



Food and Agriculture  
Organization of the  
United Nations



International  
Plant Protection  
Convention

# REPORT

## Expert Working Group on the revision of ISPM 26 (Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (*Tephritidae*)) (2021-010)

Wellington, New Zealand

10-14 July 2023

IPPC Secretariat

IPPC Secretariat. 2023. *Report on the meeting of the Expert Working Group on the revision of ISPM 26 (Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)) (2021-010), 10-14 July 2023*, Wellington, New Zealand. Published by FAO on behalf of the Secretariat of the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC). 23 pages. Licence: CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO.

The designations employed and the presentation of material in this information product do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) concerning the legal or development status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries. The mention of specific companies or products of manufacturers, whether or not these have been patented, does not imply that these have been endorsed or recommended by FAO in preference to others of a similar nature that are not mentioned.

The views expressed in this information product are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of FAO.

© FAO, 2023



Some rights reserved. This work is made available under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 3.0 IGO licence (CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO; <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/igo/legalcode>).

Under the terms of this licence, this work may be copied, redistributed and adapted for non-commercial purposes, provided that the work is appropriately cited. In any use of this work, there should be no suggestion that FAO endorses any specific organization, products or services. The use of the FAO logo is not permitted. If the work is adapted, then it must be licensed under the same or equivalent Creative Commons licence. If a translation of this work is created, it must include the following disclaimer along with the required citation: "This translation was not created by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). FAO is not responsible for the content or accuracy of this translation. The original English edition shall be the authoritative edition."

Disputes arising under the licence that cannot be settled amicably will be resolved by mediation and arbitration as described in Article 8 of the licence except as otherwise provided herein. The applicable mediation rules will be the mediation rules of the World Intellectual Property Organization <http://www.wipo.int/amc/en/mediation/rules> and any arbitration will be conducted in accordance with the Arbitration Rules of the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL).

**Third-party materials.** Users wishing to reuse material from this work that is attributed to a third party, such as tables, figures or images, are responsible for determining whether permission is needed for that reuse and for obtaining permission from the copyright holder. The risk of claims resulting from infringement of any third-party-owned component in the work rests solely with the user.

**Sales, rights and licensing.** FAO information products are available on the FAO website ([www.fao.org/publications](http://www.fao.org/publications)) and can be purchased through [publications-sales@fao.org](mailto:publications-sales@fao.org). Requests for commercial use should be submitted via: [www.fao.org/contact-us/licence-request](http://www.fao.org/contact-us/licence-request). Queries regarding rights and licensing should be submitted to: [copyright@fao.org](mailto:copyright@fao.org).

## CONTENTS

<b>1. Opening of the meeting</b> .....	4
<b>1.1 Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat and introductions</b> .....	4
<b>1.2 Presentation of the standard setting process and the role of participants</b> .....	4
<b>2. Meeting arrangements</b> .....	4
<b>2.1 Selection of the chairperson</b> .....	4
<b>2.2 Selection of the rapporteur</b> .....	4
<b>2.3 Adoption of the agenda</b> .....	4
<b>3. Administrative matters</b> .....	4
<b>4. Review of the specification</b> .....	4
<b>5. Review of discussion papers</b> .....	5
<b>5.1 Discussion Paper: Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae) – Prepared by Sonya BROUGHTON</b> .....	5
<b>5.2 Discussion paper: Specification 75 - Prepared by Caio Cesar SIMAO</b> .....	5
<b>5.3 Discussion paper: Revision of ISPM 26 (Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)) – Prepared by Toshihisa KAMIJI</b> .....	5
<b>5.4 Notes on the tasks of specification 75: Revision of ISPM 26 (Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)) - Prepared by Hoang Kim THOA</b> ..	6
<b>5.5 Notes and revisions to ISPM 26 - Prepared by Arturo Bello RIVERA</b> .....	6
<b>5.6 Discussion paper on the revision of ISPM 26 (Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)) (2021-010) – Prepared by María Florencia VAZQUEZ</b> .....	6
<b>5.7 Issues with ISPM 26 where Fruit Fly Status is Absent: The Entire Country is Pest Free – prepared by George GILL</b> .....	7
<b>5.8 Discussion Paper on the Revision of ISPM 26 (Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)) (2021-010) - Prepared by Cory PENCA</b> .....	7
<b>5.9 Discussion Paper on the Revision of ISPM 26 - Prepared by Zhihong LI</b> .....	7
<b>5.10 Review of guides and related IPPC material</b> .....	8
<b>6. Development of the Revision of ISPM 26 (Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)) (2021-010)</b> .....	8
<b>6.1 Brainstorming session to draft the Revision of ISPM 26</b> .....	8
<b>6.2 Revision of ISPM 26</b> .....	10
<b>7. Any other business</b> .....	17
<b>8. Close of the meeting</b> .....	17
Appendix 1: Agenda .....	18
Appendix 2: Documents list.....	20
Appendix 3: Participants list.....	22

## **1. Opening of the meeting**

### **1.1 Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat and introductions**

[1] The IPPC Secretariat (hereafter referred to as “the secretariat”) opened the meeting and welcomed all participants to the meeting of the Expert Working Group (EWG) on the revision of ISPM 26 (Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)) (2021-010) and thanked the New Zealand NPPO, for hosting the EWG. The IPPC Secretariat also thanked all members for participating in the meeting.

[2] Peter THOMSON, Director of Animal and Plant Health, Biosecurity New Zealand, Ministry for Primary Industries, welcomed all participants to New Zealand with a Māori karakia (prayer). Mr THOMSON described his long association with the IPPC and the importance of international standard setting work. He acknowledged the groups expertise, thanked them for travelling to New Zealand and for their commitment to revising the standard during the week.

[3] The participants introduced themselves.

### **1.2 Presentation of the standard setting process and the role of participants**

[4] The secretariat gave a presentation summarizing the standard setting process<sup>1</sup>. The secretariat also outlined the roles of the EWG participants, explaining that the experts should consider the topic of the standard from a globally acceptable perspective, rather than as national or regional representatives.

## **2. Meeting arrangements**

### **2.1 Selection of the chairperson**

[5] The EWG selected Ms Sonya BROUGHTON as chairperson.

### **2.2 Selection of the rapporteur**

[6] The EWG selected Mr Caio Cesar SIMAO as rapporteur.

### **2.3 Adoption of the agenda**

[7] The EWG adopted the agenda (Appendix 1).

## **3. Administrative matters**

[8] The secretariat introduced the documents list (Appendix 2) and the participants list (Appendix 3), and invited participants to notify the secretariat of any information that required updating in the participants list or was missing from it.

[9] The host representative, Ms Joanne WILSON informed the participants of the local arrangements.

## **4. Review of the specification**

[10] The Steward, Ms Joanne WILSON introduced Specification 75 (*Revision of ISPM 26 (Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae))*), laying out the tasks of the EWG.<sup>2</sup> She noted, that the main tasks for the EWG were to improve its consistency with ISPM 4 (*Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas*) and ISPM 8 (*Determination of pest status in an area*), reduce ambiguity to promote consistent interpretation, define criteria for suspension, reinstatement and revocation of FF-PFAs, and to review annexes and appendices.

