

## 2023 SECOND CONSULTATION

1 July – 30 September 2023

**Compiled comments for 2023 Second Consultation:**

**2018-011\_Draft\_Annex\_ISPM37**

### Summary

#### Participants

Name	Summary
Australia	Comments completed
Barbados	Barbados supports the adoption of this annex.
European Union	The comments on the draft standard are submitted by the European Commission on behalf of the European Union and its 27 Member States.
Gabon	Annexe validée
Malawi	We support the draft Annex
Singapore	Singapore is supportive of this draft.
South Africa	This document is well written and fully covered aspects of host definitions which showed a more holistic definition of what a host is; this encompassed insect development in each host category. It further detailed aspects of detailing host phenology, which usually affects infestation rates, for instance, differences in infestation rates between mature and immature fruit. Considerations of environmental factors were also detailed as useful in the evaluations, and this is important as insect development is mostly governed by environmental variables. Emphasis on the methodologies used in sampling and assessments were adequate as well.

**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**S** (Status) - A = Accepted, C = Closed, O = Open, W = Withdrawn, M = Merged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	<i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i> <b>(255) Argentina (1 Oct 2023 4:20 AM)</b> Argentina supports the COSAVE comments
G	(General Comment)	C	<i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i> <b>(254) Barbados (30 Sep 2023 7:29 PM)</b> Barbados considers this annex to be a good document which will complement the current standard nicely.

G	(General Comment)	C	<i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i> <b>(241) Peru (29 Sep 2023 11:41 PM)</b> Peru agrees with the comments agreed upon as COSAVE
G	(General Comment)	C	<i>Category : EDITORIAL</i> <b>(240) Paraguay (29 Sep 2023 8:59 PM)</b> Paraguay de acuerdo con los comentarios de COSAVE.
G	(General Comment)	C	<i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i> <b>(239) Russian Federation (29 Sep 2023 4:34 PM)</b> General Comment: The Russian Federation would like to formally endorse the EPPO comments submitted via the IPPC Online Comment System.
G	(General Comment)	C	<i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i> <b>(238) Belarus (29 Sep 2023 2:44 PM)</b> General comment: Republic of Belarus, would like to formally endorse the EPPO comments submitted via the IPPC Online Comment System
G	(General Comment)	C	<i>Category : EDITORIAL</i> <b>(237) Switzerland (29 Sep 2023 1:29 PM)</b> Switzerland would like to formally endorse the EPPO comments submitted via the IPPC Online Comment System.
G	(General Comment)	C	<i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i> <b>(236) Philippines (29 Sep 2023 11:29 AM)</b> The PH has no further co the Criteria for evaluation of available information for determining host status of fruit to fruit flies
G	(General Comment)	C	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(210) Venezuela (28 Sep 2023 9:41 PM)</b> Venezuela está de acuerdo con los Criterios para la evaluación del proyecto de anexo a la NIMF 37, ya que es de suma importancia porque establece los criterios que deben tener para determinar la condición de una fruta como hospedante de Moscas de la Fruta (Tephritidae), describiendo las tres categorías para dicha condición de hospedante.  Una de las observación es que se describan cual es la fenología del cultivo hospedante y conocer el comportamiento poblacional de

			las especies que es directamente proporcional al ciclo biológico de cada especie de Moscas de la Fruta (Tephritidae).
G	(General Comment)	C	<p><i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>  <b>(194) South Africa (28 Sep 2023 12:10 PM)</b></p> <p>This document is well written and fully covered aspects of host definitions which showed a more holistic definition of what a host is; this encompassed insect development in each host category. It further detailed aspects of detailing host phenology, which usually affects infestation rates, for instance, differences in infestation rates between mature and immature fruit. Considerations of environmental factors were also detailed as useful in the evaluations, and this is important as insect development is mostly governed by environmental variables. Emphasis on the methodologies used in sampling and assessments were adequate as well.</p>
G	(General Comment)	C	<p><i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>  <b>(179) New Zealand (28 Sep 2023 9:32 AM)</b></p> <p>The addition of this Annex to ISPM 37 offers more detailed guidance to both importing and exporting countries' NPPOs in their preparation or assessment of available information identifying the fruit fly host status category of a particular plant species or cultivar.</p> <p>The ISPM 37 Annex would benefit from the inclusion of 'worked' examples of the information prepared or collated in the determination of each of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) a natural host to a named fruit fly species;</li> <li>(ii) a conditional host to a named fruit fly species; and</li> <li>(iii) a non-host to a named fruit fly species.</li> </ul> <p>It wouldn't need to be the same fruit type or fruit fly species across the worked examples.</p> <p>Those 'worked' examples could be developed as implementation material or case studies. Main reason would be that as more examples etc. are identified that they could be added relatively easily to a guidance</p>

			document versus the process to include in an Annex.
G	(General Comment)	C	<i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i> <b>(175) India (27 Sep 2023 10:33 AM)</b> India agrees with the proposed amendments
G	(General Comment)	C	<i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i> <b>(171) United Kingdom (26 Sep 2023 5:18 PM)</b> The UK supports the comments the EPPO secretariat have submitted on behalf of those EPPO member countries which are not part of the European Union.
G	(General Comment)	C	<i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i> <b>(161) Caribbean Agricultural Health and Food Safety Agency (25 Sep 2023 9:36 PM)</b> Guyana supports this draft annex to ISPM 37
G	(General Comment)	C	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(160) Caribbean Agricultural Health and Food Safety Agency (25 Sep 2023 9:36 PM)</b> The draft criteria will provide a suitable guide in determining host status.
G	(General Comment)	C	<i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i> <b>(159) Caribbean Agricultural Health and Food Safety Agency (25 Sep 2023 9:36 PM)</b> Barbados considers this annex to be a good document which will complement the current standard nicely.
G	(General Comment)	C	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(156) IPPC Regional Workshop Africa (23 Sep 2023 3:12 PM)</b> Criteria helpful.
G	(General Comment)	C	<i>Category : EDITORIAL</i> <b>(155) IPPC Regional Workshop Africa (23 Sep 2023 3:12 PM)</b> le Mali, après lecture du document, approuve le projet d'annexe NIMP37, n'a pas d'observation
G	(General Comment)	C	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(154) IPPC Regional Workshop Africa (23 Sep 2023 3:12 PM)</b> I agree with this ISPM
G	(General Comment)	C	<i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i> <b>(153) IPPC Regional Workshop Africa (23 Sep 2023 3:12 PM)</b>

			We support draft Annex to ISPM 37
G	(General Comment)	C	<i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i> <b>(151) Malawi (23 Sep 2023 2:28 PM)</b> We support the draft Annex to ISPM37
G	(General Comment)	C	<i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i> <b>(98) Thailand (15 Sep 2023 8:13 AM)</b> Thailand supports all comments from APPPC.
G	(General Comment)	C	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(85) Brazil (8 Sep 2023 3:18 PM)</b> Brazil supports those comments provided by COSAVE
G	(General Comment)	C	<i>Category : EDITORIAL</i> <b>(79) Guyana (4 Sep 2023 12:10 AM)</b> Guyana supports the review of this draft annex to ISPM 37
G	(General Comment)	C	<i>Category : EDITORIAL</i> <b>(78) Iraq (31 Aug 2023 7:38 PM)</b> It has been viewed and we have no comments.
G	(General Comment)	C	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(77) Mozambique (31 Aug 2023 1:31 PM)</b> Mozambique agrees with the draft annex to ISPM 37. The proposed draft standard is more technical and it brings clarity to the host status of fruit to fruit fly
G	(General Comment)	C	<i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i> <b>(70) Thailand (22 Aug 2023 6:47 AM)</b> Thailand agreed with the proposed draft annex to ISPM 37: Criteria for evaluation of available information for determining host status of fruit to fruit flies (Tephritidae)
1	<b>DRAFT ANNEX TO ISPM 37: Criteria for evaluation of available information for determining host status of fruit to fruit flies (<i>Tephritidae</i>) (2018-011)</b>	C	<i>Category : EDITORIAL</i> <b>(217) Australia (29 Sep 2023 3:35 AM)</b> Removal of italics for Tephritidae. Comment justification: Family names are not italicised in scientific and other literature.
1	<b>DRAFT ANNEX TO ISPM 37: Criteria for evaluation of available information for determining host status of fruit to fruit flies (<i>Tephritidae</i>) (2018-011)</b>	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(169) Canada (26 Sep 2023 4:22 PM)</b> Tephritidae does not need to be italicized
1	<b>DRAFT ANNEX TO ISPM 37: Criteria for evaluation of available information for determining host status of fruit to fruit flies</b>	C	<i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i> <b>(158) Caribbean Agricultural Health and Food Safety Agency (25 Sep 2023 9:36 PM)</b> The Bahamas offers no objections to the adoption of Draft Annex to ISPM 37 for

	<i>(Tephritidae)</i> (2018-011)		determining the host status of fruit flies based on the criteria for evaluation of available information.
1	<b>DRAFT ANNEX TO ISPM 37: Criteria for evaluation of available information for determining host status of fruit to fruit flies (<i>Tephritidae</i>) (2018-011)</b>	C	<i>Category : EDITORIAL</i> <b>(53) United States of America (21 Aug 2023 7:32 PM)</b> Will the family name be italicized through the entire text?
30	<b>ANNEX 1: Criteria for evaluation of available information for determining host status of fruit to fruit flies (<i>Tephritidae</i>)</b>	C	<i>Category : EDITORIAL</i> <b>(218) Australia (29 Sep 2023 3:35 AM)</b> Removal of italics. Family names are not italicised in scientific and other literature.
30	<b>ANNEX 1: Criteria for evaluation of available information for determining host status of fruit to fruit flies (<del><i>Tephritidae</i></del> <i>Tephritidae</i>)</b>	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(168) Canada (26 Sep 2023 4:21 PM)</b> <i>Tephritidae</i> does not need to be italicized
32	<p>National plant protection organizations (NPPOs) use a variety of available information (e.g. scientific literature, NPPO reports, pest records) related to the host status of fruit to fruit flies when they implement adopted ISPMs related to pest risk analysis (PRA), pest free areas, the design of import and export programmes, eradication, surveillance, pest records, and more. There is considerable inconsistency, however, in the interpretation of available information, and the terms used in such information to describe hosts do not always align with those defined in the core text of this standard, which can lead to trade disruption. This annex promotes harmonization by outlining the criteria that should be used when evaluating available information to determine the host status of fruit to fruit flies (<i>Tephritidae</i>) and provides guidance on assessing the uncertainty of the resulting host status determination. It also provides guidance to NPPOs on applying host status determinations in activities such as PRA. The annex provides guidance on interpretation of available information only in relation to undamaged fruit, based on the definitions and requirements set out in the core text of this standard.</p> <p><u>Many terms are used in published literature to describe the host status of fruit-to-fruit flies including “potential host”, “artificial host”, “conditional non-host”, “preferred host”, “general host”, “wild host” and “alternative host”. National plant protection organizations should, however, use one of the three host status categories described in the Definitions section of this standard: natural host, conditional host, and non-host.</u></p>	P	<i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i> <b>(244) Mexico (30 Sep 2023 6:19 PM)</b> For consistency section 2 should be integrated in the Introduction section. The title of the section is not consistent with the content.
32	National plant protection organizations (NPPOs) use a variety of available information (e.g. scientific literature, NPPO reports, pest records) related to the host status of fruit to fruit flies when they implement adopted ISPMs related to pest	C	<i>Category : EDITORIAL</i> <b>(219) Australia (29 Sep 2023 3:36 AM)</b> Removal of italics for <i>Tephritidae</i> . Family

	<p>risk analysis (PRA), pest free areas, the design of import and export programmes, eradication, surveillance, pest records, and more. There is considerable inconsistency, however, in the interpretation of available information, and the terms used in such information to describe hosts do not always align with those defined in the core text of this standard, which can lead to trade disruption. This annex promotes harmonization by outlining the criteria that should be used when evaluating available information to determine the host status of fruit to fruit flies (<i>Tephritidae</i>) and provides guidance on assessing the uncertainty of the resulting host status determination. It also provides guidance to NPPOs on applying host status determinations in activities such as PRA. The annex provides guidance on interpretation of available information only in relation to undamaged fruit, based on the definitions and requirements set out in the core text of this standard.</p>	<p>names are not italicised in scientific and other literature.</p>
32	<p>National plant protection organizations (NPPOs) use a variety of available information (e.g. scientific literature, NPPO reports, pest records) related to the host status of fruit to fruit flies when they implement adopted ISPMs related to pest risk analysis (<del>PRA</del>), (<del>PRA</del>) or pest free areas, <u>for</u> the design of import and export programmes, eradication, surveillance, pest <del>records</del>, <u>records</u> and more. There is considerable inconsistency, however, in the interpretation of available information, and the terms used in such information to describe hosts do not always align with those defined in the core text of this standard, which can lead to trade disruption. This annex promotes harmonization by outlining the criteria that should be used when evaluating available information to determine the host status of fruit to fruit flies (<i>Tephritidae</i>) and provides guidance on assessing the uncertainty of the resulting host status determination. It also provides guidance to NPPOs on applying host status determinations in activities such as PRA. The annex provides guidance on interpretation of available information only in relation to undamaged fruit, based on the definitions and requirements set out in the core text of this standard.</p>	<p>P <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>  <b>(195) European Union (28 Sep 2023 7:15 PM)</b>  Three editorial suggestions and creation of a new paragraph suggested.</p>
32	<p>National plant protection organizations (NPPOs) use a variety of available information (e.g. scientific literature, NPPO reports, pest records) related to the host status of fruit to fruit flies when they implement adopted ISPMs related to pest risk analysis (PRA), pest free areas, the design of import and export programmes, eradication, surveillance, pest records, and more. There is considerable inconsistency, however, in the interpretation of available information, and the terms used in such information to describe hosts do not always align with those defined in the core text of this standard, which can lead to trade disruption. This annex promotes harmonization by outlining the criteria that should be used when evaluating available information to determine the host status of fruit to fruit flies</p>	<p>C <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>  <b>(180) South Africa (28 Sep 2023 11:25 AM)</b>  Proposal for deletion of the sentence: "It also provides guidance to NPPOs on applying host status determinations in activities such as PRA." This is because this is perceived as a repetition since it is also covered by the first sentence.</p>

