium on Fruit Flies of Economic Importance, 12–16 May 2014, Bangkok, Thailand.

Dominiak, B.C. & Fanson, B.G. 2020. Current quarantine and suspension distances are excessive for incipient populations of Queensland fruit fly (*Bactrocera tryoni* (Froggatt)) (Diptera: Tephritidae) in southern New South Wales, Australia. *Crop Protection*, 138: 105341.

ISPM 4. 2017. *Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas*. Rome, IPPC Secretariat, FAO. Adopted 1995. www.ippc.int/en/publications/614

ISPM 8. 2021.*Determination of pest status in an area*. Rome, IPPC Secretariat, FAO. www.ippc.int/en/publications/612

Kean, J. 2015. The effective sampling area of traps: estimation and application. In: R.M. Beresford, K.J. Froud, J.M. Kean & S.P. Worner, eds. *The plant protection data toolbox*. Proceedings of a symposium held on 11 August 2014, Taupo, New Zealand. Auckland, New Zealand, New Zealand Plant Protection Society. 176 pp.

Meats, A. & Edgerton, J.E. 2008. Short- and long-range dispersal of the Queensland fruit fly, *Bactrocera tryoni* and its relevance to invasive potential, sterile insect technique and surveillance trapping. *Australian Journal of Experimental Agriculture*, 48: 1237–1245.

NAPPO (North American Plant Protection Organization). 2010. *Guidelines for the establishment, maintenance and verification of fruit fly pest free areas in North America*. Regional Standard for Phytosanitary Measures (RSPM) 17. Ottawa, The Secretariat of the North American Plant Protection Organization. 13 pp.

Ormsby, M.D. 2021. Establishing criteria for the management of tephritid fruit fly outbreaks. *CABI Agriculture & Bioscience*, 2: 23. https://doi.org/10.1186/s43170-021-00043-w

Qin, Y., Paini, D.R., Wang, C., Fang, Y. & Li, Z. 2015. Global establishment risk of economically important fruit fly species (Tephritidae). *PLoS ONE*, 10(1): e0116424. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0116424

Suckling, D.M., Kean, J.M., Stringer, L.D, Cáceres-Barrios, C., Hendrichs, J., Reyes-Flores, J. & Dominiak, B.C. 2016. Eradication of tephritid fruit fly pest populations: outcomes and prospects. *Pest Management Science*, 72: 456–465.

Discussion papers

Participants and interested parties are encouraged to submit discussion papers to the IPPC Secretariat (ippc@fao.org) for consideration by the EWG.

Publication history

This is not an official part of the specification

2022-04 CPM-16 added topic *Revision of ISPM 26 (*Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)*)*, priority 2.

2022-05 Standards Committee (SC) revised and approved for first consultation.

2022-07 Consultation.

2022-10 Steward revised the draft specification.

2022-11 SC revised and approved the specification.

Specification 75. 2022. *Revision of ISPM 26 (*Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)*)*. Rome, IPPC Secretariat, FAO.

Publication history last updated: 2022-11