[11] Ms WILSON noted that many of the papers prepared by the EWG members were specifically structured around the tasks in the specification. She commented that the papers were of high quality and that the

---

<sup>1</sup> 15\_EWG\_ISPM26\_2023\_Jul.

<sup>2</sup> Specification 75: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/91863/>

approach of basing the papers around the tasks would benefit discussions of the key issues with the standard.

- [12] She also noted that if the EWG determined that further revisions outside the scope of the Specification 75 would be needed, the EWG could identify these, and submit it to the Standards Committee (SC) for consideration.

## 5. Review of discussion papers

- [13] Most discussion papers were reviewed during the virtual pre-meeting, held 5 days prior to the face-to-face meeting.

### 5.1 Discussion Paper: Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae) – Prepared by Sonya BROUGHTON

- [14] Ms Sonya BROUGHTON presented the discussion paper<sup>3</sup> on the Australian perspective of the establishment and maintenance of several fruit fly pest free areas and described the geographical differences between some of these PFAs e.g., Tasmania and Western Australia. She highlighted that setting criteria for outbreak, suspension, reinstatement, and revocation requires consideration of differences in climate and ecology and how those factors affect likelihood of establishment of fruit flies.

- [15] Ms Sonya BROUGHTON was interested in discussing the differences between trading based on absence status of PFA and clarifying what is needed and when. She stressed that surveillance should be proportionate to the risk being faced and set the trap check frequency etc. accordingly. She recommended including a structured decision-making framework for determining the relevant criteria for the establishment, outbreak, suspension, reinstatement, and revocation of pest free areas for fruit flies and the complexities of this subject.

### 5.2 Discussion paper: Specification 75 - Prepared by Caio Cesar SIMAO

- [16] Mr Caio Cesar SIMAO (Brazil) presented the discussion paper<sup>4</sup> on the Brazilian experience with establishing and maintaining FF-PFAs for *Anastrepha grandis* in a large and diverse country. He discussed the importance of FF-PFAs for Brazil and that the revision of ISPM 26 should take into consideration the biology of target fruit flies when establishing FF-PFAs, changes in trap density according to ISPM 4 definitions and, that controls on the movement of regulated articles need to be in place in areas where fruit flies could establish. His concerns with the existing ISPM 26 were similar to others, in that FF-PFAs take a lot of effort to maintain especially in areas where the climatic conditions prevent establishment of the target species.
- [17] It was noted by another member that the current ISPM 26 is unclear about what to do when a FF population is not able to establish long term, but could be a quarantine concern to another country or when it could spread to other areas in the short term.

### 5.3 Discussion paper: Revision of ISPM 26 (Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)) – Prepared by Toshihisa KAMIJI

- [18] Mr Toshihisa KAMIJI (Japan) presented the discussion paper<sup>5</sup>. He discussed the importance of fruit flies such as *Bactrocera dorsalis* and *Bactrocera tryoni* which are widely distributed in the tropics and subtropics, but are not distributed in Japan. Mr KAMIJI highlighted revisions to ISPM 8 and ISPM 4 that were not consistent with the current ISPM 26 and that determinations of pest ‘absence’ as per ISPM 8 should be out of scope for the revision of ISPM 26 as the establishment of FF-PFAs in these

---

<sup>3</sup> 05\_EWG\_ISPM26\_2023\_Jul

<sup>4</sup> 06\_EWG\_ISPM26\_2023\_Jul

<sup>5</sup> 07\_EWG\_ISPM26\_2023\_Jul

circumstances should not be relevant especially where climatic conditions were unsuitable for establishment. Examples from of *Bactrocera dorsalis* and *Bactrocera tsuneonis* were provided.

- [19] Mr KAMIJI highlighted that the criteria for determining whether a recently detected fruit fly population constitutes an incursion or an established population was dependent on the ecology of the target fruit fly species e.g. univoltine compared with multivoltine. He proposed that the triggers for suspension of a FF-PFA also needed revising to take into consideration fruit fly biology, responses to attractants etc. as the current triggers were inappropriate for some species. Likewise, the current criteria for reinstatement of a FF-PFA following a suspension is not applicable to all fruit fly species and environmental conditions.
- [20] Mr KAMIJI provided suggestions in his paper on possible revisions that could be made to reduce ambiguity and increase consistency across ISPMs. He proposed that appendices could be moved from the ISPM to implementation and guidance materials.

#### **5.4 Notes on the tasks of specification 75: Revision of ISPM 26 (Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)) - Prepared by Hoang Kim THOA**

- [21] Ms Hoang Kim THOA (Vietnam) presented the discussion paper<sup>6</sup>. Ms THOA proposed that the characteristics of a FF-PFA need revision to include consideration of climate within a country. These climatic considerations included precipitation, relative humidity, temperature, wind speed etc. Climatic conditions can have a significant impact on the success of a FF-PFA. She also proposed that the revised ISPM 26 should provide more detail on buffer zones to FF-PFAs and how these should vary depending on the target species and flight range. She also discussed the roles and responsibilities of the NPPO and stakeholders in the maintenance of FF-PFAs.
- [22] As with other papers, Ms THOA discussed here views on defining the criteria for suspension, reinstatement and revocation of FF-PFAs and how the current criteria is not appropriate for all fruit fly species. She noted that there needed to be more links and alignment with other ISPMs throughout the revised ISPM 26 including ISPM 17 (*Pest reporting*), ISPM 10 (*Requirements for the establishment of pest free places of production and pest free production sites*) and ISPM 4. She proposed that ISPM 26 should be considered as an annex to ISPM 4. She also noted that it is important to consider potential impact of flies on biodiversity and that management strategies should be adjusted to suit the conditions of each country.

#### **5.5 Notes and revisions to ISPM 26 - Prepared by Arturo Bello RIVERA**

- [23] Mr Arturo Bello RIVERA (Mexico) presented his proposed revisions to the text of ISPM 26<sup>7</sup>. His main discussion points were around public awareness campaigns and how these should be maintained to support the successful maintenance of the FF-PFA; the need for quality control activities within FF-PFA surveillance systems; and the need for regular review and audit, of FF-PFAs by NPPOs to ensure they are maintained as intended.
- [24] Mr RIVERA provided the group with copies of procedural manuals and RSPMs prepared by his NPPO and by his region on the FF-PFAs. This included different programmes for different fruit fly species.

#### **5.6 Discussion paper on the revision of ISPM 26 (Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)) (2021-010) – Prepared by María Florencia VAZQUEZ**

- [25] Ms María Florencia VAZQUEZ (Argentina) introduced the legislation of SENASA Resolution N° 152: National fruit fly control and eradication program and Phytosanitary emergency plan for fruit flies (in English and in Spanish)<sup>8</sup>. These legislative documents were supported by Ms VAZQUEZ paper

---

<sup>6</sup> 08\_EWG\_ISPM26\_2023\_Jul

<sup>7</sup> 09\_EWG\_ISPM26\_2023\_Jul

<sup>8</sup> 10\_EWG\_ISPM26\_2023\_Jul\_En, 10\_EWG\_ISPM26\_2023\_Jul\_Sp, 16\_EWG\_ISPM26\_2023\_Jul

describing the National Fruit Fly Programme (PROCEM) operating in Argentina for *Ceratitis capitata* and *Anastrepha fraterculus*.