	<i>(Tephritidae)</i> and provides guidance on assessing the uncertainty of the resulting host status determination. <b>It also provides guidance to NPPOs on applying host status determinations in activities such as PRA.</b> The annex provides guidance on interpretation of available information only in relation to undamaged fruit, based on the definitions and requirements set out in the core text of this standard.		
32	National plant protection organizations (NPPOs) use a variety of available information (e.g. scientific literature, NPPO reports, pest records) related to the host status of fruit to fruit flies when they implement adopted ISPMs related to pest risk analysis (PRA), pest free areas, the design of import and export programmes, eradication, surveillance, pest records, and more. There is considerable inconsistency, however, in the interpretation of available information, and the terms used in such information to describe hosts do not always align with those defined in the core text of this standard, which can lead to trade disruption. This annex promotes harmonization by outlining the criteria that should be used when evaluating available information to determine the host status of fruit to fruit flies ( <del><i>(Tephritidae)</i></del> <i>Tephritidae</i> ) and provides guidance on assessing the uncertainty of the resulting host status determination. It also provides guidance to NPPOs on applying host status determinations in activities such as PRA. The annex provides guidance on interpretation of available information only in relation to undamaged fruit, based on the definitions and requirements set out in the core text of this standard.	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(170) Canada (26 Sep 2023 4:23 PM)</b> Tephritidae does not need to be italicized
32	National plant protection organizations (NPPOs) use a variety of available information (e.g. scientific literature, NPPO reports, pest records) related to the host status of fruit to fruit flies when they implement adopted ISPMs related to pest risk analysis ( <del>PRA</del> ), <del>(PRA) or</del> pest free areas, <del>for</del> the design of import and export programmes, eradication, surveillance, pest <del>records, records</del> and more. There is considerable inconsistency, however, in the interpretation of available information, and the terms used in such information to describe hosts do not always align with those defined in the core text of this standard, which can lead to trade disruption. This annex promotes harmonization by outlining the criteria that should be used when evaluating available information to determine the host status of fruit to fruit flies ( <i>Tephritidae</i> ) and provides guidance on assessing the uncertainty of the resulting host status determination. It also provides guidance to NPPOs on applying host status determinations in activities such as PRA. The annex provides guidance on interpretation of available information only in relation to undamaged fruit, based on the definitions and requirements set out in the core text of this standard.	P	<i>Category : EDITORIAL</i> <b>(133) EPP0 (19 Sep 2023 12:25 PM)</b> Three editorial suggestions and creation of a new paragraph suggested.



32	<p>National plant protection organizations (NPPOs) use a variety of available information (e.g. scientific literature, NPPO reports, pest records) related to the host status of fruit to fruit flies when they implement adopted ISPMs related to pest risk analysis (PRA), pest free areas, the design of import and export programmes, eradication, surveillance, pest records, and more.</p> <p><u>Many terms are used in published literature to describe the host status of fruit-to-fruit flies including “potential host”, “artificial host”, “conditional non-host”, “preferred host”, “general host”, “wild host” and “alternative host”. National plant protection organizations should, however, use one of the three host status categories described in the core text of this standard: natural host, conditional host, and non-host.</u></p> <p>There is <del>considerable inconsistency</del> <u>a lack of consistency</u>, however, in the interpretation of available information, and the terms used in such information to describe hosts do not always align with those defined in the core text of this standard, which can lead to trade disruption. This annex promotes harmonization by outlining the criteria that should be used when evaluating available information to determine the host status of fruit to fruit flies (<i>Tephritidae</i>) and provides guidance <del>on to NPPOs on:</del> <u>on to NPPOs on:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <u>assessing the uncertainty of the resulting host status determination.</u> <del>It also provides guidance to NPPOs on;</del></li> <li>- <u>applying host status determinations in activities such as PRA.</u> <del>The annex provides guidance on interpretation of;</del> and</li> <li>- <u>interpreting available information only in relation to <del>undamaged fruit</del> <u>fruit free from any mechanical or natural damage</u>,</u> based on the definitions and requirements set out in the core text of this standard.</li> </ul>	<p>P</p> <p><i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>  <b>(106) IPPC Regional Workshop Latin America (18 Sep 2023 8:26 PM)</b>  To improve text flow</p> <p>Brought from section 2 to improve text flow</p> <p>It is more precise and descriptive to refer to the "lack of consistency"</p> <p>To be consistent with the terminology of ISPM No. 37.</p>
32	<p>National plant protection organizations (NPPOs) use a variety of available information (e.g. scientific literature, NPPO reports, pest records) related to the host status of fruit to fruit flies when they implement adopted ISPMs related to pest risk analysis (PRA), pest free areas, the design of import and export programmes, eradication, surveillance, pest records, and more. There is considerable inconsistency, however, in the interpretation of available information, and the terms used in such information to describe hosts do not always align with those defined in the core text of this standard, which can lead to trade disruption. This annex promotes <del>harmonization</del> <u>consistency</u> by outlining the criteria that should be used when evaluating available information to determine the host status of fruit to fruit flies (<i>Tephritidae</i>) and provides guidance on assessing the uncertainty of the</p>	<p>P</p> <p><i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>  <b>(99) PPPO (17 Sep 2023 7:48 PM)</b>  PPPO suggests the word 'harmonization' be replaced with the word 'consistency' as harmonization is an IPPC principle that is promoted across all ISPMs.</p>

	resulting host status determination. It also provides guidance to NPPOs on applying host status determinations in activities such as PRA. The annex provides guidance on interpretation of available information only in relation to undamaged fruit, based on the definitions and requirements set out in the core text of this standard.		
32	National plant protection organizations (NPPOs) use a variety of available information (e.g. scientific literature, NPPO reports, pest records) related to the host status of fruit to fruit flies when they implement adopted ISPMs related to pest risk analysis (PRA), pest free areas, the design of import and export programmes, eradication, surveillance, pest records, and more. There is considerable inconsistency, however, in the interpretation of available information, and the terms used in such information to describe hosts do not always align with those defined in the core text of this standard, which can lead to trade disruption. This annex promotes harmonization by outlining the criteria that should be used when evaluating available information to determine the host status of fruit to fruit flies ( <i>Tephritidae</i> ) and provides guidance on assessing the uncertainty of the resulting host status determination. It also provides guidance to NPPOs on applying host status determinations in <del>activities such as various activities, including</del> PRA. The annex provides guidance on interpretation of available information only in relation to undamaged fruit, based on the definitions and requirements set out in the core text of this standard.	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(54) United States of America (21 Aug 2023 7:37 PM)</b> Host status could be used by NPPOS for various other activities, and PRA is just one of them. The other activities are not described in detail in this draft.
32	National plant protection organizations (NPPOs) use a variety of available information (e.g. scientific literature, NPPO reports, pest records) related to the host status of fruit to fruit flies when they implement adopted ISPMs related to pest risk analysis (PRA), pest free areas, the design of import and export programmes, eradication, surveillance, pest records, and more. There is <del>considerable inconsistency</del> <u>lack of consistency</u> , however, in the interpretation of available information, and the terms used in such information to describe hosts do not always align with those defined in the core text of this standard, which can lead to trade disruption. This annex promotes harmonization by outlining the criteria that should be used when evaluating available information to determine the host status of fruit to fruit flies ( <i>Tephritidae</i> ) and provides guidance on assessing the uncertainty of the resulting host status determination. It also provides guidance to NPPOs on applying host status determinations in activities such as PRA. The annex provides guidance on interpretation of available information only in relation to undamaged fruit, based on the definitions and requirements set out in the core text of this standard.	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(42) COSAVE (18 Aug 2023 3:01 PM)</b> It is more precise and descriptive to refer to the "lack of consistency"
32	National plant protection organizations (NPPOs) use a variety of available	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(41) COSAVE (18 Aug 2023 2:59 PM)</b>

	<p>information (e.g. scientific literature, NPPO reports, pest records) related to the host status of fruit to fruit flies when they implement adopted ISPMs related to pest risk analysis (PRA), pest free areas, the design of import and export programmes, eradication, surveillance, pest records, and more. <u>Many terms are used in published literature to describe the host status of fruit-to-fruit flies including “potential host”, “artificial host”, “conditional non-host”, “preferred host”, “general host”, “wild host” and “alternative host”. National plant protection organizations should, however, use one of the three host status categories described in the core text of this standard: natural host, conditional host, and non-host.</u> There is considerable inconsistency, however, in the interpretation of available information, and the terms used in such information to describe hosts do not always align with those defined in the core text of this standard, which can lead to trade disruption. This annex promotes harmonization by outlining the criteria that should be used when evaluating available information to determine the host status of fruit to fruit flies (<i>Tephritidae</i>) and provides guidance on assessing the uncertainty of the resulting host status determination. It also provides guidance to NPPOs on applying host status determinations in activities such as PRA. The annex provides guidance on interpretation of available information only in relation to undamaged fruit, based on the definitions and requirements set out in the core text of this standard.</p>	<p>Section 2 was integrated to this section for better reading.</p>
32	<p>National plant protection organizations (NPPOs) use a variety of available information (e.g. scientific literature, NPPO reports, pest records) related to the host status of fruit to fruit flies when they implement adopted ISPMs related to pest risk analysis (PRA), pest free areas, the design of import and export programmes, eradication, surveillance, pest records, and more. <u>Many terms are used in published literature to describe the host status of fruit-to-fruit flies including “potential host”, “artificial host”, “conditional non-host”, “preferred host”, “general host”, “wild host” and “alternative host”. National plant protection organizations should, however, use one of the three host status categories described in the core text of this standard: natural host, conditional host, and non-host</u> There is <del>considerable inconsistency</del> <u>a lack of consistency</u>, however, in the interpretation of available information, and the terms used in such information to describe hosts do not always align with those defined in the core text of this standard, which can lead to trade disruption. This annex promotes harmonization by outlining the criteria that should be used when evaluating available information to determine the host status of fruit to fruit flies (<i>Tephritidae</i>) and provides guidance on assessing the uncertainty of the resulting host status determination. It also provides guidance to NPPOs on applying host status determinations in activities such as PRA. The annex provides</p>	<p>P <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>  <b>(14) Uruguay (15 Aug 2023 7:32 PM)</b>  Section 2 was integrated to this section for better reading. It is more precise and descriptive to refer to the "lack of consistency"</p>

	<p>guidance on interpretation of available information only in relation to undamaged fruit, based on the definitions and requirements set out in the core text of this standard.</p>		
<p>32</p>	<p>National plant protection organizations (NPPOs) use a variety of available information (e.g. scientific literature, NPPO reports, pest records) related to the host status of fruit to fruit flies when they implement adopted ISPMs related to pest risk analysis (PRA), pest free areas, the design of import and export programmes, eradication, surveillance, pest records, and more. There is considerable inconsistency, however, in the interpretation of available information, and the terms used in such information to describe hosts do not always align with those defined in the core text of this standard, which can lead to trade disruption. This annex promotes harmonization by outlining the criteria that should be used when evaluating available information to determine the host status of fruit to fruit flies (<i>Tephritidae</i>) and provides guidance on assessing the uncertainty of the resulting host status determination. It also provides guidance to NPPOs on applying host status determinations in activities such as PRA. The annex provides guidance on interpretation of available information only in relation to <del>undamaged fruit</del> <u>fruit free from any mechanical or natural damage</u>, based on the definitions and requirements set out in the core text of this standard.</p>	<p>P</p>	<p><i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>  <b>(9) CA (12 Aug 2023 2:08 AM)</b>                  Change expression "undamaged fruit" for "fruit free from any mechanical or natural damage". This is to be consistent with the terminology of ISPM No. 37.</p>
<p>32</p>	<p>National plant protection organizations (NPPOs) use a variety of available information (e.g. scientific literature, NPPO reports, pest records) related to the host status of fruit to fruit flies when they implement adopted ISPMs related to pest risk analysis (PRA), pest free areas, the design of import and export programmes, eradication, surveillance, pest records, and more. There is considerable inconsistency, however, in the interpretation of available information, and the terms used in such information to describe hosts do not always align with those defined in the core text of this standard, which can lead to trade disruption. This annex promotes harmonization by outlining the criteria that should be used when evaluating available information to determine the host status of fruit to fruit flies (<i>Tephritidae</i>) and provides guidance on assessing the uncertainty of the resulting host status determination. It also provides guidance to NPPOs on applying host status determinations in activities such as PRA. The annex provides guidance on interpretation of available information only in relation to <del>undamaged fruit</del> <u>fruit free from any mechanical or natural damage</u>, based on the definitions and requirements set out in the core text of this standard.</p>	<p>P</p>	<p><i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>  <b>(4) Colombia (10 Aug 2023 10:58 PM)</b>                  Change expression "undamaged fruit" for "fruit free from any mechanical or natural damage". This is to be consistent with the terminology of ISPM No. 37.</p>

