



## COMMISSION ON PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES

### TWENTIETH SESSION

#### RESPONSE TO COSAVE TECHNICAL COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT REVISION OF ISPM 26

#### AGENDA ITEM 11

*(Prepared by New Zealand)*

#### 1. Purpose

- [1] This paper provides New Zealand's position on the technical comments submitted by COSAVE member countries on the draft revision of ISPM 26 (*Establishment and maintenance of pest free areas for tephritid fruit flies*).

#### 2. Background

- [2] COSAVE submitted their comments through the CPM objection mechanism, noting that they do not object to the adoption of the draft ISPM but seek to provide technical improvements related primarily to the inclusion of certain definitions.
- [3] The comments from COSAVE relate to:
- The relevance and necessity of several introduced definitions, and
  - The relationship between those definitions and harmonised IPPC terminology.

#### 3. Deletion of definitions

- [4] New Zealand agrees that definitions should be introduced only when they add technical clarity and avoid unnecessary duplication with existing phytosanitary terminology. COSAVE's recommendation to remove definitions from the draft ISPM that simply restate their ordinary meaning is reasonable.
- [5] In addition, New Zealand supports ensuring that any terminology specific to fruit flies remains consistent with existing broader definitions. New Zealand agrees with COSAVE's view that the general definition of *pest free area* is sufficient and should apply across all pests.
- [6] It is noted that the Standards Committee at their November 2025 meeting added the ISPM 5 term "*pest free area*" as a subject for revision to their work programme in the *List of topics for IPPC standards*. The purpose of revising the definition is to ensure that the difference between "*pest absence*" and "*pest free area*" is clearly understood. The revision of the definition of "*pest free area*" will negate the need for a specific definition in ISPM 26.

#### 4. Incorporating clarifications into the body of the standard

- [7] New Zealand supports COSAVE's practical approach of incorporating clarification of terms within the body of the draft ISPM. Based on this rationale, New Zealand considers that the term "*target fruit fly*", proposed for deletion by COSAVE, should be clarified within the text. Clarification of the term "*target fruit fly*" could be included in "*Outline of requirements*" (Appendix 1).

## 5. New Zealand's Overall Assessment of COSAVE's objection

- [8] New Zealand supports the adoption of ISPM 26 and appreciates COSAVE's constructive and non-objectional suggestions to improve the draft. We encourage CPM to consider these comments in finalising the text to ensure that the revised draft ISPM 26 is clear, harmonised, and practical for contracting parties to implement.
- [9] Appendix 1 shows what the proposed revisions will look like in the relevant sections of the draft ISPM 26. The proposed revisions only affect "*Definitions*", "*Outline of requirements*" and "*section 2*" of the draft ISPM. Strikethrough is used to indicate text proposed for deletion. **Blue text** indicates proposed new text.

## APPENDIX 1: Proposed revisions to draft ISPM 26 *Establishment and maintenance of pest free areas for tephritid fruit flies* recommended for adoption by CPM

### [1] DRAFT REVISION OF ISPM 26: Establishment and maintenance of pest free areas for tephritid fruit flies (2021-010)

#### [2] INTRODUCTION

##### [3] Scope

[4] This standard provides requirements and guidance for the establishment and maintenance of pest free areas for economically important tephritid fruit flies.

[5] If an exporting 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 a fruit fly pest free area (FF-PFA) in that area should not be required by importing countries – and hence this standard will not apply – unless there is technical justification.

##### [6] Bibliography

##### [7] References

[8] The present standard refers to ISPMs. ISPMs are available on the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP) at <https://www.ippc.int/core-activities/standards-setting/ispms>.

##### [9] Further reading

[10] Information to support the implementation of this standard may be available on the IPP at <https://www.ippc.int/en/about/core-activities/capacity-development/guides-and-training-materials/>.

[11] **IPPC Secretariat**. 2019. *Guide for establishing and maintaining pest free areas – Understanding the principal requirements for pest free areas, pest free places of production, pest free production sites and areas of low pest prevalence*. IPPC Secretariat. Rome, FAO. xviii + 107 pp. <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/90620/>

##### [12] Definitions

[13] Definitions of phytosanitary terms used in this standard can be found in ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*). In addition to the definitions in ISPM 5, in this standard the following definitions apply.

fruit fly pest free area      ~~An area where a national plant protection organization (NPPO) has declared that the target fruit fly is absent (in accordance with ISPM 8, including when the target fruit fly has been eradicated in accordance with ISPM 9 (Guidelines for pest eradication programmes)) and where the NPPO officially maintains the area as a pest free area in accordance with this standard.~~ A fruit fly pest free area is a **phytosanitary measure**.

target fruit fly              The **pest** specified for a fruit fly pest free area, regardless of whether the fruit fly is one species or more. “Target fruit fly” does not include sterile fruit flies released in a **sterile insect technique** programme.

breeding population        A group of fruit flies of the same species that interbreed and are capable of producing viable offspring within an **area**. A detection of an immature life stage (egg, larva or pupa), a female with viable eggs or a specified number of adults is evidence of a breeding population.



- the effectiveness of available survey methods; and
- the availability of methods for eradication of the target fruit fly.

[25] **1. Resources and infrastructure**

[26] When establishing and maintaining an FF-PFA, the NPPO of the exporting country should ensure that it has in place, or has ready access to, adequate infrastructure and operational capability and resources to establish and maintain the FF-PFA. Operational capability includes trained personnel to collect and identify specimens of the target fruit fly in a timely manner.

[27] In circumstances where an entity is authorized to undertake certain activities on behalf of an NPPO, (such as diagnosis, application of phytosanitary treatments, eradication activities), this should be done in accordance with ISPM 45 (*Requirements for national plant protection organizations if authorizing entities to perform phytosanitary actions*). Authorized entities should be audited in accordance ISPM 47 (*Audit in the phytosanitary context*).

[28] **2. Communication and engagement**

[29] An important factor determining the success of an FF-PFA programme is the support and participation of the public close to the area, especially the local community. This includes the producers in the area, individuals who travel to or through the area, and parties with direct or indirect interests. Public support is particularly important in areas where the risk of introducing the target fruit fly is higher. The NPPO of the exporting country may implement an ongoing public- and stakeholder-awareness programme. It may be helpful to inform the public and stakeholders using different media (e.g. written, radio, television, social media, internet). This could be on topics such as the importance of establishing and maintaining the FF-PFA, and the importance of avoiding introducing or reintroducing the target fruit fly through potentially infested host material (e.g. [flowers and fruits, in the botanical sense](#)). Public and stakeholder support is likely to lead to more compliance with the various measures used to establish and maintain the FF-PFA.