- [26] She noted in her discussion paper<sup>9</sup> that due to the diversity of fruit fly species, reproductive rates (univoltine or multivoltine) and response to attractants and climate, it is difficult to standardize criteria to determine an outbreak for all fruit fly genera. She provided references to support this assertion. She proposed revisions to text regarding suspension of FF-PFAs and proposed that Annex 2 remains part of the text of ISM 26 and recommended Annex 3 and Appendix 1 are moved to implementation and guidance materials.

### **5.7 Issues with ISPM 26 where Fruit Fly Status is Absent: The Entire Country is Pest Free – prepared by George GILL**

- [27] Mr George GILL (New Zealand) presented New Zealand's perspective regarding the revision of ISPM 26<sup>10</sup>. He described how New Zealand is free from all economically important species of fruit fly and is geographically isolated meaning that the country does not experience the same pressure from fruit flies as other countries. Because of these factors he proposed that differences in these conditions are highlighted in the revised ISPM 26 such as for the suspension and reinstatement of FF-PFAs. Mr GILL presented a tracked-changed draft of ISPM 26 for the group to consider.

### **5.8 Discussion Paper on the Revision of ISPM 26 (Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)) (2021-010) - Prepared by Cory PENCA**

- [28] Mr Cory PENCA (USA) presented a discussion paper<sup>11</sup>. In his opinion it is difficult to establish a universal criterion for eradication for all possible scenarios. He believed that the ISPM should require only that criteria should be established in advance of setting up a FF-PFA to avoid inconsistency in reinstatement of a FF-PFA. He also believed that it would be challenging to provide specific requirements for trap densities within a PFA as this should be based on the characteristics of the pest species.

- [29] Mr PENCA discussed the technical challenges with distinguishing between detections, incursions and established populations and when eradication occurs citing various references and experience.

- [30] He proposed that Appendix 1 is moved to implementation and guidance materials, but the Appendix should be reorganized and revised. He noted that ISPM 35 references the appendices and annexes in ISPM 26 and that changes to ISPM 35 would be required if any of them were removed from ISPM 26.

### **5.9 Discussion Paper on the Revision of ISPM 26 - Prepared by Zhihong LI**

- [31] Ms Zhihong LI (China) presented a discussion paper<sup>12</sup>. Ms LI highlighted changes in taxonomy that need to be updated in the ISPM and suggested taxonomic papers can be added as reference papers.

- [32] She noted that the group should not only improve consistency with ISPM 4 and 8, but also with ISPM 37 which has recently been revised.

- [33] Ms LI believed that the Annexes and Appendices should all be retained and required revisions based on consultation with experts in her country. She asserted that these materials are particularly important for developing countries.

- [34] Ms LI discussed her experiences with FF-PFAs for *Bactrocera minax* and *Bactrocera tsuneonis* and standards that her country has for PFAs based on ISPM 26. She presented examples of new traps being

---

<sup>9</sup> 16\_EWG\_ISPM26\_2023\_Jul

<sup>10</sup> 11\_EWG\_ISPM26\_2023\_Jul\_Rev1

<sup>11</sup> 12\_EWG\_ISPM26\_2023\_Jul

<sup>12</sup> 13\_EWG\_ISPM26\_2023\_Jul

used in China that can be added to the appendix. One trap example developed in China is an integrated trap that combines the functions of McPhail and Steiner traps known as a green ball trap.

### 5.10 Review of guides and related IPPC material

- [35] The Secretariat presented a review of guides and related IPPC material, and the recent progress in the development of ISPMs related to ISPM 26<sup>13</sup>.
- [36] The Secretariat clarified to the group the difference between requirements and guidance, and the status of annexes as part of the ISPM and appendices as guidance materials. Appendices are generally no longer included in ISPMs.
- [37] The steward clarified that anything the group decided to move to guidance information is not needed to be revised by the EWG and could be managed by the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC).
- [38] The Chair thanked all participants providing discussion papers.

## 6. Development of the Revision of ISPM 26 (Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)) (2021-010)

- [39] The secretariat drew the attention of the EWG to the reference documents for drafting ISPMs: the *IPPC style guide*, ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*) and the *Guidelines for a consistent ISPM terminology* (in the *IPPC procedure manual for standard setting*)<sup>14</sup>. The secretariat highlighted the need for consistency in the use of terms, both within the draft and with other ISPMs. When drafting the annex, if a suitable term was available in ISPM 5 then that term should be used; new terms could be defined or, if they could be used in other ISPMs, proposed for inclusion in ISPM 5.
- [40] The Chair suggested that the group should focus on the core text of ISPM 26 itself and all supplementary documents (Annexes and Appendices) could be put aside for another group (IC) if it was determined that these should no longer remain part of the standard. Determining what should stay in the standard would be the one of the tasks for the group to discuss.

### 6.1 Brainstorming session to draft the Revision of ISPM 26

- [41] The chair, Ms Sonya BROUGHTON opened the brainstorming session with a discussion on the broader concepts from Specification 75. In particular, she initiated a discussion on Task 3, about when a fruit fly detection constitutes an incursion or an established population.
- [42] Opinions from the group varied but it was agreed that there needed to be some nuancing around the definitions of an incursion and an established population in the standard and the level of surveillance that is needed. It was questioned at what point a decision is made about when an incursion becomes an established/breeding population that is unable to be eradicated. It was also suggested that requiring three generations of no fruit fly detections to declare eradication for some species may be inappropriate for species that may die out during the winter. Specific discussion points were as follows.
- [43] Mr Toshihisa KAMIJI proposed that different fruit flies have different ecological characteristics and therefore it is difficult to define a unified criterion for “incursion” or “established population” for all species. Mr KAMIJI referenced section 2.3 of his paper to highlight this point.
- [44] Mr PENCA suggested that the term “establishment” should be removed from ISPM 26 as once a population has established, then the country can no longer claim a FF-PFA. There may be specific

---

<sup>13</sup> 14\_EWG\_ISPM26\_2023\_Jul

<sup>14</sup> *IPPC style guide*: [www.ippc.int/en/publications/132/](http://www.ippc.int/en/publications/132/); ISPM 5: [www.ippc.int/en/publications/622/](http://www.ippc.int/en/publications/622/); *IPPC procedure manual for standard setting*: [www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/ippc-standard-setting-procedure-manual/](http://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/ippc-standard-setting-procedure-manual/)

---

measures that can be adjusted but the specific criteria for moving between “transient”, “established”, “incursion” may be too onerous, e.g., three life cycles.