33	<del>2. Terms for the host status categories used in this standard</del>	P	<i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i> <b>(242) Mexico (30 Sep 2023 6:17 PM)</b> This section 2 should be integrated in the Introduction section. The title of the section is not consistent with the content
33	<del>2. Terms for the host status categories used in this standard</del>	P	<i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i> <b>(107) IPPC Regional Workshop Latin America (18 Sep 2023 8:26 PM)</b> Section 2 was integrated in the Introduction section. In addition, the title of the section is not consistent with the content
33	<del>2. Terms for the host status categories used in this standard</del>	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(39) COSAVE (18 Aug 2023 2:58 PM)</b> Section 2 was integrated in the Introduction section. In addition the title of the section is not consistent with the content
33	<del>2. Terms for the host status categories used in this standard</del>	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(15) Uruguay (15 Aug 2023 7:33 PM)</b> Section 2 was integrated in the Introduction section. In addition the title of the section is not consistent with the content
34	<del>Many terms are used in published literature to describe the host status of fruit-to-fruit flies including “potential host”, “artificial host”, “conditional non-host”, “preferred host”, “general host”, “wild host” and “alternative host”. National plant protection organizations should, however, use one of the three host status categories described in the Definitions section of this standard: natural host, conditional host, and non-host.</del>	P	<i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i> <b>(243) Mexico (30 Sep 2023 6:18 PM)</b> This section 2 should be integrated in the Introduction section. The title of the section is not consistent with the content
34	Many terms are used in published literature to describe the host status of fruit-to-fruit flies including “potential host”, “artificial host”, “conditional non-host”, “preferred host”, “general host”, “wild host” and “alternative host”. National plant protection organizations should, however, use one of the three host status categories described in the Definitions section of this standard: natural host, conditional host, and non-host. <a href="#">Suggested use of alternate terms describing host status of fruit to fruit fly by host status category used by this ISPM is included in Appendix 2.</a>	P	<i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i> <b>(221) Australia (29 Sep 2023 3:37 AM)</b> The inclusion of the table in the appendix will assist NPPO's in the use of the correct host categories used in ISPM 37 when comparing to terms used in the literature. The suggested table was produced by the EWG showing how a range of terms align to the terms in ISPM 37. This table is included at the end of this document as a suggested appendix.
34	Many terms are used in published literature to describe the host status of fruit-to-fruit flies including “potential host”, “artificial host”, “conditional non-host”, “preferred host”, “general host”, “wild host” and “alternative host”. <del>National plant protection organizations</del> NPPOs should, however, use one of the three host status categories described in the Definitions section of this standard: natural host, conditional host, and non-host.	P	<i>Category : EDITORIAL</i> <b>(220) Australia (29 Sep 2023 3:37 AM)</b> NPPO acronym has been used above.

34	<p>Many terms are used in published literature to describe the host status of <del>fruit to-fruit</del> <u>fruit to fruit</u> flies including “potential host”, “artificial host”, “conditional non-host”, “preferred host”, “general host”, “wild host” and “alternative host”. National plant protection organizations should, however, <u>only</u> use one of the three host status categories described in the Definitions section of this standard: natural host, conditional <del>host,</del> <u>host</u> and non-host.</p>	P	<p><i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>  <b>(196) European Union (28 Sep 2023 7:19 PM)</b>                  1) Typo                  2) For more clarity                  3) Unnecessary comma.</p>
34	<p>Many terms are used in published literature to describe the host status of <del>fruit to-fruit</del> <u>fruit to fruit</u> flies including “potential host”, “artificial host”, “conditional non-host”, “preferred host”, “general host”, “wild host” and “alternative host”. National plant protection organizations should, however, <u>only</u> use one of the three host status categories described in the Definitions section of this standard: natural host, conditional <del>host,</del> <u>host</u> and non-host.</p>	P	<p><i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>  <b>(134) EPP0 (19 Sep 2023 12:25 PM)</b>                  Unnecessary comma.                   1) Typo                  2) For more clarity</p>
34	<p><del>Many terms are used in published literature to describe the host status of fruit to-fruit flies including “potential host”, “artificial host”, “conditional non-host”, “preferred host”, “general host”, “wild host” and “alternative host”. National plant protection organizations should, however, use one of the three host status categories described in the Definitions section of this standard: natural host, conditional host, and non-host.</del></p>	P	<p><i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>  <b>(108) IPPC Regional Workshop Latin America (18 Sep 2023 8:26 PM)</b>                  Section 2 was integrated in the Introduction section.</p>
34	<p>Many terms are used in published literature to describe the host status of fruit-to-fruit flies including “potential host”, “artificial host”, “conditional non-host”, “preferred host”, “general host”, “wild host” and “alternative host”. National plant protection organizations should, however, use one of the three host status categories described in the Definitions section of this standard: natural host, conditional host, and non-host. <u>Suggested use of alternate terms describing host status of fruit to fruit fly by 'host status category' used by this ISPM is included in Appendix 2.</u></p>	P	<p><i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>  <b>(100) PPPO (17 Sep 2023 7:48 PM)</b>                  Insertion of text referring to Appendix categorizing common terms describing host status from literature to terms used within ISPM 37.                   The inclusion of the table in the Appendix will assist NPPOs in the use of the correct host categories used in ISPM 37 when comparing to terms used in the literature.                   The suggested table was produced by the EWG showing how a range of terms align to the terms in ISPM 37. This table is included at the end of this document as a suggested appendix.</p>
34	<p><del>Many terms are used in published literature to describe the host status of fruit to-fruit flies including “potential host”, “artificial host”, “conditional non-host”, “preferred host”, “general host”, “wild host” and “alternative host”. National plant protection organizations should, however, use one of the three host status categories described in the Definitions section of this standard: natural host, conditional host, and non-host.</del></p>	P	<p><i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>  <b>(40) COSAVE (18 Aug 2023 2:58 PM)</b>                  Section 2 was integrated in the Introduction section. In addition the title of the section is not consistent with the content</p>

34	<p><del>Many terms are used in published literature to describe the host status of fruit-to-fruit flies including “potential host”, “artificial host”, “conditional non-host”, “preferred host”, “general host”, “wild host” and “alternative host”. National plant protection organizations should, however, use one of the three host status categories described in the Definitions section of this standard: natural host, conditional host, and non-host.</del></p>	P <p><i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>  <b>(16) Uruguay (15 Aug 2023 7:33 PM)</b>  Section 2 was integrated in the Introduction section. In addition the title of the section is not consistent with the content</p>
34	<p>Many terms are used in published literature to describe the host status of fruit-to-fruit flies including “potential host”, “artificial host”, “conditional non-host”, “preferred host”, “general host”, “wild host” and “alternative host”. National plant protection organizations should, however, use one of the three host status categories described in the Definitions section of this standard: natural host, conditional host, and non-host.</p> <p><u>A natural host is a plant species or cultivar: in which the target fruit fly develops completely from egg to viable adult, starting in attached fruit to the plant that is free from any mechanical or natural damage, under natural conditions.</u></p> <p><u>A conditional host is a plant species or cultivar: that shows evidence of infestation under semi-natural or certain, clearly described natural conditions (including field trials); and in which the target fruit fly develops completely from egg to viable adult, starting in attached fruit to the plant that is free from any mechanical or natural damage, under clearly described conditions.</u></p> <p><u>A non-host is a plant species or cultivar: in which the target fruit fly does not develop at all in attached fruit to the plant that is free from any mechanical or natural damage under natural conditions, or starts to develop in such fruit under natural conditions but does not complete its development to viable adult; or in which the target fruit fly does not develop from egg to viable adult in field trials, in trials conducted under semi-natural conditions as set out in this standard or in laboratory experiments.</u></p>	P <p><i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>  <b>(10) CA (12 Aug 2023 2:11 AM)</b>  Maintain the definitions of host categories to ensure the principle of transparency in the process of establishing phytosanitary measures.</p>
34	<p>Many terms are used in published literature to describe the host status of fruit-to-fruit flies including “potential host”, “artificial host”, “conditional non-host”, “preferred host”, “general host”, “wild host” and “alternative host”. National plant</p>	P <p><i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>  <b>(5) Colombia (10 Aug 2023 11:00 PM)</b>  Maintain the definitions of host categories to ensure the principle of transparency in</p>

	<p>protection organizations should, however, use one of the three host status categories described in the Definitions section of this standard: natural host, conditional host, and non-host.</p> <p><u>A natural host is a plant species or cultivar:</u>  <u>- in which the target fruit fly develops completely from egg to viable adult, starting in attached fruit to the plant that is free from any mechanical or natural damage, under natural conditions.</u></p> <p><u>A conditional host is a plant species or cultivar:</u>  <u>- that shows evidence of infestation under semi-natural or certain, clearly described natural conditions (including field trials); and</u>  <u>- in which the target fruit fly develops completely from egg to viable adult, starting in attached fruit to the plant that is free from any mechanical or natural damage, under clearly described conditions.</u></p> <p><u>A non-host is a plant species or cultivar:</u>  <u>- in which the target fruit fly does not develop at all in attached fruit to the plant that is free from any mechanical or natural damage under natural conditions, or starts to develop in such fruit under natural conditions but does not complete its development to viable adult; or</u>  <u>- in which the target fruit fly does not develop from egg to viable adult in field trials, in trials conducted under semi-natural conditions as set out in this standard or in laboratory experiments.</u></p>	<p>process of establishing phytosanitary measures.</p>
35	<p><b>32. Criteria for evaluating available information</b></p>	<p>P <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>  <b>(109) IPPC Regional Workshop Latin America (18 Sep 2023 8:26 PM)</b>                  Consequential change as per previous comments</p>
35	<p><b>32. Criteria for evaluating available information</b></p>	<p>P <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>  <b>(17) Uruguay (15 Aug 2023 7:35 PM)</b>                  Consequential change as per suggestion to integrate section 2 in the introduction section</p>
36	<p><b>32.1 General criteria</b></p>	<p>P <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>  <b>(110) IPPC Regional Workshop Latin America (18 Sep 2023 8:26 PM)</b>                  Consequential change as per previous comments</p>
36	<p><b>32.1 General criteria</b></p>	<p>P <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i></p>



			<b>(18) Uruguay (15 Aug 2023 7:35 PM)</b> Consequential change
37	<del>When determining host status based on</del> While not many details are always present in the available information, <del>when determining host status</del> NPPOs should assess the <del>quality (i.e. completeness, reliability and relevance)-relevance</del> of the information by considering whether it provides the following:	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(93) Brazil (13 Sep 2023 8:57 PM)</b> For better understanding, once not all these items below might be available in the information
38	an accurate identification of the plant species (scientific name and authority) or cultivar, with supporting evidence (e.g. published keys and taxonomic publications used for plant <u>species</u> (including cultivar) identification, verification of plant material by a specialist taxonomist, molecular identification, voucher specimens);	P	<i>Category : EDITORIAL</i> <b>(222) Australia (29 Sep 2023 3:38 AM)</b> Technical accuracy.
38	an accurate identification of the plant species (scientific name and authority) <u>or</u> cultivar, with supporting evidence (e.g. published keys and taxonomic publications used for plant (including cultivar) identification, verification of plant material by a specialist taxonomist, molecular identification, voucher specimens);	C	<i>Category : EDITORIAL</i> <b>(181) South Africa (28 Sep 2023 11:31 AM)</b> Proposal for deletion of the conjunction: "or" and replaced with the conjunction: "and". This is suggested in order to provide more clarity and inclusivity.
38	an accurate identification of the plant species (scientific name and authority) <u>as well as the name of the cultivar</u> or <u>cultivar variety</u> , when available, with supporting evidence (e.g. published keys and taxonomic publications used for plant (including cultivar) identification, verification of plant material by a specialist taxonomist, molecular identification, voucher specimens);	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(111) IPPC Regional Workshop Latin America (18 Sep 2023 8:26 PM)</b> to clarify what means "identification"
38	an accurate identification of the plant species (scientific name and authority) or <del>cultivar</del> <u>cultivar (if relevant)</u> , with supporting evidence (e.g. published keys and taxonomic publications used for plant (including cultivar) identification, verification of plant material by a specialist taxonomist, molecular identification, voucher specimens);	P	<i>Category : EDITORIAL</i> <b>(101) PPPO (17 Sep 2023 7:48 PM)</b> For clarity.
38	an accurate identification of the plant species (scientific name and authority) <u>well as the cultivar</u> or <u>cultivar the variety when available</u> , with supporting evidence (e.g. published keys and taxonomic publications used for plant (including cultivar) identification, verification of plant material by a specialist taxonomist, molecular identification, voucher specimens);	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(91) COSAVE (13 Sep 2023 3:28 PM)</b> to clarify what means "identification" in this context
38	an accurate identification of the plant species (scientific name and authority) or cultivar, <u>as well as the cultivar or the variety, when available</u> , with supporting evidence (e.g. published keys and taxonomic publications used for plant (including cultivar) identification, verification of plant material by a specialist taxonomist, molecular identification, voucher specimens);	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(80) Uruguay (4 Sep 2023 6:45 PM)</b> To clarify what means "identification" in this context
38	an accurate identification of the plant species (scientific name and <del>authority</del> ) <u>descriptor</u> or cultivar, with supporting evidence (e.g. published keys and	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(11) CA (12 Aug 2023 2:15 AM)</b> The term appropriate to the International

	taxonomic publications used for plant (including cultivar) identification, verification of plant material by a specialist taxonomist, molecular identification, voucher specimens);		Code of Zoological Nomenclature indicates that to specify the identification data of the plant species are scientific name and descriptor. Therefore, it is suggested to eliminate the term "Authority" for "descriptor".
38	an accurate identification of the plant species (scientific name and <a href="#">authority</a> <a href="#">descriptor</a> ) or cultivar, with supporting evidence (e.g. published keys and taxonomic publications used for plant (including cultivar) identification, verification of plant material by a specialist taxonomist, molecular identification, voucher specimens);	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(6) Colombia (10 Aug 2023 11:03 PM)</b> The term appropriate to the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature indicates that to specify the identification data of the plant species are scientific name and descriptor. Therefore, it is suggested to eliminate the term "Authority" for "descriptor".
39	a description of the sampled area (e.g. any pest-control measures applied in the area, any phytosanitary measures applied in the area, presence of other natural or conditional hosts in the area), details of location (e.g. geographic coordinates, climate, growing region, <del>elevation</del> -elevation), and details of collection dates (e.g. early or late season, multiple years);	P	<i>Category : EDITORIAL</i> <b>(223) Australia (29 Sep 2023 3:39 AM)</b> Grammatical accuracy
39	a description of the sampled area (e.g. any pest-control measures <a href="#">applied in the area</a> and, <del>any</del> phytosanitary measures applied in the area, presence of other natural <a href="#">hosts</a> or conditional hosts in the area), details of location (e.g. geographic coordinates, <del>climate</del> , growing region, <del>elevation</del> -elevation, <a href="#">climate</a> ) and details of collection dates (e.g. early or late season, multiple years);	P	<i>Category : EDITORIAL</i> <b>(197) European Union (28 Sep 2023 7:21 PM)</b> 1) Simplification 2) Clearer 3) More logical order
39	a description of the sampled area (e.g. any pest-control measures applied in the area, any phytosanitary measures applied in the area, presence of other natural or conditional hosts in the area), details of location (e.g. geographic coordinates, climate, growing region, elevation) and details of collection dates (e.g. early or late season, multiple years);	C	<i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i> <b>(184) South Africa (28 Sep 2023 11:40 AM)</b> Proposal to use the wording: "over years" rather than "multiple years". This is because, data collection of two years cannot be referred to as "multiple years". However, "over years" can refer to data collection of two years and beyond.
39	a description of the sampled area (e.g. any pest-control measures applied in the area, any phytosanitary measures applied in the area, presence of other natural or conditional hosts in the area), details of location (e.g. geographic coordinates, climate, growing region, elevation) and details of <a href="#">collection</a> dates (e.g. early or late season, multiple years);	C	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(183) South Africa (28 Sep 2023 11:37 AM)</b> Clarity is requesting. Does this mean: "harvest" or "collection of monitoring data"?
39	a description of the sampled area (e.g. any pest-control measures applied in the area, any phytosanitary measures applied in the area, presence of other natural or conditional hosts in the area), details of location (e.g. geographic coordinates, climate, growing region, elevation) and details of collection dates (e.g. early or late	C	<i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i> <b>(182) South Africa (28 Sep 2023 11:34 AM)</b> In South Africa, phytosanitary measures (postharvest controls) are applied in

	season, <b>multiple</b> years);		packhouses and during freight, they are not necessarily area-specific. The only strictly "phytosanitary measure" applied on farms is surveillance monitoring for invasive fruit flies, unless packhouses are located on-farm.
39	a description of the sampled area (e.g. any pest-control measures <b>applied in the area</b> and, <del>any</del> phytosanitary measures applied in the area, presence of other natural <b>hosts</b> or conditional hosts in the area), details of location (e.g. geographic coordinates, <del>climate</del> , growing region, <del>elevation</del> <b>elevation, climate</b> ) and details of collection dates (e.g. early or late season, multiple years);	P	<i>Category : EDITORIAL</i> <b>(135) EPPO (19 Sep 2023 12:25 PM)</b> 1) Simplification 2) Clearer 3) More logical order
41	details of the fruit-collection conditions (e.g. commercial or non-commercial environment, harvested from the plant or collected after falling to the ground);	C	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(198) European Union (28 Sep 2023 7:23 PM)</b> Paragraphs 41, 42 and 43 are not clear. What is the difference? Does 'fruit collection' pertain to the following indent (harvesting procedures)? Is it related to fruit-collection or fruit-sampling?
41	details of the fruit-collection conditions (e.g. commercial or non-commercial environment, harvested from the plant or collected after falling to the ground);	C	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(136) EPPO (19 Sep 2023 12:25 PM)</b> Paragraphs 41, 42 and 43 are not clear. What is the difference? Does 'fruit collection' pertain to the following indent (harvesting procedures)? Is it related to fruit-collection or fruit-sampling?
42	a description of the fruit-handling procedures (e.g. harvesting procedures, post-harvest processing and treatment, transportation procedures);	C	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(199) European Union (28 Sep 2023 7:23 PM)</b> Paragraphs 41, 42 and 43 are not clear. What is the difference? Does 'fruit collection' pertain to the following indent (harvesting procedures)? Is it related to fruit-collection or fruit-sampling?
42	a description of the fruit-handling procedures (e.g. harvesting procedures, <b>post-harvest processing and treatment, transportation procedures</b> );	C	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(186) South Africa (28 Sep 2023 11:44 AM)</b> This sentence may have to be revisited since it is not technical clear how this impacts on the determination of host status because fruit flies infest prior to harvest, not after harvest
42	a description of the fruit-handling procedures (e.g. harvesting procedures, <b>post-harvest processing and treatment, transportation procedures</b> );	C	<i>Category : EDITORIAL</i> <b>(185) South Africa (28 Sep 2023 11:43 AM)</b> Or absence? This is what enables export.

42	a description of the fruit-handling procedures (e.g. harvesting procedures, post-harvest processing and treatment, transportation procedures);	C	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(137) EPPO (19 Sep 2023 12:25 PM)</b> Paragraphs 41, 42 and 43 are not clear. What is the difference? Does 'fruit collection' pertain to the following indent (harvesting procedures)? Is it related to fruit-collection or fruit-sampling?
43	a description of the fruit-sampling method (e.g. number and distribution of plants sampled and number of fruits sampled per plant);	C	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(200) European Union (28 Sep 2023 7:24 PM)</b> Paragraphs 41, 42 and 43 are not clear. What is the difference? Does 'fruit collection' pertain to the following indent (harvesting procedures)? Is it related to fruit-collection or fruit-sampling?
43	a description of the fruit-sampling method (e.g. number and distribution of plants sampled and number of fruits sampled per plant);	C	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(138) EPPO (19 Sep 2023 12:25 PM)</b> Paragraphs 41, 42 and 43 are not clear. What is the difference? Does 'fruit collection' pertain to the following indent (harvesting procedures)? Is it related to fruit-collection or fruit-sampling?
43	a description of the fruit-sampling method (e.g. number and distribution of plants sampled and number <u>or weight</u> of fruits sampled per plant);	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(112) IPPC Regional Workshop Latin America (18 Sep 2023 8:26 PM)</b> Some authors describe the sample weight instead of the number of fruits sampled.
43	a description of the fruit-sampling method (e.g. number and distribution of plants sampled and number of fruits sampled per <del>plant</del> <u>plant or sample weight</u> );	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(92) COSAVE (13 Sep 2023 3:29 PM)</b> Some authors describe the sample weight instead of the number of fruits sampled.
43	a description of the fruit-sampling method (e.g. number and distribution of plants sampled and number of fruits sampled per <del>plant</del> <u>plant, or sample weight</u> );	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(81) Uruguay (4 Sep 2023 6:47 PM)</b> Some authors describe the sample weight instead of the number of fruit sampled
44	details of the condition of the skin or rind (e.g. <del>rind</del> thickness);	P	<i>Category : EDITORIAL</i> <b>(225) Australia (29 Sep 2023 3:40 AM)</b> Improved clarity, as thickness can refer to both the skin or rind.
44	details of the <u>condition-characteristics</u> of the skin or rind (e.g. rind thickness);	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(162) APPPC (26 Sep 2023 10:59 AM)</b> Suggest changing this word to 'characteristics' because 'condition' sounds more like the state of damage addressed in the next point
44	details of the condition of the skin or rind (e.g. rind thickness);	C	<i>Category : EDITORIAL</i> <b>(103) PPPO (17 Sep 2023 7:48 PM)</b> PPPO, in agreement with New Zealand,

			suggests replacing 'condition' with 'characteristics' as 'condition' is not the right word when referring to the example used (rind thickness).
44	details of the <del>condition</del> <u>characteristics</u> of the skin or rind (e.g. rind thickness);	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(102) PPPO (17 Sep 2023 7:48 PM)</b> Suggest changing this word to 'characteristics' because 'condition' sounds more like the state of damage addressed in the next point
45	details of whether the fruit is damaged or not, <del>the cause of any damage (e.g. mechanical or natural damage), and the extent of the damage;</del>	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(163) APPPC (26 Sep 2023 10:59 AM)</b> As Section 1 explains "The annex provides guidance on interpretation of available information only in relation to undamaged fruit, based on the definitions and requirements set out in the core text of this standard", the information on the cause of any damage or the extent of the damage are no longer relevant.
45	details of whether the fruit is damaged or not, <del>the cause of any damage (e.g. mechanical or natural damage), and the extent of the damage;</del>	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(148) Japan (22 Sep 2023 6:12 AM)</b> As Section 1 explains "The annex provides guidance on interpretation of available information only in relation to undamaged fruit", the information on the cause of any damage or the extent of the damage are no longer relevant.
46	details of the stage of fruit maturity ( <del>or or</del> other indicators of ripeness, <del>such as e.g.</del> dry matter content, colour, sugar content, standardized or objective ripeness scale);	P	<i>Category : EDITORIAL</i> <b>(224) Australia (29 Sep 2023 3:40 AM)</b> Simplifies the text.
46	details of the stage of fruit maturity (or other indicators of ripeness, such as dry matter content, colour, sugar content, standardized <del>or objective</del> ripeness scale);	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(113) IPPC Regional Workshop Latin America (18 Sep 2023 8:26 PM)</b> Standardized ripeness'scales are not necessarily objective, they are a guide to assess ripeness
46	details of the stage of fruit maturity (or other indicators of ripeness, such as dry matter content, colour, sugar content, <del>standardized or objective</del> <u>standardized</u> ripeness scale);	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(43) COSAVE (18 Aug 2023 3:02 PM)</b> Standardized ripeness'scales are not necessarily objective, they are a guide to assess ripeness
46	details of the stage of fruit maturity (or other indicators of ripeness, such as dry matter content, colour, sugar content, standardized <del>or objective</del> ripeness scale);	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(19) Uruguay (15 Aug 2023 7:37 PM)</b> Standardized ripeness'scales are not necessarily objective, they are a guide to assess ripeness
49	where there is infestation, a description of the fruit fly rearing method for	C	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>

	development to adults (taking into consideration that eggs and larvae should not have been transferred from infested fruit to artificial diet for rearing);		<b>(57) United States of America (21 Aug 2023 7:45 PM)</b> Suggest combining with the bullet below for clarity
50	where there is infestation, a clear presentation of fruit fly rearing results, indicating the number of fruit fly adults reared per fruit or per weight of fruit and the total number <del>and of fruit composing the fruit sample or the</del> weight of the fruit sample under suitable conditions;	P	<i>Category : EDITORIAL</i> <b>(201) European Union (28 Sep 2023 7:27 PM)</b> More precise wording (because what "total number (...) of the fruit sample" means?)
50	where there is infestation, a clear presentation of fruit fly rearing results, indicating the number of fruit fly adults reared per fruit or per weight of fruit and the total number <del>and of fruit composing the fruit sample or the</del> weight of the fruit sample under suitable conditions;	P	<i>Category : EDITORIAL</i> <b>(139) Eppo (19 Sep 2023 12:25 PM)</b> More precise wording (because what "total number (...) of the fruit sample" means?)
50	<del>where there is infestation,</del> a clear presentation of fruit fly rearing results, indicating the number of fruit fly adults reared per fruit or per weight of fruit and the total number and weight of the fruit sample under suitable conditions;	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(55) United States of America (21 Aug 2023 7:41 PM)</b> redundant
51	an accurate identification of the fruit fly species (scientific name and <del>authority</del> <del>descriptor</del> ) reared from the fruit together with supporting evidence (e.g. published keys and taxonomic publications used for fruit fly species identification, verification of fruit fly species by a specialist taxonomist, photographs, molecular identification, voucher specimens); and	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(246) Mexico (30 Sep 2023 6:24 PM)</b> According with the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature the identification data of the plant species are scientific name and descriptor
51	an accurate identification of the fruit fly species (scientific name and authority) reared from the fruit together with supporting evidence (e.g. published keys and taxonomic publications used for fruit fly species identification, verification of fruit fly species by a specialist taxonomist, photographs, molecular identification, voucher specimens); <del>and</del> <del>and</del> <del>biology</del>	P	<i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i> <b>(152) IPPC Regional Workshop Africa (23 Sep 2023 3:12 PM)</b>
51	<del>- if reared from the fruit, instead of the field collection,</del> an accurate identification of the fruit fly species (scientific name and authority) <del>reared from the fruit</del> together with supporting evidence (e.g. <del>..</del> published keys and taxonomic publications used for fruit fly species identification, verification of fruit fly species by a specialist taxonomist, photographs, molecular identification, voucher specimens); and	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(56) United States of America (21 Aug 2023 7:44 PM)</b> for clarity of the method
52	in the absence of infestation, a clear presentation of fruit fly rearing results (e.g. no eggs or larvae, no pupation, no viable fruit fly adults reared from the <del>plant species</del> <del>or cultivar fruit</del> under suitable conditions).	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(245) Mexico (30 Sep 2023 6:23 PM)</b> Fruit flies are reared from fruits
52	in the absence of infestation, a clear presentation of fruit fly rearing results (e.g. no eggs or larvae, no pupation, no <b>viable</b> fruit fly adults reared from the plant species or cultivar under suitable conditions).	C	<i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i> <b>(112) New Zealand (28 Sep 2023 11:39 PM)</b> We recognise Attributes (e.g. viable) are used in 3.2 and ISPM 37 the main standard. Suggest to footnote the main standard as