- [45] Mr SIMAO suggested it makes sense to keep three generations of no detections as a criteria for declaring an eradication. This is because an importing country may place even more onerous requirements on an exporting country if not included in the standard. Having criteria in ISPM or guidance allows exporting countries a starting point for this negotiation.
- [46] Other members agreed that three generations of no fruit fly detections are impractical and that there are other methods for determining practical eradication. For example, increasing trap numbers to detect very low numbers of fruit flies if they are lure responsible. For a fruit fly to have a functional population, there needs to be a specific number of individuals to allow for breeding. In some scenarios, three generations was suggested to be too much and it was proposed to use terminology of “up to three generations”.
- [47] This aligned with how Argentina applies this concept for species that cannot survive winter temperatures and can therefore not establish. A single generation has been accepted for some species by trading partners to re-instate FF-PFA.
- [48] It was also noted during discussions that trap numbers should be interpreted with caution and other methods of detection such as fruit cutting/sampling should be considered regarding declarations of eradication. The group discussed that the probability of something establishing may vary depending on pathways of entry, measures to prevent entry, urban vs production areas, climate and potential for establishment. It was questioned whether it was necessary to be concerned about numbers of fruit flies in a trap, environmental variables, the polyphagous nature and invasiveness of some species.
- [49] ISPM 26 is currently a catch all ISPM so it may need to be less prescriptive. The group also considered using ‘may’ instead of ‘should’ for various triggers and generations for eradication. They discussed whether to distinguish between species, how this could be done and, if this is more appropriate for implementation and guidance material.
- [50] Mr KAMIJI referred to his paper that proposed guidance be provided for each species to clarify what is considered an establishment versus a detection.
- [51] Ms VAZQUEZ also thought it was important to talk about fertile adults (female and male). If an inseminated female was detected, then this would constitute an outbreak. She suggested that the group re-defined an “outbreak”. Her paper proposed triggers.
- [52] Mr RIVERA described differences in species behaviour, altitude, climate and that these factors may also impact triggers. The group briefly discussed how climate change was changing the way species were behaving.
- [53] It was agreed that there needed to be nuancing around the definitions of an incursion and established/breeding population that needs refining in the standard and the level of surveillance that is needed. There was discussion about when detections become an incursion and when an incursion becomes an outbreak and is unable to be eradicated. The group also discussed what a functionally extinct species in an area was and how trapping effort could be optimized.
- [54] The group discussed how it was not unusual to find only males and never find a breeding population indicating that the triggers in ISPM 26 are not always clear. Participants provided examples of experiences in their own countries. An example given was the situation that New Zealand often faces where single flies have been trapped but there have been no other detections despite large increases in trap numbers. Other countries e.g., Australia, assume that if a male is present then this could potentially indicate a breeding population as traps target males not females.
- [55] There was general agreement that “three life cycles” is too onerous and species, climate conditions etc. should be considered. The wording in the ISPM was suggested to be changed to “up to three life cycles”.

It was also agreed that further work was needed by the group on triggers as well as defining what a fertile adult is. The paper presented by Mr KAMIJI provided good suggestions on triggers and this was considered further.

- [56] The group would factor in the following when discussing appropriate triggers for an incursion or outbreak: trap density, species and biology, species ecology, risk (use of SIT or male annihilation), lure responsiveness of the species climate geography, temperatures. The group would come back to these key concepts during the review of the text of ISPM 26.
- [57] Further questions were raised on what action should be taken for finding fruit flies in a PFA, i.e., detection does not mean the area will lose its PFA status. A detection alone should not be enough for a suspension but should trigger corrective actions. The current ISPM (2.4.1) allows for this.
- [58] The group discussed whether it was productive to use the term “outbreak” but rather “incursion”. ISPM 26 uses “outbreak” which does not allow for the nuance of just a detection and not an established/breeding population. Additionally, as per the definition for “outbreak” in ISPM 5, there should not be an established population in a PFA that may increase suddenly. The group decided that “outbreak” should be replaced with “incursion” in ISPM 26 and “detection” can be used for triggers. It was proposed to add a diagram/decision tree to clarify the difference between a detection, an incursion, and an outbreak, however this was thought to be more appropriate for guidance materials.
- [59] Other initial points of discussion included:
- differences between general and specific surveillance and when should each type of surveillance should be used for fruit flies;
  - the ambiguity about what can be suspended i.e. whole or part of a FF-PFA; and
  - the definition of a pest free area in the current ISPM 26 being different from ISPM 5.

## 6.2 Revision of ISPM 26

- [60] The EWG decided to review the text prepared by the steward which was updated by the secretariat with additional changes made by Mexico. The EWG moved through the standard sequentially and made the following revisions noting that the IPPC Secretariat’s editor would check scientific language.

### *Title.*

- [61] There was general agreement that the title should be updated to include ‘maintenance’ as the ISPM is not just about establishing FF-PFAs. Therefore, the title was proposed to be: “*Establishment and maintenance for pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)*”.

### *Scope*

- [62] The EWG decided to update the scope to make it clear what the standard should not apply to. This was repeated later in the general requirements and the exclusion aligns with the new text of ISPM 4 which is yet to be adopted by the CPM 18. The secretariat explained that it is acceptable to have the same concept in both sections. Therefore, the following exclusion was added:
- [63] If a country has declared a fruit fly to be absent in an area in accordance with ISPM 8 (Determination of pest status in an area), then establishing and maintaining a PFA in accordance with this ISPM, should not be required by importing countries, unless there is technical justification.

### *Definitions*

- [64] The EWG agreed that a definition of a breeding population should be included. The suggested definition is “A breeding population could be an established population or a transient population”. An established population can go into perpetuation however, a transient population could breed but die off in winter. Although ‘establishment (of a pest)’ and ‘transience’ are defined in the glossary, the common element for both, which is not included in ISPM 5, is the occurrence of a ‘breeding population’.

---

### ***Outline of requirements***

- [65] EWG agreed to copy outline of requirements as listed in ISPM 4 to ISPM 26 to be better aligned. The elements previously listed here were deleted. Reference to Annex 1 was updated. The last sentence was updated as following:
- [66] This standard includes specific requirements for the surveillance activities of fruit fly trapping and host sampling (described in Annex 1), corrective action planning (Annex 2), suspension, reinstatement, and withdrawal of FF-PFA status.

### ***Background***

- [67] The EWG made the following revisions to the background:
- [68] The EWG thought that the ISPM 5 definition of PFA is subject to interpretation and is therefore unclear. Some are reading ‘where appropriate’ as it is a contracting party’s choice rather than being something that should be technically justified, or officially maintained as something that is mandatory. In addition, there is a lack of clarity between ‘absence’ and an official PFA. The EWG decided to recommend that the TPG reviews the ISPM 5 definition of PFA to decide if further explanation is required and to make a distinction between declarations of ‘absence’ and an ‘official PFA’.
- [69] *Toxotrypana* was removed as it is no longer recognized as a genera and added ‘for example’ to the list of genera in the Tephritidae family so that text will cover future potential taxonomic changes to the family/genera. The EWG also thought that it was important to include text to specify that target fruit flies for FF-PFAs should be ‘economically important species of the order Diptera’.
- [70] EWG decided to propose a sentence to refer to the “Guide for establishing and maintaining PFA” in ISPM 26. The EWG acknowledged that the sentence is likely to be removed by the SC as this is not a normal approach to ISPMs, but the group wanted to highlight the importance of the guide and that a guide is available to support the ISPM. The sentence included was “*Guide for establishing and maintaining PFA may be referred to*”. The group proposed to include this sentence in the background section as it is not a requirement but is good background information.

### ***Impacts on biodiversity and the environment***

- [71] A section on the impacts on biodiversity and the environment was included in the revised ISPM 26 to align with newer ISPMs and task 7 of the specification. The included text aligns with the text of ISPM 4.