			ink amendment. Viable could create problem for fruit fly free countries if there is an incursion and the detected fly is not able to reproduce. Suggest "no fertile fruit fly adults" or similar to differentiate between survivability and ability to reproduce. For example, irradiation will not kill the adult but it removes the biosecurity risk. Alternatively, this information could be provided elsewhere in a definition of 'viable'. ISPM 26 also use fertile.
52	in the absence of infestation, a clear presentation of fruit fly rearing results (e.g. no eggs or larvae, no pupation, no viable fruit fly adults reared from the <del>plant species or cultivar fruit</del> under suitable conditions).	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(114) IPPC Regional Workshop Latin America (18 Sep 2023 8:26 PM)</b> Fruit flies are reared from fruits
52	in the absence of infestation, a clear presentation of fruit fly rearing results (e.g. no eggs or larvae, no pupation, no viable fruit fly adults reared from the <del>fruit of the plant species or cultivar</del> under suitable conditions).	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(86) Brazil (8 Sep 2023 3:32 PM)</b> the fly is reared from a fruit not from a plant specie
52	in the absence of infestation, a clear presentation of fruit fly rearing results (e.g. no eggs or larvae, no pupation, no viable fruit fly adults reared from the <del>plant species or cultivar fruit</del> under suitable conditions).	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(44) COSAVE (18 Aug 2023 3:04 PM)</b> Fruit flies are reared from fruits.
52	in the absence of infestation, a clear presentation of fruit fly rearing results (e.g. no eggs or larvae, no pupation, no viable fruit fly adults reared from the <del>plant species or cultivar fruit</del> under suitable conditions).	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(20) Uruguay (15 Aug 2023 7:38 PM)</b> Fruit flies are reared from fruits
53	In addition to these general evaluation criteria, further information is required for each host status category as described in sections <del>32.2</del> to <del>32.4</del> of this annex.	P	<i>Category : EDITORIAL</i> <b>(115) IPPC Regional Workshop Latin America (18 Sep 2023 8:26 PM)</b> Consequential change
53	In addition to these general evaluation criteria, further information is required for each host status category as described in sections <del>32.2</del> to <del>32.4</del> of this annex.	P	<i>Category : EDITORIAL</i> <b>(21) Uruguay (15 Aug 2023 7:39 PM)</b> Consequential change
54	<del>32.2</del> <b>Natural host</b>	P	<i>Category : EDITORIAL</i> <b>(116) IPPC Regional Workshop Latin America (18 Sep 2023 8:26 PM)</b> Consequential change
54	<del>32.2</del> <b>Natural host</b>	P	<i>Category : EDITORIAL</i> <b>(22) Uruguay (15 Aug 2023 7:40 PM)</b> Consequential change
55	The information used to determine natural host status should contain evidence of both infestation and development to viable adults under clearly described natural <del>conditions and evidence of development to viable adults</del> conditions.	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(247) Mexico (30 Sep 2023 6:29 PM)</b> To avoid redundancy
55	The information used to determine natural host status should contain evidence of both infestation and development to viable adults under <del>clearly described</del> natural	P	<i>Category : EDITORIAL</i> <b>(226) Australia (29 Sep 2023 3:42 AM)</b>

	conditions and evidence of development to viable adults.		Removed the words "clearly described" as they are not necessary and are not used in the definition in main body of ISPM 37.
55	The information used to determine natural host status should contain evidence of both infestation and development to viable adults under clearly described natural <del>conditions and evidence of development to viable adults</del> conditions.	P	<i>Category : EDITORIAL</i> <b>(213) New Zealand (28 Sep 2023 11:41 PM)</b> Suggest to delete this part of the sentence because it repeats the part before it.
55	The information used to determine natural host status should contain evidence of both infestation <del>and development to viable adults</del> under clearly described natural conditions and evidence of development to viable adults.	P	<i>Category : EDITORIAL</i> <b>(202) European Union (28 Sep 2023 7:27 PM)</b> Redundant with the end of the sentence and consistency with the definition of "natural host" in ISPM 37 (otherwise delete "and evidence of development to viable adults" at the end of the sentence, but that would stick a little less to the definition of "natural host" in ISPM 37).
55	The information used to determine natural host status should contain evidence of both infestation and development to viable adults under <del>clearly described</del> natural conditions and evidence of development to viable adults.	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(177) Japan (27 Sep 2023 11:13 AM)</b> "clearly described" is not clear.
55	The information used to determine natural host status should contain evidence of both infestation and development to viable adults under clearly described natural <del>conditions and evidence of development to viable adults</del> conditions.	P	<i>Category : EDITORIAL</i> <b>(176) Japan (27 Sep 2023 11:11 AM)</b>
55	The information used to determine natural host status should contain evidence of both infestation and development to viable adults <del>under clearly described under</del> natural <del>conditions and evidence of development to viable adults</del> conditions.	P	<i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i> <b>(164) APPPC (26 Sep 2023 10:59 AM)</b>
55	The information used to determine natural host status should contain evidence of both infestation <del>and development to viable adults</del> under clearly described natural conditions and evidence of development to viable adults.	P	<i>Category : EDITORIAL</i> <b>(140) Eppo (19 Sep 2023 12:25 PM)</b> Redundant with the end of the sentence and consistency with the definition of "natural host" in ISPM 37 (otherwise delete "and evidence of development to viable adults" at the end of the sentence, but that would stick a little less to the definition of "natural host" in ISPM 37).
55	The information used to determine natural host status should contain evidence of both infestation and development to viable adults under clearly described natural <del>conditions and evidence of development to viable adults</del> conditions.	P	<i>Category : EDITORIAL</i> <b>(117) IPPC Regional Workshop Latin America (18 Sep 2023 8:26 PM)</b> To avoid redundancy
55	<u>Established records of pests having developed and successfully reared out of fruits is what defines a host. And that the said host can be used as medium to rear the pest for study purposes without difficulty or change in form.</u>	P	<i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i> <b>(75) Ghana (30 Aug 2023 11:36 PM)</b> Would not encourage the use of this term in Ghana.



	The information used to determine natural host status should contain evidence of both infestation and development to viable adults under clearly described natural conditions and evidence of development to viable adults.		
55	The information used to determine natural host status should contain evidence of both infestation and development to viable adults under clearly described natural conditions <del>and evidence of development to viable adults.</del>	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(45) COSAVE (18 Aug 2023 3:06 PM)</b> To avoid redundancy
55	The information used to determine natural host status should contain evidence of both infestation and development to viable adults under clearly described natural <del>conditions and evidence of development to viable adults conditions.</del>	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(23) Uruguay (15 Aug 2023 7:41 PM)</b> To avoid redundancy
56	<del>National plant protection organizations</del> <u>NPPOs</u> should consider whether, in addition to the items listed in section 3.1 of this annex, the information available also provides details of the viability of emergent adults in terms of their size, flight ability, longevity and fecundity.	P	<i>Category : EDITORIAL</i> <b>(229) Australia (29 Sep 2023 3:44 AM)</b> NPPO acronym used above
56	<del>National plant protection organizations should consider whether, in addition to the items listed in section 3.1 of this annex, the information available also provides</del> <u>The information used to determine natural host status should contain evidence of both infestation and development to fertile adults under clearly described natural conditions.</u> <del>National plant protection organisations should consider whether, in addition to the items listed in section 3.1 of this annex, the information available also provides enough detail to determine the reproductive status of the insect, details of the viability of emergent adults in terms of their size, flight ability, longevity and fecundity.</del>	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(214) New Zealand (28 Sep 2023 11:43 PM)</b> The listed traits (size, flight ability, etc) further confuse what is meant by "viable". Suggested alternative wording: "The information used to determine natural host status should contain evidence of both infestation and development to fertile adults under clearly described natural conditions. National plant protection organisations should consider whether, in addition to the items listed in section 3.1 of this annex, the information available also provides enough detail to determine the reproductive status of the insect."
56	National plant protection organizations should consider whether, in addition to the items listed in section 3.1 of this annex, the information available also provides details of the viability of emergent adults in terms of their size, <del>flight ability</del> <u>activity</u> , longevity and fecundity.	P	<i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i> <b>(178) China (28 Sep 2023 6:55 AM)</b> "flight ability" is uneasy to test. "flight ability" cannot be tested and described
56	National plant protection organizations should consider whether, in addition to the items listed in section <del>3</del> <u>2</u> .1 of this annex, the information available also provides details of the viability of emergent adults in terms of their size, flight ability, longevity and fecundity.	P	<i>Category : EDITORIAL</i> <b>(118) IPPC Regional Workshop Latin America (18 Sep 2023 8:26 PM)</b> Consequential change
56	National plant protection organizations should consider whether, in addition to the items listed in section 3.1 of this annex, the information available also provides details of the viability of emergent adults in terms of their size, flight ability, <del>longevity</del> <u>longevity, fertility</u> and fecundity.	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(58) United States of America (21 Aug 2023 7:47 PM)</b> this is one of the important physiological factors for both females and males, while

			fecundity usually refers to female egg laying.
56	National plant protection organizations should consider whether, in addition to the items listed in section 32.1 of this annex, the information available also provides details of the viability of emergent adults in terms of their size, flight ability, longevity and fecundity.	P	<i>Category : EDITORIAL</i> <b>(24) Uruguay (15 Aug 2023 7:41 PM)</b> Consequential change
57	<b>32.3 Conditional host</b>	P	<i>Category : EDITORIAL</i> <b>(119) IPPC Regional Workshop Latin America (18 Sep 2023 8:26 PM)</b> Consequential change
57	<b>32.3 Conditional host</b>	P	<i>Category : EDITORIAL</i> <b>(25) Uruguay (15 Aug 2023 7:42 PM)</b> Consequential change
58	The information used to determine conditional host status should contain evidence of both infestation and development to viable adults from <u>field</u> trials under semi-natural <del>field</del> conditions as set out in section 2 of this standard, with published methodological details and results.	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(248) Mexico (30 Sep 2023 6:31 PM)</b> To be consistent with section 2 of ISPM 37
58	The information used to determine conditional host status should contain evidence of both infestation and development to viable adults from <u>field</u> trials under semi-natural <del>field</del> conditions as set out in section 2 of this standard, with published methodological details and results.	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(120) IPPC Regional Workshop Latin America (18 Sep 2023 8:26 PM)</b> For consistency with section 2 of ISPM 37
58	<p><u>The conditions under which the pest found itself in the host may not be known, and should therefore be considered as a potential host (if that is the first time it is recorded from that host).</u></p> <p><u>This status does not tend to stay for long as soon as continuous tests and rearing from the host is established, the status can be added to the list of host plants.</u></p> <p><u>Further tests and surveys are then conducted to ascertain the status as to the suitability of the host. If the pest is able to complete its life cycle successfully and emerge as an adult, then it can be documented and added on as a host plant.</u></p> <p><u>In the presence of all the known plants, pests would attack the ones that best suit their development, emergence, and survival. There may also be other species in the same plant/fruit (co-habitation), but proportions of the different species tends to favour the one species group than the others. And the dominant species tends to be the preferred host from all the other plats/host in the area of study.</u></p> <p>The information used to determine conditional host status should contain evidence of both infestation and development to viable adults from trials under semi-natural field conditions as set out in section 2 of this standard, with published</p>	P	<i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i> <b>(76) Ghana (30 Aug 2023 11:44 PM)</b> Would not encourage the use of this term in Ghana

	methodological details and results.		
58	The information used to determine conditional host status should contain evidence of both infestation and development to viable adults from <u>field</u> trials under semi-natural <del>field</del> conditions as set out in <del>section</del> <u>section 2</u> of this standard, with published methodological details and results.	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(46) COSAVE (18 Aug 2023 3:08 PM)</b> For consistency with section 2 of ISPM 37
58	The information used to determine conditional host status should contain evidence of both infestation and development to viable adults from <u>field</u> trials under semi-natural <del>field</del> conditions as set out in section 2 of this standard, with published methodological details and results.	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(26) Uruguay (15 Aug 2023 7:43 PM)</b> For consistency with section 2 of ISPM 37.
59	<del>National plant protection organizations</del> <u>NPPOs</u> should consider whether, in addition to the items listed in section 3.1 of this annex, the information available also provides details of the viability of emergent adults in terms of their size, flight ability, longevity and fecundity.	P	<i>Category : EDITORIAL</i> <b>(228) Australia (29 Sep 2023 3:43 AM)</b> NPPO acronym used above.
59	National plant protection organizations should consider whether, in addition to the items listed in section <del>32</del> .1 of this annex, the information available also provides details of the viability of emergent adults in terms of their size, flight ability, longevity and fecundity.	P	<i>Category : EDITORIAL</i> <b>(27) Uruguay (15 Aug 2023 7:44 PM)</b> Consequential change
60	<del>32.4</del> <b>Non-host</b>	P	<i>Category : EDITORIAL</i> <b>(121) IPPC Regional Workshop Latin America (18 Sep 2023 8:26 PM)</b> Consequential change
60	<del>32.4</del> <b>Non-host</b>	P	<i>Category : EDITORIAL</i> <b>(28) Uruguay (15 Aug 2023 7:44 PM)</b> Consequential change
61	The information used to determine non-host status should contain evidence of the absence of infestation, or of the incomplete development to viable adults, <u>under natural conditions or</u> derived from field trials <del>or trials</del> conducted under semi-natural conditions as set out in section 2 of this standard, with published methodological details and results. If this information is not available, data from laboratory experiments may be used.	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(249) Mexico (30 Sep 2023 6:33 PM)</b> To be consistent with section 2 of ISPM 37
61	The information used to determine non-host status should contain evidence of the absence of infestation, or of the incomplete development to viable adults, <u>under clearly described natural conditions or</u> derived from field trials <del>or trials</del> conducted under semi-natural conditions as set out in section 2 of this standard, with published methodological details and results. If this information is not available, data from laboratory experiments may be used.	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(203) European Union (28 Sep 2023 7:30 PM)</b> 1) See definition of non-host in ISPM 37 for "under natural conditions" and see paragraph 55 about natural host for "clearly described". 2) See C3 and title of section 2 in ISPM 37.
61	The information used to determine non-host status should contain evidence of the absence of infestation, or of the incomplete development to viable adults, <u>under</u>	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(141) Eppo (19 Sep 2023 12:25 PM)</b> 1) See definition of non-host in ISPM 37 for

	<u>clearly described natural conditions or</u> derived from field trials <del>or trials</del> conducted under semi-natural conditions as set out in section 2 of this standard, with published methodological details and results. If this information is not available, data from laboratory experiments may be used.		"under natural conditions" and see paragraph 55 about natural host for "clearly described". 2) See C3 and title of section 2 in ISPM 37.
61	The information used to determine non-host status should contain evidence of the absence of infestation, or of the incomplete development to viable adults, <u>derived under natural conditions or</u> from field trials <del>or trials</del> conducted under semi-natural conditions as set out in section 2 of this standard, with published methodological details and results. If this information is not available, data from laboratory experiments may be used.	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(122) IPPC Regional Workshop Latin America (18 Sep 2023 8:26 PM)</b> For consistency with the definition of Non-host in ISPM 37
61	The information used to determine non-host status should contain evidence of the absence of infestation, or of the incomplete development to viable adults, <u>under natural conditions or</u> derived from field trials <del>or trials</del> conducted under semi-natural conditions as set out in section 2 of this standard, with published methodological details and results. If this information is not available, data from laboratory experiments may be used.	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(47) COSAVE (18 Aug 2023 3:09 PM)</b> For consistency with the definition of Non-host in ISPM 37.
61	The information used to determine non-host status should contain evidence of the absence of infestation, or of the incomplete development to viable adults, <u>under natural conditions or</u> derived from field trials <del>or trials</del> conducted under semi-natural conditions as set out in section 2 of this standard, with published methodological details and results. If this information is not available, data from laboratory experiments may be used.	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(29) Uruguay (15 Aug 2023 7:46 PM)</b> For consistency with the definition of Non-host in ISPM 37
62	If the information on non-host status is derived from field surveillance by fruit sampling, NPPOs should consider whether, in addition to the items listed in section 3.1 of this annex, the information available also provides evidence of the presence of reproductively mature adults of the target fruit fly species in the sampled area before and during sampling (e.g. from trap <u>records</u> ).	C	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(191) South Africa (28 Sep 2023 12:00 PM)</b> Trap records may very well indicate presence of mature adults, due to the highly polyphagous nature of fruit flies, but it will not show what the host is (which could be located relatively far away from the non-host, or interspersed with it. This may therefore not prove anything.
62	If the information on non-host status is derived from field surveillance by fruit sampling, NPPOs should consider whether, in addition to the items listed in section 3.1 of this annex, the information available also provides evidence of the presence of reproductively mature adults of the target fruit fly species in the sampled area before and during sampling (e.g. from trap <u>records</u> ).	C	<i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i> <b>(189) South Africa (28 Sep 2023 11:56 AM)</b> Trap records will not apply for polyphagous Fruit Flies.
62	If the information on non-host status is derived from field surveillance by fruit sampling, NPPOs should consider whether, in addition to the items listed in	C	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(187) South Africa (28 Sep 2023 11:50 AM)</b>

	section 3.1 of this annex, the information available also provides evidence of the presence of <b>reproductively mature</b> adults of the target fruit fly species in the sampled area before and during sampling (e.g. from trap records).		Suggestion for deletion of the wording: "reproductively mature" . This is because determination of the presence of reproductive mature adults is scientifically impractical and non-justifiable.
62	If the information on non-host status is derived from field surveillance by fruit sampling, NPPOs should consider whether, in addition to the items listed in section 32.1 of this annex, the information available also provides evidence of the presence of reproductively mature adults of the target fruit fly species in the sampled area before and during sampling (e.g. from trap records).	P	<i>Category : EDITORIAL</i> <b>(123) IPPC Regional Workshop Latin America (18 Sep 2023 8:26 PM)</b> Consequential change
62	If the information on non-host status is derived from field surveillance by fruit sampling, NPPOs should consider whether, in addition to the items listed in section 32.1 of this annex, the information available also provides evidence of the presence of reproductively mature adults of the target fruit fly species in the sampled area before and during sampling (e.g. from trap records).	P	<i>Category : EDITORIAL</i> <b>(30) Uruguay (15 Aug 2023 7:50 PM)</b> Consequential change
63	If the information on non-host status is derived from field trials <del>or from trials</del> conducted under semi-natural conditions, there are no further criteria for evaluation of the information <del>other than in addition to</del> the general evaluation criteria listed in section 3.1 of this annex.	P	<i>Category : EDITORIAL</i> <b>(204) European Union (28 Sep 2023 7:32 PM)</b> See C3 and title of section 2 in ISPM 37.  Better wording.
63	If the information on non-host status is derived from field trials <del>or from trials</del> conducted under semi-natural conditions, there are no further criteria for evaluation of the information <del>other than in addition to</del> the general evaluation criteria listed in section 3.1 of this annex.	P	<i>Category : EDITORIAL</i> <b>(142) EPPO (19 Sep 2023 12:25 PM)</b> See C3 and title of section 2 in ISPM 37.  Better wording
63	If the information on non-host status is derived from field trials or from trials conducted under semi-natural conditions, there are no further criteria for evaluation of the information other than the general evaluation criteria listed in section 32.1 of this annex.	P	<i>Category : EDITORIAL</i> <b>(124) IPPC Regional Workshop Latin America (18 Sep 2023 8:26 PM)</b> Consequential change
63	If the information on non-host status is derived from field trials <del>or from trials</del> conducted under semi-natural conditions, there are no further criteria for evaluation of the information other than the general evaluation criteria listed in section 3.1 of this annex.	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(97) Brazil (13 Sep 2023 10:22 PM)</b> Which field trials other than fruit sampling (mentioned in the paragraph above) can generate information of non-host?
63	<del>If the information on non host status is derived from field trials or from trials conducted under semi natural conditions, there are no further criteria for evaluation of the information other than the general evaluation criteria listed in section 3.1 of this annex.</del>	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(59) United States of America (21 Aug 2023 7:48 PM)</b> Seems unnecessary here. This section covers requirements other than those already in section 3.1.
63	If the information on non-host status is derived from field trials or from trials conducted under semi-natural conditions, there are no further criteria for evaluation	P	<i>Category : EDITORIAL</i> <b>(31) Uruguay (15 Aug 2023 7:51 PM)</b>

	of the information other than the general evaluation criteria listed in section 32.1 of this annex.		Consequential change
64	If the information on non-host status is derived from laboratory experiments, NPPOs should consider whether, in addition to the items listed in section 3.1 of this annex, the information available also provides <b>some of</b> the following:	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(94) Brazil (13 Sep 2023 9:16 PM)</b> The information does not always contain all the details listed below.
64	If the information on non-host status is derived from laboratory experiments, NPPOs should consider whether, in addition to the items listed in section 32.1 of this annex, the information available also provides the following:	P	<i>Category : EDITORIAL</i> <b>(32) Uruguay (15 Aug 2023 7:51 PM)</b> Consequential change
65	details of the fruit fly colony's origin (e.g. date of collection and location of natural host for the parental line, <b>number of generations reared by the start of the experiment</b> (preferably not more than five generations, unless wild types are added during the maintenance of the colony), substrate used for egg collection (preferably fruit substrate));	C	<i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i> <b>(190) South Africa (28 Sep 2023 11:59 AM)</b> Clarity is requested regarding whether this refers to the number of generations recorded prior to, or at the beginning of the experiment or the number of generations that are produced due to the inception of the experiment.
65	details of the fruit fly colony's origin (e.g. date of collection and location of natural host for the parental line, number of generations reared by the start of the experiment (preferably not more than five generations, unless wild types are added during the maintenance of the colony), substrate used for egg collection (preferably fruit <del>substrate</del> ));	P	<i>Category : EDITORIAL</i> <b>(74) Kenya (28 Aug 2023 3:37 PM)</b>
66	a description of the fruit fly rearing method used for maintenance of the colony (e.g. artificial diet used for larvae; conditions of the rearing room, such as temperature, humidity, <del>light</del> );	P	<i>Category : EDITORIAL</i> <b>(165) APPPC (26 Sep 2023 10:59 AM)</b> Korea propose to change light as a photoperiod because in the condition of the rearing room, not only light but also photoperiod is important.
66	a description of the fruit fly rearing method used for maintenance of the colony (e.g. artificial diet used for larvae; conditions of the rearing room, such as temperature, humidity, <del>light</del> );	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(157) Korea, Republic of (25 Sep 2023 6:41 AM)</b> Korea propose to change light as a photoperiod because in the condition of the rearing room, not only light but also photoperiod is important.
66	a description of the fruit fly rearing method used for maintenance of the colony (e.g. <b>natural or</b> artificial diet used for larvae; conditions of the rearing room, such as temperature, humidity, light);	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(125) IPPC Regional Workshop Latin America (18 Sep 2023 8:26 PM)</b> Include natural diets, which are also used in this type of studies.
66	a description of the fruit fly rearing method used for maintenance of the colony (e.g. <b>natural or</b> artificial diet used for larvae; conditions of the rearing room, such as temperature, humidity, light);	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(12) CA (12 Aug 2023 2:18 AM)</b> Include natural diets, which are also used in this type of studies.

66	a description of the fruit fly rearing method used for maintenance of the colony (e.g. <u>natural or</u> artificial diet used for larvae; conditions of the rearing room, such as temperature, humidity, light);	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(7) Colombia (10 Aug 2023 11:04 PM)</b> Include natural diets, which are also used in this type of studies.
67	details of the quality of the fruit fly colony used in the experiment (e.g. developmental <del>rates</del> and <del>survivals</del> <u>survival rates</u> , mating period, oviposition period, fecundity);	P	<i>Category : EDITORIAL</i> <b>(173) Japan (27 Sep 2023 8:01 AM)</b>
67	details of the quality of the fruit fly colony used in the experiment (e.g. <del>u</del> , <u>physiological conditions i.e.</u> , developmental rates and survival, mating period, oviposition period, fecundity);	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(60) United States of America (21 Aug 2023 7:51 PM)</b> for clarity
68	<del>details of the physiological condition of the fruit fly females used (e.g. mating status, age; the fruit fly adult females used should be mated and should be at the peak of their reproductive potential);</del>	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(61) United States of America (21 Aug 2023 7:52 PM)</b> deleted - needs to be combined with the bullet above to avoid redundancy.
70	<del>details of the natural infestation rate of the plant species or cultivar used in the experiment (fruit fly species identified and number of fruit fly adults emerged per fruit or per weight of fruit, as determined by incubating a sample of the fruit used in each replicate of the experiment without exposing it to the target fruit fly); and</del>	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(62) United States of America (21 Aug 2023 7:53 PM)</b> Suggest deleting – the meaning is confusing; such information is unlikely to be available for many situations. Perhaps this needs to be in 3.1?
71	a description of the method used in the laboratory <del>experiment infestation</del> (e.g. cages used, exposure period, presence of food and water in cages, number <u>and</u> <u>age</u> of females <u>and males</u> used per cage, <del>presence of males in cages</del> , use of a natural host as a control in separate cages to demonstrate normal oviposition behaviour, <del>time of conduct of experiment</del> , <u>lab</u> conditions during experiment, number of replicates <u>in the experiments</u> using different <del>cohorts</del> <u>cohorts of flies</u> ).	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(63) United States of America (21 Aug 2023 8:28 PM)</b> Changes improved clarity of the requirements.
72	<b>43. Assessing the uncertainty of the host status determination</b>	P	<i>Category : EDITORIAL</i> <b>(126) IPPC Regional Workshop Latin America (18 Sep 2023 8:26 PM)</b> Consequential change
72	<b>43. Assessing the uncertainty of the host status determination</b>	P	<i>Category : EDITORIAL</i> <b>(33) Uruguay (15 Aug 2023 7:52 PM)</b> Consequential change
73	The available information related to the host status of plant species or cultivars to fruit flies has varying levels of quality (i.e. completeness, reliability and relevance) and this will, in turn, influence the level of uncertainty associated with the host status determination. As a general rule, the reliability of a host record diminishes with the age of the publication. Further guidance on the quality of information can be found in ISPM 6 ( <i>Surveillance</i> ), ISPM 8 ( <i>Determination of pest status in an area</i> ) and <del>IPPC Secretariat (2021)</del> <u>IPPC Secretariat (2021) Pest status guide – Understanding the principal</u>	P	<i>Category : EDITORIAL</i> <b>(232) Australia (29 Sep 2023 3:47 AM)</b> Changed text to include text title rather than using referencing format.