### ***Requirements***

#### ***1. General Requirements***

- [72] One member of the group highlighted that the current ISPM 26 does not provide guidance on when the ‘full range of elements’ should be used or when only some should be used and therefore the EWG agreed to remove the following paragraph: ‘*FF-PFAs may be established in accordance with this ISPM under a variety of situations. Some of them require the application of the full range of elements provided by this standard; others require only the application of some of these elements*’.
- [73] It was agreed by the EWG to include the concept of “Present: transient” populations and how these can be managed with the qualifier that it may be necessary to take interim measures to protect trading partners.
- [74] It was discussed to remove ambiguity regarding surveillance from the section as it implies that general surveillance is sufficient to detect fruit flies whereas the EWG agreed that specific surveillance maybe required (e.g. specific trapping) for activities in a FF-PFA. However the EWG agreed to retain, “general” when referring to surveillance specifically if the status is “absent” as this covers scenarios of absent after eradication or countries that are free of fruit flies since in this case general surveillance may be sufficient. The EWG agreed that surveillance should be risk based and determined on a case-by-case

scenario and the importing country has the option to require specific surveillance depending on the situation. “Delimiting” was removed as it is not possible to undertake delimiting survey under general surveillance.

### ***1.1 Communication and stakeholder engagement***

[75] Title was changed to align with ISPM 4.

[76] The EWG removed bulleted examples of types of awareness information and reinforced that awareness programmes should be ongoing while the FF-PFA is being maintained. The rationale for removing bullets was that the level of information about public awareness is more suited to guidance and countries have different methods of raising awareness.

### ***1.2 Supervision activities***

[77] The EWG discussed the section title but were unable to propose a better name to capture all the activities that support the programme such as supervision, review and monitoring captured in the section.

### ***1.3 Documentation and record-keeping***

[78] The EWG agreed that this section on ‘documentation and record-keeping’ should be moved from 1.2 to 1.3 for logical flow of information.

[79] The EWG also decided to change “occurrence” to “incursion” and maintain “outbreaks” as incursions can become bigger and established and turn into outbreaks.

[80] It was also questioned why records should be maintained for “at least 24 months” but the EWG agreed that it is likely that this is how long it takes to be confident that the fruit fly is not present as it spans through multiple seasons and potential generations of a species.

## ***2. Specific requirements***

[81] It was proposed to include a section under ‘specific requirements’ about criteria for interpreting detections and what constitutes a breeding population because they are fundamental principles for the standard that applies to the establishment, maintenance, corrective action plans and reinstatement of FF-PFAs.

[82] The EWG recommended to the SC to consider if a definition for ‘breeding population’ in ISPM 5 that aligns with the wording captured in specific requirements is needed. It was noted that the IPPC convention is to only define terms in ISPM 5 that are used in multiple ISPMs and the definition given in this revised ISPM 26 gives subcategories “established” and “transient” which are covered by the glossary definitions of “establishment” and “transient”, respectively, and “population” is being used in the normal dictionary sense. Therefore, the definition given in the revised ISPM 26 is sufficient.

### ***2.1 Initiation of the FF-PFA***

[83] This section was renamed from “Characterisation” to “Initiation” to align with the headings in the new ISPM 4.

[84] Other minor changes were made for clarity, to remove ambiguity and to be more inclusive of methods used in all countries (e.g., GIS changed to maps).

#### ***2.2.1 Buffer zone***

[85] The EWG agreed to revise the section for clarity.

#### ***2.2.2 Surveillance activities for the establishment of an FF-PFA***

[86] The EWG concluded that detecting a single adult should not mean the area is no longer a FF-PFA. However, if live immature life stages, 2 or more females or inseminated females can mean loss of PFA

as that indicates a breeding population. The group agreed that the basis is that there should be no indication of a breeding population to establish a PFA and that a breeding population can be defined as finding immature individuals or inseminated female adults, however the EWG questioned how many adults (male/female) would indicate loss of PFA.

[87] Previously, a find of a single adult could result in loss of a FF-PFA however this was considered too stringent as a single find does not indicate a breeding population. This raised the question of whether 2 or more females is also too low of a trigger.

[88] The group questioned whether it is necessary to specify triggers as there are a number of factors that need to be considered to make this decision i.e. the biology of the fruit fly species, the effectiveness/sensitivity/density of the trapping grid, the FF species response to attractants. It was agreed by the group that the detection of a single mated female or an immature stage is indicative of a breeding population. The group agreed that the standard should not include a statement about how many males need to be detected to be indicative of a population and over what time period. It is also difficult to determine if a male is fertile. It was also agreed that when establishing a FF-PFA the triggers should be the same as for a suspension of a FF-PFA. The criteria should be the absence of a breeding population, which is defined earlier in the standard.

### **2.2.5 Official declaration of the fruit fly pest free area**

[89] The EWG aligned the wording with the new ISPM 4 and 8 regarding the determination and declarations.

### **2.3.3 Corrective actions (including response to an incursion)**

[90] The EWG refined wording to align with other standards regarding technical justification.

#### **2.2.2.1 Trapping procedures**

[91] The EWG discussed that the use of attractant, covers both lures and protein based traps. They decided to clarify that trap inspection and specimen collection is a two-step process i.e. to check the traps (including trap servicing) and collect any fruit flies.

[92] The EWG agreed to move the whole section on trapping and sampling to a new Annex 1 and only keep high level information in the body of the ISPM and reference the annex when necessary. This does not change the obligations as annexes are still part of the ISPM.

#### **2.2.2.2 Fruit fly host sampling procedures**

[93] The EWG decided to modify the title of new Annex 1 to “fruit fly host sampling” instead of “fruit sampling” as e.g., *Bactrocera cucurbitae* infests leaves and stems as well, not only the fruit. The EWG requested a global change to replace “fruit” with “host” (as fruit includes, vegetables and plant parts).

#### **2.2.2.3 Handling of samples and identification of species**

[94] The EWG decided to change “...samples collected in the field should be brought to a facility...” to “...samples collected in the field or from field traps may be brought to a facility...” as some countries may not have laboratory/storage facilities to bring the sample to.

[95] The EWG also proposed to make reference to ISPM 27 diagnostic protocols.

### **2.2.3 Controls on the movement of regulated articles**

[96] The EWG reviewed the section and changed the level of obligation regarding the items of the list of controls from “may” to “should”. They also agreed to a global change of “pest” to “fruit fly”.

### **2.2.4 Additional technical information for the establishment of an FF-PFA**

[97] The EWG made edits in the section for readability and clarity.

## **2.2.5 Official declaration of the fruit fly pest free area**

[98] The EWG changed the title and the wording in the paragraph to align with wording from ISPM 8, included a reference to ISPM 4 and section 2.3: “When the pest status is determined as absent (in accordance with ISPM 8) or eradication of the target fruit fly from the area is achieved (in accordance with ISPM 9 (*Guidelines for pest eradication programmes*)), the NPPO should make an official declaration that the area is free from the target fruit fly. All internal management procedures and measures to maintain the FF-PFA (see ISPM 4 and section 2.3) should be in place before any declaration is made.”

## **2.3 Maintenance of the FF-PFA**

[99] The EWG made edits in the section for readability and clarity and agreed to a global change of PFA to FF-PFA.