	<a href="#">requirements for pest status determination.</a>		
73	The available information related to the host status of plant species or cultivars to fruit flies <del>has varying levels of quality is variable</del> (i.e. completeness, reliability and relevance) and this will, in turn, influence the level of uncertainty associated with the host status determination. As a general rule, the reliability of a host record diminishes with the age of the publication. Further guidance on the quality of information can be found in ISPM 6 ( <i>Surveillance</i> ), ISPM 8 ( <i>Determination of pest status in an area</i> ) and IPPC Secretariat (2021).	P	Category : EDITORIAL <b>(231) Australia (29 Sep 2023 3:46 AM)</b> Improved clarity
73	The <a href="#">quality of the</a> available information related to the host status of plant species or cultivars to fruit flies has varying levels of quality (i.e. completeness, reliability and relevance) and this will, in turn, influence the level of uncertainty associated with the host status determination. As a general rule, the reliability of a host record diminishes with the age of the publication. Further guidance on the quality of information can be found in ISPM 6 ( <i>Surveillance</i> ), ISPM 8 ( <i>Determination of pest status in an area</i> ) and IPPC Secretariat (2021).	P	Category : EDITORIAL <b>(230) Australia (29 Sep 2023 3:45 AM)</b> Improved clarity.
73	The available information related to the host status of plant species or cultivars to fruit flies has varying levels of quality (i.e. completeness, reliability and relevance) and this will, in turn, influence the level of uncertainty associated with the host status determination. <del>As a general rule, the reliability of a host record diminishes with the age of the publication.</del> Further guidance on the quality of information can be found in ISPM 6 ( <i>Surveillance</i> ), <del>and</del> ISPM 8 ( <i>Determination of pest status in an area</i> ) <del>and IPPC Secretariat (2021).</del>	P	Category : TECHNICAL <b>(205) European Union (28 Sep 2023 7:35 PM)</b> We propose to delete a sentence as we think the statement is not always applicable. Reliability does not necessarily change with the age of publication. Also, we prefer referencing to ISPM 8 only. We have some concern about referring to an IPPC guidance document in a standard.
73	The available information related to the host status of plant species or cultivars to fruit flies has varying levels of quality (i.e. completeness, reliability and relevance) and this will, in turn, influence the level of uncertainty associated with the host status determination. <del>As a general rule, the reliability of a host record diminishes with the age of the publication.</del> Further guidance on the quality of information can be found in ISPM 6 ( <i>Surveillance</i> ), ISPM 8 ( <i>Determination of pest status in an area</i> ) and IPPC Secretariat (2021).	P	Category : TECHNICAL <b>(166) APPPC (26 Sep 2023 10:59 AM)</b> The age of the publication itself does not directly affect the reliability of a host record.
73	The available information related to the host status of plant species or cultivars to fruit flies has varying levels of quality (i.e. completeness, reliability and relevance) and this will, in turn, influence the level of uncertainty associated with the host status determination. <del>As a general rule, the reliability of a host record diminishes with the age of the publication.</del> Further guidance on the quality of information can be found in ISPM 6 ( <i>Surveillance</i> ), ISPM 8 ( <i>Determination of pest status in an area</i> ) and IPPC Secretariat (2021).	P	Category : TECHNICAL <b>(149) Japan (22 Sep 2023 6:14 AM)</b> The age of the publication itself does not directly affect the reliability of a host record.



73	The available information related to the host status of plant species or cultivars to fruit flies has varying levels of quality (i.e. completeness, reliability and relevance) and this will, in turn, influence the level of uncertainty associated with the host status determination. <del>As a general rule, the reliability of a host record diminishes with the age of the publication.</del> Further guidance on the quality of information can be found in ISPM 6 ( <i>Surveillance</i> ), <del>and</del> ISPM 8 ( <i>Determination of pest status in an area</i> ) <del>and IPPC Secretariat (2021).</del>	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(143) EPPO (19 Sep 2023 12:25 PM)</b> We propose to delete a sentence as we think the statement is not always applicable. Reliability does not necessarily change with the age of publication. Also, we prefer referencing to ISPM 8 only. We have some concern about referring to an IPPC guidance document in a standard.
73	The available information related to the host status of plant species or cultivars to fruit flies has varying levels of quality (i.e. completeness, reliability and relevance) and this will, in turn, influence the level of uncertainty associated with the host status determination.  As a general rule, the reliability of a host record diminishes with the age of the publication. Further guidance on the quality of information can be found in ISPM 6 ( <i>Surveillance</i> ), ISPM 8 ( <i>Determination of pest status in an area</i> ) and IPPC Secretariat (2021).	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(64) United States of America (21 Aug 2023 8:29 PM)</b> Creating a separate para, shows more emphasis on the quality of recent publications vs. the older one.
74	The quality of the information should be assessed based on the design of the method used to determine the <del>type-category</del> of host (e.g. sample size, number of replicates), the presentation of results and the expertise of the contributors.	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(250) Mexico (30 Sep 2023 6:35 PM)</b> For consistency with ISPM 37.
74	The quality of the information should be assessed based on the <u>trial</u> design of the method used to determine <del>the type of</del> host <u>status category</u> (e.g. sample size, number of replicates), the presentation of results and the expertise of the contributors.	P	<i>Category : EDITORIAL</i> <b>(206) European Union (28 Sep 2023 7:36 PM)</b> Clearer  See e.g. paragraphs 33 (i.e title of section 2), 34 or 53.
74	The quality of the information should be assessed based on the <u>trial</u> design of the method used to determine <del>the type of</del> host <u>status category</u> (e.g. sample size, number of replicates), the presentation of results and the expertise of the contributors.	P	<i>Category : EDITORIAL</i> <b>(144) EPPO (19 Sep 2023 12:25 PM)</b> Clearer  See e.g. paragraphs 33 (i.e title of section 2), 34 or 53.
74	The quality of the information should be assessed based on the design of the method used to determine the <del>type-category</del> of host (e.g. sample size, number of replicates), the presentation of results and the expertise of the contributors.	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(127) IPPC Regional Workshop Latin America (18 Sep 2023 8:26 PM)</b> For consistency with ISPM 37.
74	The quality of the information should be assessed based on the design of the method used to determine the type of <del>host (e.g. sample size, host, number of replicates)</del> , the presentation of results and the expertise of the contributors.	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(65) United States of America (21 Aug 2023 8:30 PM)</b> Redundant to the info in the Sections above
74	The quality of the information should be assessed based on the design of the method used to determine the <del>type-category</del> of host (e.g. sample size, number of	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(48) COSAVE (18 Aug 2023 3:25 PM)</b>

	replicates), the presentation of results and the expertise of the contributors.		For consistency with ISPM 37.
74	The quality of the information should be assessed based on the design of the method used to determine the <del>type-category</del> of host (e.g. sample size, number of replicates), the presentation of results and the expertise of the contributors.	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(34) Uruguay (15 Aug 2023 7:54 PM)</b> For consistency with ISPM 37.
75	The completeness of the information should be assessed against the criteria listed in <del>the the section on</del> General requirements <del>requirements section of in</del> this standard and the evaluation criteria listed in section 3 of this annex. <del>National plant protection organizations NPPOs</del> should consider the key elements for the determination of host status to be the identification of the plant species or cultivar and the fruit fly species by a specialist taxonomist, the deposition of voucher specimens of plant and fruit fly species, and the details provided of the fruit origin and condition.	P	<i>Category : EDITORIAL</i> <b>(233) Australia (29 Sep 2023 3:48 AM)</b> Improved clarity.
77	The following cases are some examples of situations where there can be particular uncertainty associated with the host status determination because of <del>inadequate incomplete and lower quality</del> information:	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(66) United States of America (21 Aug 2023 8:33 PM)</b> for the consistency of words used in the draft
80	One or both parent species of a newly developed hybrid or cultivar are known natural or conditional hosts ( <del>in which case, the host status of the hybrid or cultivar should be considered for its potential as a natural or conditional host until it can be confirmed otherwise</del> ).	C	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(193) South Africa (28 Sep 2023 12:07 PM)</b> Suggestion for deletion of the sentence:" in which case, the host status of the hybrid or cultivar should be considered for its potential as a natural or conditional host until it can be confirmed otherwise". This is because this sentence seems not to be relevant to leading Paragraph No 77 which aims at simply providing examples of cases where uncertainty associated with host status determination may arise. Paragraph No 77 is not aimed at providing guidance on uncertain cases. The guidance on dealing with uncertainty in host status determination is properly described in Paragraph No 82.
80	One or both <del>parent-parental</del> species of a newly developed hybrid or cultivar are known natural or conditional hosts ( <del>in which case, consider</del> the host status of the hybrid <del>or cultivar should be considered for its potential as is</del> a <u>potential</u> natural or conditional host until it can be confirmed otherwise).	P	<i>Category : EDITORIAL</i> <b>(67) United States of America (21 Aug 2023 8:37 PM)</b> Better flow.
81	<u>T</u> here is a taxonomic change in a plant or fruit fly species. If there is a taxonomic change that splits a fruit fly species into two or more species, the host range of each valid species could potentially be different. Similarly, if two or more fruit fly	P	<i>Category : EDITORIAL</i> <b>(234) Australia (29 Sep 2023 3:49 AM)</b> Correct typo.

	species that were thought to be different are now synonymized, the singular new species is likely to have a broader host range. Therefore, particular attention should be paid to taxonomic changes when evaluating host records.		
81	<u>T</u> here is a taxonomic change in a plant or fruit fly species. If there is a taxonomic change that splits a fruit fly species into two or more species, the host range of each valid species could potentially be different. Similarly, if two or more fruit fly species that were thought to be different are now synonymized, the singular new species is likely to have a broader host range. Therefore, particular attention should be paid to taxonomic changes when evaluating host records.	P	<i>Category : EDITORIAL</i> <b>(215) New Zealand (28 Sep 2023 11:43 PM)</b> Typo?
81	<del>here</del> <u>T</u> here is a taxonomic change in a plant or fruit fly species. If there is a taxonomic change that splits a fruit fly species into two or more species, the host range of each valid species could potentially be different. Similarly, if two or more fruit fly species that were thought to be different are now synonymized, the singular new species is likely to have a broader host range. Therefore, particular attention should be paid to taxonomic changes when evaluating host records.	P	<i>Category : EDITORIAL</i> <b>(207) European Union (28 Sep 2023 7:38 PM)</b> Typo.
81	here is a taxonomic change in a plant or fruit fly species. If there is a taxonomic change that splits a fruit fly species into two or more species, the host range of each valid species could potentially be different. Similarly, if two or more fruit fly species that were thought to be different are now synonymized, the singular new species is likely to have a broader host range. Therefore, particular attention should be paid to taxonomic changes when evaluating host records.	C	<i>Category : EDITORIAL</i> <b>(192) South Africa (28 Sep 2023 12:03 PM)</b> Proposed for addition of letter "T", grammatically correct.
81	<u>T</u> here is a taxonomic change in a plant or fruit fly species. If there is a taxonomic change that splits a fruit fly species into two or more species, the host range of each valid species could potentially be different. Similarly, if two or more fruit fly species that were thought to be different are now synonymized, the singular new species is likely to have a broader host range. Therefore, particular attention should be paid to taxonomic changes when evaluating host records.	P	<i>Category : EDITORIAL</i> <b>(174) Japan (27 Sep 2023 8:04 AM)</b>
81	<del>here</del> <u>T</u> here is a taxonomic change in a plant or fruit fly species. If there is a taxonomic change that splits a fruit fly species into two or more species, the host range of each valid species could potentially be different. Similarly, if two or more fruit fly species that were thought to be different are now synonymized, the singular new species is likely to have a broader host range. Therefore, particular attention should be paid to taxonomic changes when evaluating host records.	P	<i>Category : EDITORIAL</i> <b>(145) EPPPO (19 Sep 2023 12:25 PM)</b> Typo
81	<u>T</u> here is a taxonomic change in a plant or fruit fly species. If there is a taxonomic change that splits a fruit fly species into two or more species, the host range of each	P	<i>Category : EDITORIAL</i> <b>(128) IPPC Regional Workshop Latin America (18 Sep 2023 8:26 PM)</b>