### **2.3.1 Surveillance for maintaining the FF-PFA**

[100] The first paragraph edited to reference new Annex 1 and the sentence requiring a quality control programme was moved to the new Annex 1.

### **Review and audit of the programme by the importing NPPO**

[101] The proposed section was deleted as auditing can be agreed to at a bilateral level rather than being prescribed in the ISPM.

### **2.3.3 Corrective actions (including response to an incursion)**

[102] The EWG decided to update the title to replace “outbreak” with “incursion” and changed from “declare” to “determination when an FF-PFA, or part therefore...” and added “notification of the suspension of an FF-PFA or part of it ...” in order to show there is a two-step process: first determine which part of the FF-PFA has been compromised and the second to notify relevant trading partners.

[103] They also agreed to add a statement that “the correct action plan may include interim measures agreed between relevant NPPOs to enable the continuation in trade”. These may be e.g., systems approach or phytosanitary treatment and may be agreed between exporting and importing country if the PFA is suspended.

## **2.4 Suspension, reinstatement or revocation of an FF-PFA status**

### **2.4.1 Suspension**

[104] The EWG added more detail to what should be considered when identifying if a detection constitutes a breeding population or not to ensure the criteria for suspension is clear to the reader.

[105] The EWG agreed to state that the number of fruit flies detected to indicate a breeding population may be agreed in advance by the NPPO. This is to avoid disagreement at a later stage and different NPPOs accepting too many fruit fly detections before declaring suspension.

### **2.4.2 Reinstatement**

[106] Th EWG amended the text to consider the biology and ecology of the pest rather than having a set number of generations before reinstatement of the FF-PFA can occur. The wording was compared with that included for the establishment of a FF-PFA.

### **2.4.3 Revocation**

[107] Revocation was renamed to withdrawal to align with the wording in ISPM 4. The EWG agreed to state that the FF-PFA is revoked when it is not practical or feasible (i.e., due to cost-benefit) to eradicate the fruit fly population that become established.

---

**Annexes and appendices:**

[108] It was agreed by all members of the EWG that the ISPM should be kept at a high level and details are best to be captured in the annexes. The following annexes are proposed to be kept:

- Annex 1 (new): trapping and fruit sampling from section 2.2.2.1 to be moved to an annex (this is being proposed to avoid repetition of this information throughout the document). The level of obligation will not change.
- The current appendix regarding what type of traps that can be used will remain as an appendix
- Annex 2: Corrective action plan (previously Annex 1)
- Annex 3: Control measures (Previously Annex 2)

[109] The EWG recommended that the previous Annex 3 (Phytosanitary procedures for fruit fly management) and the 2 appendices (Fruit fly trapping and Fruit sampling) are moved to implementation material. They felt that the obligations in the previous Annex 3 are already captured, and the appendices should become guidance materials and no longer included in the ISPM so they can be updated more easily. More information on the discussion is provided later in the report under the heading “Annex 3 and Appendices”.

**[New] Annex 1: Fruit fly surveillance: trapping and host sampling**

[110] The EWG moved sections on trapping (sections 2.2.2.1 to 2.2.2.3) from the body of the ISPM to Annex 1. This annex now includes general information on trapping procedures. Duplication/repetition was removed throughout.

[111] The EWG asked if reference to the IAEA guidelines on fruit sampling<sup>15</sup> could be included in the Annex but it was advised not to include as it was not an IPPC document and therefore its content could be changed. It would also make the Annex unnecessarily long. The IAEA guidelines could form part of guidance information or as a resource.

[112] A section for Quality Assurance of Trapping was included in the Annex as this was considered important for part of fruit fly trapping programmes. Elements of what may be included in the programme were listed.

**Annex 2: Corrective action plan****1. Actions to apply the corrective action plan**

[113] The EWG added text to the annex on corrective action plans to capture the concept that the biology and ecology of a pest should be considered. It also distinguishes between transient populations and what is necessary if a breeding population is suspected. They also provided information on the actions from the outcome of the delimiting survey.

**2. Suspension of FF-PFA status**

[114] The EWG tidied up the text and included text about the suspension radius, and how it should be defined based on the biology and ecology of the target FF.

**3. Implementation of control measures in the affected area**

[115] The EWG expanded on the eradication actions and removed duplication. More details were included in Annex 3 to support Annex 2.

---

<sup>15</sup> *Fruit sampling guidelines for area-wide fruit fly programmes*, published in 2017 by FAO and the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) (in English only) and available at: <https://www.iaea.org/about/insect-pest-control-section>.

- [116] It was agreed to mention that the correct action plan may include interim measures (e.g., systems approach or phytosanitary treatment) to enable the continuation of trade. These may be agreed between exporting and importing countries if the PFA is suspended.

*Criteria for reinstatement of an FF-PFA and actions to be taken*

- [117] The EWG made a change to the second bullet point to provide clarity that some countries may maintain higher levels of surveillance even after PFA has been reinstated and that the purpose of surveillance is to check that the FF-PFA has been maintained.

*Notification of NPPOs*

- [118] The EWG amended the sentence to remove “and other agencies” to “NPPOs or competent authorities delegated by the NPPO” as these notifications should be NPPO to NPPO and competent authorities. Additionally, the wording now aligns with ISPM 4. If there is domestic notification between state governments or other domestic agencies, then that is a domestic obligation and does not need to be covered in the ISPM.

**Annex 3: Control measures for an outbreak within a fruit fly pest free area (2014)**

- [119] The EWG decided to change “should” to “may” when discussing the circle delimiting the eradication area as some countries may not use circles but may use polygons.

**2. Control measures**

- [120] The EWG decided to remove the paragraph on audit as this is already captured in the body of the ISPM.

*2.3 Packing and packing facilities*

- [121] The EWG changed the heading to “Packing facilities” as the section does not cover anything on packing itself, only the facility.

- [122] The list changed to state “the NPPO of the exporting country should, as necessary...” to clarify that some countries may not need to do all the bullet points.

*2.5 Processing and processing facilities*

- [123] The EWG decided to change the sentence “processing (e.g....) does not pose an additional fruit fly risk...” to “processing (e.g....) may not pose an additional pest risk to the area...” as depending on the processing method, the risk may be present but could be managed. This change allows the NPPO to determine the level of risk rather than prescribe that fruit for processing is not a risk.

*2.6 Treatment and treatment facilities*

- [124] The EWG amended the text to clarify that treatment may be required for host that is moving from an area under eradication into the FF-PFA.

**3. Documentation and record keeping**

- [125] The EWG added the minimum length of time the country should be required to maintain their record for at least 24 months, aligning it with the ISPM body.

**4. Termination of control measures in the eradication area**

- [126] The EWG decided to simplify the text and instead of repetition, reference the appropriate sections of the ISPM regarding reinstatement.

**Annex 3 and Appendices**

- [127] The EWG did not fully review the original Annex 3 (from the current ISPM 26). However, it was generally agreed that the annex should be moved to implementation and guidance material as the information can easily become out of date. General comments on the Annex 3 were:

- Suppression is not something that would be used for a PFA as you would normally go to eradication. This section is only useful for ALPPs.
- There is nothing that hasn't already been mentioned in the body of the ISPM.
- Annex 3 is general information and is not considered to be requirements/obligations but is good guidance material.