	valid species could potentially be different. Similarly, if two or more fruit fly species that were thought to be different are now synonymized, the singular new species is likely to have a broader host range. Therefore, particular attention should be paid to taxonomic changes when evaluating host records.		
81	<del>here is a taxonomic change-</del> Taxonomic changes in a <del>plant or</del> fruit fly species. <del>If there is a taxonomic change-species</del> that splits-split a fruit fly species into two or more species, the host range of each valid species could potentially be different. <del>Similarly, if f</del> two or more fruit fly species <del>that were thought to be different</del> are now synonymized, the singular new species is likely to have a broader host range. Therefore, particular attention should be paid to taxonomic changes when evaluating host records.	P	Category : EDITORIAL <b>(68) United States of America (21 Aug 2023 8:41 PM)</b> For clarity and better flow.
81	There is a taxonomic change in a plant or fruit fly species. If there is a taxonomic change that splits a fruit fly species into two or more species, the host range of each valid species could potentially be different. Similarly, if two or more fruit fly species that were thought to be different are now synonymized, the singular new species is likely to have a broader host range. Therefore, particular attention should be paid to taxonomic changes when evaluating host records.	P	Category : EDITORIAL <b>(13) CA (12 Aug 2023 2:19 AM)</b> The letter "T" is missing from the word "There".
81	There is a taxonomic change in a plant or fruit fly species. If there is a taxonomic change that splits a fruit fly species into two or more species, the host range of each valid species could potentially be different. Similarly, if two or more fruit fly species that were thought to be different are now synonymized, the singular new species is likely to have a broader host range. Therefore, particular attention should be paid to taxonomic changes when evaluating host records.	P	Category : EDITORIAL <b>(8) Colombia (10 Aug 2023 11:05 PM)</b> The letter "T" is missing from the word "There".
82	The result of <del>an analysis-a determination</del> of host status should be accompanied by <del>a determination-an evaluation</del> of the level and nature of the associated uncertainty. If the level of uncertainty is too high, and the NPPO cannot determine host status, appropriate field surveillance by fruit sampling or field trials should be used to determine host status (see step C in the section on General requirements in this standard).	P	Category : TECHNICAL <b>(251) Mexico (30 Sep 2023 6:36 PM)</b> To be consistent with the text
82	The result of an analysis of host status should be accompanied by a determination of the level and nature of the associated uncertainty. If the level of uncertainty is too high, and the NPPO cannot determine host status, appropriate field surveillance by fruit sampling or field trials <u>conducted under semi-natural conditions</u> should be used to determine host status (see step C in the section on General requirements in this standard).	P	Category : TECHNICAL <b>(208) European Union (28 Sep 2023 7:39 PM)</b> See C3 and title of section 2 in ISPM 37.
82	The result of an analysis of host status should be accompanied by a determination of the level and nature of the associated uncertainty. <u>If there are uncertainties in the</u>	P	Category : TECHNICAL <b>(150) Japan (22 Sep 2023 6:17 AM)</b> "too high" may be subjective and its

	<u>information used to determine host status</u> <del>If the level of uncertainty is too high,</del> and the NPPO cannot determine host status, appropriate field surveillance by fruit sampling or field trials should be used to determine host status (see step C in the section on General requirements in this standard).		interpretation may vary.
82	The result of an analysis of host status should be accompanied by a determination of the level and nature of the associated uncertainty. If the level of uncertainty is too high, and the NPPO cannot determine host status, appropriate field surveillance by fruit sampling or field trials <u>conducted under semi-natural conditions</u> should be used to determine host status (see step C in the section on General requirements in this standard).	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(146) EPPO (19 Sep 2023 12:25 PM)</b> See C3 and title of section 2 in ISPM 37.
82	The result of <u>an analysis-a determination</u> of host status should be accompanied by <del>a determination-an evaluation</del> of the level and nature of the associated uncertainty. If the level of uncertainty is too high, and the NPPO cannot determine host status, appropriate field surveillance by fruit sampling or field trials should be used to determine host status (see step C in the section on General requirements in this standard).	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(129) IPPC Regional Workshop Latin America (18 Sep 2023 8:26 PM)</b> For consistency along the draft.
82	The result of an analysis of host status <u>based on the available information</u> should be accompanied by a determination of the level and nature of the associated uncertainty. If the level of uncertainty is too high, and the NPPO cannot determine host status, appropriate field surveillance by fruit sampling or field trials should be used to determine host status (see step C in the section on General requirements in this standard).	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(95) Brazil (13 Sep 2023 10:09 PM)</b> For clarification, once the uncertainty is not based on field trials or surveillance
82	The result of an analysis of host status should be accompanied by <del>a determination-an evaluation</del> of the level and nature of the associated uncertainty. If the level of uncertainty is too high, and the NPPO cannot determine host status, appropriate field surveillance by fruit sampling or field trials should be used to determine host status (see step C in the section on General requirements in this standard).	P	<i>Category : EDITORIAL</i> <b>(50) COSAVE (18 Aug 2023 3:28 PM)</b>
82	The result of <u>an analysis-a determination</u> of host status should be accompanied by a determination of the level and nature of the associated uncertainty. If the level of uncertainty is too high, and the NPPO cannot determine host status, appropriate field surveillance by fruit sampling or field trials should be used to determine host status (see step C in the section on General requirements in this standard).	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(49) COSAVE (18 Aug 2023 3:27 PM)</b> For consistency along the draft.
82	The result of <u>an analysis-a determination</u> of host status should be accompanied by <del>a determination-an evaluation</del> of the level and nature of the associated uncertainty. If the level of uncertainty is too high, and the NPPO cannot determine host status, appropriate field surveillance by fruit sampling or field trials should be used to determine host status (see step C in the section on General requirements in this standard).	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(35) Uruguay (15 Aug 2023 7:55 PM)</b> For consistency along the draft.

	standard).		
83	<b>54. Application of the host status of a fruit to a fruit fly in pest risk analysis</b>	P	<i>Category : EDITORIAL</i> <b>(130) IPPC Regional Workshop Latin America (18 Sep 2023 8:26 PM)</b> Consequential change
83	<b>54. Application of the host status of a fruit to a fruit fly in pest risk analysis</b>	P	<i>Category : EDITORIAL</i> <b>(36) Uruguay (15 Aug 2023 7:56 PM)</b> Consequential change
88	in the evaluation and selection of pest risk management options <del>to mitigate the pest risk</del> (e.g. inspection, phytosanitary treatment); and	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(252) Mexico (30 Sep 2023 6:39 PM)</b> To avoid redundancy
88	in the evaluation and selection of pest risk management options <del>to mitigate the pest risk</del> (e.g. inspection, phytosanitary treatment); and	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(131) IPPC Regional Workshop Latin America (18 Sep 2023 8:26 PM)</b> To avoid redundancy
88	in the evaluation and selection of pest risk management options <del>to mitigate the pest risk</del> (e.g. inspection, phytosanitary treatment); and	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(51) COSAVE (18 Aug 2023 3:31 PM)</b> To avoid redundancy.
88	in the evaluation and selection of pest risk management options <del>to mitigate the pest risk</del> (e.g. inspection, phytosanitary treatment); and	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(37) Uruguay (15 Aug 2023 7:57 PM)</b> To avoid redundancy
89	in <u>pest</u> risk communication (e.g. consultation and sharing of information).	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(253) Mexico (30 Sep 2023 6:40 PM)</b> More appropriate term and to be consistent
89	in <u>pest</u> risk communication (e.g. consultation and sharing of information).	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(132) IPPC Regional Workshop Latin America (18 Sep 2023 8:26 PM)</b> For consistency
89	in <u>pest</u> risk communication (e.g. consultation and sharing of information).	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(52) COSAVE (18 Aug 2023 3:32 PM)</b> For consistency
89	in <u>pest</u> risk communication (e.g. consultation and sharing of information).	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(38) Uruguay (15 Aug 2023 7:58 PM)</b> For consistency
91	When a PRA is conducted for import of fruit from a plant species or cultivar categorized as a conditional host, the pest risk of the conditional host should be considered as being lower than that of a natural host (when infested by the same species of fruit fly). Phytosanitary measures should be appropriate for the pest risk posed by the conditional host. <u>The measures should specify features of the conditional host to differentiate it from a natural host. For example, the commodity description could include the level of fruit ripeness, or the nature of pre- and post-harvest activities.</u>	P	<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i> <b>(216) New Zealand (28 Sep 2023 11:46 PM)</b> It could be useful to add some examples of how features of the conditional host could be used to develop distinct phytosanitary measures. Suggested wording: 'Phytosanitary measures should be appropriate for the pest risk posed by the conditional host. The measures should specify features of the conditional host to differentiate it from a natural host. For example, the commodity description could include the level of fruit ripeness, or the

			nature of pre- and post- harvest activities.”
91	When a PRA is conducted for import of fruit from a plant species or cultivar categorized as a conditional host, the pest risk of the conditional host should be considered as being lower than that of a natural host (when infested by the same species of fruit fly). Phytosanitary measures should be <del>appropriate for consistent with the pest risk posed by the conditional host</del> risk.	P	<i>Category : EDITORIAL</i> <b>(209) European Union (28 Sep 2023 7:40 PM)</b> Clearer.
91	When a PRA is conducted for import of fruit from a plant species or cultivar categorized as a conditional host, the pest risk of the conditional host should be considered as being lower than that of a natural host (when infested by the same species of fruit fly). Phytosanitary measures should be <del>appropriate for consistent with the pest risk posed by the conditional host</del> risk.	P	<i>Category : EDITORIAL</i> <b>(147) EPPO (19 Sep 2023 12:25 PM)</b> Clearer.
92	Even if plant species or cultivars are categorized as natural hosts, they may not all pose the same pest risk. Therefore, when conducting a PRA for import of fruit from a plant species or cultivar categorized as a natural host for a particular fruit fly species, the evidence that led to the decision of natural host status should be described in detail so that phytosanitary measures can be selected that are appropriate for the level of pest risk posed. <u>The pest risk of a conditional host should be considered to be lower than that of a natural host when infested by the same species of fruit fly, but the measures should provide the same level of protection as a treatment.</u>	P	<i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i> <b>(211) New Zealand (28 Sep 2023 11:33 PM)</b> Additional text proposed to highlight the differences in risk and phytosanitary measures for natural or conditional hosts.
92	Even if plant species or cultivars are categorized as natural hosts, they may not all pose the same pest risk. Therefore, when conducting a PRA for import of fruit from a plant species or cultivar categorized as a natural host for a particular fruit fly species, the evidence that led to the decision of natural host status should be described in detail so that phytosanitary measures can be selected that are appropriate for the level of pest risk posed. <u>The pest risk of a conditional host should be considered to be lower than that of a natural host when infested by the same species of fruit fly, but the measures should provide the same level of protection as a treatment.</u>	P	<i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i> <b>(104) PPPO (17 Sep 2023 7:48 PM)</b> Additional text proposed to highlight the differences in risk and phytosanitary measures for natural or conditional hosts.
94	<b>IPPC Secretariat.</b> 2021. <i>Pest status guide – Understanding the principal requirements for pest status determination.</i> Rome, IPPC Secretariat, FAO. xv + 77 pp.	P	<i>Category : EDITORIAL</i> <b>(69) United States of America (21 Aug 2023 8:56 PM)</b> Relevant ISPMs are added.
96	This section is not part of the standard. The Standards Committee in May 2016	P	<i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i> <b>(235) Australia (29 Sep 2023 3:50 AM)</b>

	<p>requested the secretariat to gather information on any potential implementation issues related to this draft. Please provide details and proposals on how to address these potential implementation issues.</p> <p><u><a href="#">APPENDIX 2: Classification of alternative terms describing host status of fruit to fruit fly to terms used by ISPM 37</a></u></p> <p><u><a href="#">Natural Host</a></u>  <u><a href="#">Host, field host, primary host, preferred host, commercial host, regulated host, reproductive host, secondary host, wild host, occasional host, minor host, poor host, rare host, alternate host, realized host, moderately good host, good host, very good host, fundamental host.</a></u></p> <p><u><a href="#">Conditional Host</a></u>  <u><a href="#">host, non-preferred host, experimental host, laboratory host, potential host, artificial host, conditional non-host.</a></u></p> <p><u><a href="#">Non-host</a></u>  <u><a href="#">Natural non-host</a></u></p>	<p>The inclusion of this information in a table as an appendix will assist NPPO's in the use of the correct host categories as used in ISPM 37 when comparing to terms used in the literature.</p> <p>This table was produced by the EWG showing how a range of terms align to the terms in ISPM 37. (See email from NPPO Australia to Secretariat for copy of the table format).</p>
<p>96</p>	<p>This section is not part of the standard. The Standards Committee in May 2016 requested the secretariat to gather information on any potential implementation issues related to this draft. Please provide details and proposals on how to address these potential implementation issues.</p>	<p>C <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>  <b>(167) APPPC (26 Sep 2023 10:59 AM)</b>                  Collection of lists of conditional host and non host of individual fruit fly species may help to implement this Annex.</p>
<p>96</p>	<p>This section is not part of the standard. The Standards Committee in May 2016 requested the secretariat to gather information on any potential implementation issues related to this draft. Please provide details and proposals on how to address these potential implementation issues.</p> <p><u><a href="#">There will be some issues with the implementation of this standard in relation to the categorization of the terms. Therefore, Appendix 2 will address these and should be included in this standard.</a></u></p>	<p>P <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>  <b>(105) PPPO (17 Sep 2023 7:48 PM)</b>                  Suggested Appendix 2 by PPPO is a table to bring consistency in describing host status. PPPO SC Members will provide this table.</p>



	<p><u>APPENDIX 2: Classification of alternative terms describing host status of fruit to fruit fly to terms used by ISPM 37</u></p> <p><u>(There is a table that is supposed to go here under Appendix 2, but we are unable to insert the table into this online document. PPPO SC Members will provide this table).</u></p>	
--	--	--