[128] Appendix 1 was proposed to be moved to the implementation and guidance material. It was recommended that Appendices are revised to ensure they reflect current practices and technologies. A review could also determine if the Appendix should be simplified to focus on lures rather than trap types which can change frequently.

[129] It was recommended that Appendix 2 should be expanded to include guidance material on fruit sampling rather than only referring to the IAEA guide.

[130] The EWG:

- (1) *invited* the SC to consider the revision of ISPM 26 *Establishment and maintenance of fruit fly pest free areas (Tephritidae)* for approval for consultation.
- (2) *recommended* that the TPG reviews the ISPM 5 definition of PFA to decide if further explanation is required and to make a distinction between declarations of 'absence' and an 'official PFA'.
- (3) *recommended* to the SC to change the title to ISPM 26: (Establishment and maintenance of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)) (2021-010).
- (4) *recommended* to move the current Annex 3 and the Appendixes 1 and 2 to guidance material so they could be more easily updated.

## 7. Any other business

[131] There was no other business.

## 8. Close of the meeting

[132] The chairperson thanked the EWG members for all their hard work, the steward and assistant steward for their guidance, and the secretariat for their support.

[133] The steward and the secretariat thanked the chairperson for her skillful chairing of the meeting.

[134] The Secretariat thanked the participants and the host and invited the participants to provide their feedback via an online survey after the meeting.

[135] The participants expressed their appreciation to the excellent hosting of the meeting by the New Zealand NPPO and the chairperson closed the meeting.

**Appendix 1: Agenda**

	<b>Agenda Item</b>	<b>Document No.</b>	<b>Presenter</b>
<b>1.</b>	<b>Opening of the Meeting</b>		
1.1	Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat Welcome by the host: <b>Mr Peter Thomson</b> , Director, Animal and Plant Health, Biosecurity New Zealand, Ministry for Primary Industries  Introductions		Janka KISS  Peter THOMSON  all
1.2	Presentation of the standard setting process Roles of the Participants	15_EWG_ISPM26_2023_Jul	Janka KISS
<b>2.</b>	<b>Meeting Arrangements</b>	–	
2.1	Selection of the Chairperson	–	Janka KISS
2.2	Selection of the Rapporteur	–	Chairperson
2.3	Adoption of the Agenda	01_EWG_ISPM26_2023_Jul	Chairperson
<b>3.</b>	<b>Administrative Matters</b>	–	
3.1	Documents list	02_EWG_ISPM26_2023_Jul	Janka KISS
3.2	Participants list	03_EWG_ISPM26_2023_Jul	Janka KISS
3.3	Local information	04_EWG_ISPM26_2023_Jul	Joanne WILSON
<b>4.</b>	<b>Review of Specification</b>		
4.1	Review of Specification and considerations for the Revision of ISPM 26 (Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae))	<a href="#">Specification 75</a> - Revision of ISPM 26 (Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae))	Joanne WILSON
<b>5.</b>	<b>Review of discussion papers</b>	–	Chairperson
5.1	Discussion Paper: Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies ( <i>Tephritidae</i> ) - Australian NPPO	05_EWG_ISPM26_2023_Jul	Sonya BROUGHTON
5.2	Discussion paper: Specification 75 - Brazil	06_EWG_ISPM26_2023_Jul	Caio Cesar SIMAO
5.3	Discussion paper: Revision of ISPM 26 ( <i>Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)</i> ) - Japan	07_EWG_ISPM26_2023_Jul	Toshihisa KAMIJI
5.4	<i>Notes on the tasks of specification 75: Revision of ISPM 26 (Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (tephritidae)) - Vietnam</i>	08_EWG_ISPM26_2023_Jul	Hoang Kim THOA
5.5	Notes and revisions to ISPM 26 - Mexico	09_EWG_ISPM26_2023_Jul	Arturo Bello RIVERA
5.6	SENASA Resolution N° 152: National fruit fly control and eradication program - Phytosanitary emergency plan for fruit flies (in English and in Spanish) - Argentina	10_EWG_ISPM26_2023_Jul_En 16_EWG_ISPM26_2023_Jul_Sp	María Florencia VAZQUEZ
5.7	Issues with ISPM 26 where Fruit Fly Status is Absent: The Entire Country is Pest Free	11_EWG_ISPM26_2023_Jul_Rev1	George Stuart Cuthill GILL
5.8	Discussion Paper on the Revision of ISPM 26 (Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)) (2021-010) - USA	12_EWG_ISPM26_2023_Jul	Cory PENCA

	Agenda Item	Document No.	Presenter
5.9	Discussion Paper on the Revision of ISPM 26 - China	13_EWG_ISPM26_2023_Jul	Zhihong LI
5.10	Review of guides and related IPPC material	14_EWG_ISPM26_2023_Jul	Janka KISS
6.	<p><b>Development of the Revision of ISPM 26 (Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)) (2021-010)</b></p> <p><i>Reference documents:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>IPPC Style Guide and annotated templates (particularly Part 1, sections 2, 3 and 5)</i></li> <li>- <i>ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms)</i></li> <li>- <i>Guidelines for a consistent ISPM terminology (Section 3.3.2 of the IPPC Procedure Manual for Standard Setting)</i></li> </ul>	<p style="text-align: center;"><a href="#">Link to the IPPC Style Guide</a></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><a href="#">Link to ISPM 5</a></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><a href="#">Link to the IPPC Procedure Manual for Standard Setting (2021-2022)</a></p>	Chairperson
6.1	Brainstorming session to draft the revision of ISPM 26		Chairperson / All
6.2	Revision of ISPM 26	<p style="text-align: center;"><a href="#">Link to the Annotated template for draft ISPMs 2021-010</a></p>	All
7.	<b>Any Other Business</b>	–	Chairperson
8.	<b>Close of the Meeting</b>	–	IPPC Secretariat / Chairperson

**Appendix 2: Documents list**

DOCUMENT NO.	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE	DATE POSTED / DISTRIBUTED
01_EWG_ISPM26_2023_Jul	2.3	Provisional Agenda	22 Jun 2023 05 Jul 2023
02_EWG_ISPM26_2023_Jul	3.1	Documents list	05 Jul 2023
03_EWG_ISPM26_2023_Jul	3.2	Participants List	27 Apr 2023
04_EWG_ISPM26_2023_Jul	3.3	Local information document: Wellington, New Zealand	27 Apr 2023
05_EWG_ISPM26_2023_Jul	5.1	Discussion Paper: Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae) - Australian NPPO	22 Jun 2023
06_EWG_ISPM26_2023_Jul	5.2	Discussion paper: Specification 75 - Brazil	22 Jun 2023
07_EWG_ISPM26_2023_Jul	5.3	Discussion paper: Revision of ISPM 26 (Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies ( <i>Tephritidae</i> )) - Japan	22 Jun 2023
08_EWG_ISPM26_2023_Jul	5.4	Notes on the tasks of specification 75: Revision of ISPM 26 (Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies ( <i>tephritidae</i> )) - Vietnam	22 Jun 2023
09_EWG_ISPM26_2023_Jul	5.5	Notes and revisions to ISPM 26 - Mexico	22 Jun 2023
10_EWG_ISPM26_2023_Jul	5.6	SENASA Resolution N° 152: National fruit fly control and eradication program -  Phytosanitary emergency plan for fruit flies (in English and in Spanish) - Argentina	22 Jun 2023
11_EWG_ISPM26_2023_Jul	5.7	Notes and revisions to ISPM 26 – New Zealand	26 Jun 2023
12_EWG_ISPM26_2023_Jul	5.8	Discussion Paper on the Revision of ISPM 26 (Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)) (2021-010) - USA	22 Jun 2023
13_EWG_ISPM26_2023_Jul	5.9	Discussion Paper on the Revision of ISPM 26 - China	22 Jun 2023
14_EWG_ISPM26_2023_Jul	5.10	Review of guides and related IPPC material	26 Jun 2023
15_EWG_ISPM26_2023_Jul	1.2	Presentation of the standard setting process -Roles of the Participants	22 Jun 2023
16_EWG_ISPM26_2023_Jul	5.6	Phytosanitary emergency plan for fruit flies (in English and in Spanish) - Argentina	05 Jul 2023

DOCUMENT NO.	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE	DATE POSTED / DISTRIBUTED
<b>Other documents / links</b>			
<a href="#">Specification 75 - Revision of ISPM 26 (Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae))</a>	4.1	Specification 75 - Revision of ISPM 26 (Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae))	
<a href="#">Link to the IPPC Style Guide</a>	6	IPPC Style Guide and annotated templates (particularly Part 1, sections 2, 3 and 5)	
<a href="#">Link to ISPM 5</a>	6	ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms)	
<a href="#">Link to the IPPC Procedure Manual for Standard Setting (2021-2022)</a>	6	Guidelines for a consistent ISPM terminology (Section 3.3.2 of the IPPC Procedure Manual for Standard Setting)	
<a href="#">Link to the Annotated template for draft ISPMs</a>	6.2	Revision of ISPM 26	

### Appendix 3: Participants list

A check (✓) in column 1 indicates in person attendance at the meeting.

	Participant role	Name, mailing address, telephone	Email address
	Steward	<p><b>Ms Joanne WILSON</b> Principal Adviser Animal and Plant Health Directorate Biosecurity New Zealand Ministry for Primary Industries PO Box 2526, Wellington <b>NEW ZEALAND</b> Tel +64298940528</p>	<a href="mailto:joanne.wilson@mpi.govt.nz">joanne.wilson@mpi.govt.nz</a>
	Member	<p><b>George Stuart Cuthill GILL</b> Principal Adviser/Incursion Investigator. Surveillance and Incursion Investigation (Plant Health) Biosecurity New Zealand, PO Box 2526, Wellington 6140 <b>NEW ZEALAND</b> Tel +64298940532</p>	<a href="mailto:george.Gill@mpi.govt.nz">george.Gill@mpi.govt.nz</a>
	Member	<p><b>Sonya Broughton</b> Chief Plant Biosecurity Officer Department of Primary Industries and Regional Development. 1 Nash St, East Perth, Western Australia 6000 <b>AUSTRALIA</b> Tel: +614329378392</p>	<a href="mailto:sonya.broughton@dpird.wa.gov.au">sonya.broughton@dpird.wa.gov.au</a>
	Member	<p><b>Zhihong LI</b> Professor China Agricultural University Department of Plant Biosecurity, College of Plant Protection, China Agricultural University, Beijing 100193, P. R. China <b>CHINA</b> Tel: +8613661270298</p>	<a href="mailto:lizh@cau.edu.cn">lizh@cau.edu.cn</a> ; <a href="mailto:caupq1001@163.com">caupq1001@163.com</a>
	Member	<p><b>María Florencia VAZQUEZ</b> Fruit Fly Specialist. Member of the National Coordination of the Fruit Fly Programme (PROCEM) Av. Paseo Colon 367 - Ciudad de Buenos Aires, Argentina <b>ARGENTINA</b> Tel: +5491132390630</p>	<a href="mailto:mfvazquez@senasa.gob.ar">mfvazquez@senasa.gob.ar</a> ; <a href="mailto:florvazquez84@gmail.com">florvazquez84@gmail.com</a>
	Member	<p><b>Toshihisa KAMIJI</b> Senior researcher Entomology and nematology section, research division, Yokohama plant protection station (PPS), ministry of agriculture, forestry and fisheries (MAFF) 1-16-10 Shin-yamashita, Naka-ku, Yokohama-shi, Kanagawa, Japan 231-0801 <b>JAPAN</b> Tel: +81456228842</p>	<a href="mailto:toshihisa_kamiji850@maf.f.go.jp">toshihisa_kamiji850@maf.f.go.jp</a>
	Member	<p><b>Arturo Bello RIVERA</b> Plant Health General Director Head of Department of Field Operations Moscafrut Program (Center-South) General Directorate of Plant Health Insurgentes Sur 489, P-7 Col. Hipódromo, Cuauhtémoc, 06100, Ciudad De México, <b>MÉXICO</b> Tel: +525522548597</p>	<a href="mailto:arturo.bello@senasica.gob.mx">arturo.bello@senasica.gob.mx</a>

	Participant role	Name, mailing address, telephone	Email address
	Member	<b>Cory PENCA</b> Biological Scientist United States Department of Agriculture, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Plant Protection and Quarantine 13601 Old Cutler Road, Miami, Florida 33158 <b>USA</b> Tel: +1 786 535 5707	<a href="mailto:cory.j.penca@usda.gov">cory.j.penca@usda.gov</a>
	Member	<b>Hoang Kim THOA</b> Director Plant Quarantine Diagnostic Centre (PQDC) 7A, Le Van Hien Street, Duc Thang ward, Bac Tu Liem district, Hanoi <b>VIETNAM</b> Tel: +84983878628	<a href="mailto:kimthoappd@gmail.com">kimthoappd@gmail.com</a>
	Member	<b>Caio Cesar SIMAO</b> Head of the Special Export Programs Division Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock Esplanada dos Ministerios, Bloco D, Anexo B, 3º andar, Sala 308. Brasília/DF CEP: 70.043-900 <b>BRAZIL</b> Tel: +5548996091135	<a href="mailto:caio.simao@agro.gov.br">caio.simao@agro.gov.br</a>
	Host representative	<b>Ms Preet PARMAR</b> Senior Adviser Readiness and Response Services Biosecurity New Zealand Ministry for Primary Industries PO Box 2526, Wellington 6140 <b>NEW ZEALAND</b> Tel +64220109332	<a href="mailto:Preet.Parmar@mpi.govt.nz">Preet.Parmar@mpi.govt.nz</a>
	Host representative	<b>Mr Nacanieli WAQA</b> Specialist Adviser, Pacific Imports Animal and Plant Health Directorate Biosecurity New Zealand Ministry for Primary Industries PO Box 2526, Wellington <b>NEW ZEALAND</b> Tel +6429 894 0479	<a href="mailto:Nacanieli.waqa@mpi.govt.nz">Nacanieli.waqa@mpi.govt.nz</a>

### IPPC Secretariat

	Region / Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address
✓	IPPC Secretariat	<b>Ms Janka KISS</b> Standard Setting Associate	<a href="mailto:Janka.kiss@fao.org">Janka.kiss@fao.org</a> ;