



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF THE REPORT
Meeting of the Technical Panel on Pest Free Areas and Systems Approaches for Fruit Flies,
Vienna, Austria, 31 August -- 4 September 2009

Agenda item 1 – Introduction

The technical panel on pest free areas and systems approaches for fruit flies (TPFF) met in Vienna, Austria 31 August – 4 September 2009 hosted by the Joint FAO/IAEA Division. The TPFF Steward announced his resignation prior to the meeting and it was not possible for another SC member to attend the meeting on such short notice. All other panel members were in attendance.

Agenda item 2 – Adoption of the Agenda

The agenda was adopted as presented, working papers were reviewed, a meeting chair and rapporteur were selected, and the Secretariat representative discussed roles and responsibilities of meeting participants.

Agenda item 3 – Decisions of Bodies and Activities Affecting the TPFF

The Secretariat representative presented relevant updates from CPM-4, the May 2009 SC meeting, and the TPDP and the TPPT including: formal objections on irradiation treatments for fruit flies; the SC decision on avoiding the use of brand names in so far as possible and its significance for highly technical fruit fly standards; approval of the draft specification *Determination of host susceptibility for fruit flies (Tephritidae)* by the SC for member consultation; approval of the draft ISPM *Systems approaches for pest risk management of fruit flies* by the SC for member consultation. The panel questioned when the draft specification and the draft ISPM would be sent for member consultation and expressed concern that if the specification *Determination of host susceptibility for fruit flies (Tephritidae)* was not sent for member consultation it might be necessary to cancel the 2010 TPFF meeting.

The steward for the draft ISPM on *Fruit fly trapping* reported on the May SC-7 meeting. He explained that there was one change made to the draft standard by the SC-7 related to trapping types and pest situations that differed from what the panel considered to be common practice in fruit fly programs. The panel recommended that the SC consider changing the language in the draft ISPM as follows:

--Proposed changes to draft ISPM *Fruit fly trapping*

(Section 1. Pest Situations and Survey Types, page 2, paragraph 3 of Annex 1 to ISPM No. 26)

The panel acknowledged the general improvements made to the draft standard on *Fruit fly trapping* as a result of comments provided by Member States. However, the panel is not in agreement with a modification made in Annex 1 to ISPM No. 26, Section 1 Pest Situations and Survey Types, page 2, paragraph 3 that deals with trapping types and pest situations particularly on the description of trapping survey applications. Delimiting trapping to define the target area has been included as the first trapping survey in a generally infested area before the initiation of a fruit fly suppression/eradication program. Although this is a requirement contained in ISPM No. 9 (Guidelines for Pest Eradication Programmes) and ISPM No. 4 (Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas), it is related to the scenario where the pest is not widely present in an area (a localized population or a recent introduction); however, the scenario for the draft Guideline for Fruit Fly Trapping was where an area is generally infested and pest distribution limits are already known, according with ISPM No. 8 (Determination of pest status in an area) and ISPM No. 6 (Guideline for surveillance). This latter scenario was recognized by the TPFF as the most common pest situation found in member states. Therefore, there is no need of delimiting the pest population but to determine its characteristics throughout a monitoring survey before starting a suppression/eradication programme.

The panel proposed that the existing text in Section 1 Pest Situations and Survey Types, page 2, paragraph 3 of Annex 1 to ISPM No. 26 be replaced by the following text proposed by the TPFF:

Text proposed by the TPFF to replace existing text:

Monitoring surveys are necessary in the first three situations (A, B and C) to verify the characteristics of the pest population before the initiation or during the application of suppression and eradication measures to

verify the population levels and to evaluate the efficacy of the control measures. Delimiting surveys are applied to determine the boundaries of an established FF-ALPP and as part of a corrective action plan when the pest exceeds the established low prevalence levels (situation B) (ISPM No. 30: Establishment of areas of low pest prevalence for fruit flies (*Tephritidae*)) or in a FF-PFA as part of a corrective action plan when a detection occurs (situation E) (ISPM No. 26: Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (*Tephritidae*)). Detection surveys are necessary to demonstrate pest absence (situation D) and to detect a possible entry of the pest into the FF-PFA (pest transient actionable) (ISPM no. 8).

Table No.4 on trap density should be amended accordingly.

The SC-7 recommended that trapping principles should be consistent with those described in ISPMs No. 4 and 9 regarding surveys. However, it is recognized that some of the sections in these ISPMs need to be updated. Procedures for assigning a new steward for the TPF were discussed and it was noted that a new steward would be decided by the SC in November.

Agenda item 4 -- Review of 2008-2009 work programme

The 2008 TPF meeting report and work programme was reviewed and it was emphasized that host susceptibility is a priority issue for the TPF to address. The panel agreed to invite an expert on host susceptibility to attend to 2010 TPF meeting. Draft guidelines for member countries on when to use various fruit fly standards in making phytosanitary decisions were presented and discussed. A presentation on helping countries implement fruit fly standards and facilitate trade issues was given. A paper on *International technical assistance for fruit fly risk management* was presented. An outline for the proposed publication of fruit fly ISPMs was presented and it was decided to publish initially on the web because of uncertainty regarding dates for adopting fruit fly standards that are currently under development. ISPMs under development could be added to the webpage as they are adopted. Once all standards are adopted a print publication would be developed.

Agenda item 5 -- Suppression and eradication procedures for fruit flies (*Tephritidae*)

The panel reviewed specification number 39, reviewed a discussion paper prepared by the outgoing steward, and completed a draft ISPM. The draft is being circulated for comment by members and should be finalized shortly. Among the issues discussed by the panel during the drafting process were: the panel proposed changing the title of the draft ISPM from *Suppression and Eradication Procedures for Fruit Flies (*Tephritidae*)* to *Phytosanitary Procedures for Fruit Fly (*Tephritidae*) Management*; liaison between outgoing and incoming stewards for the draft ISPM; environmental impacts of the draft ISPM; development of a standalone standard versus an annex; adding *exclusion* as an additional control strategy; proposing definitions for the terms *area-wide* and *exclusion*, appropriate level of technical information; appendices. Please see the full meeting report for complete description of all issues discussed during drafting of the ISPM.

Agenda item 6 -Meeting Close

The members of the TPF and the IPPC Secretariat thanked the Joint FAO/IAEA Division for organizing and facilitating the meeting. The meeting report was reviewed and approved by the panel. The date and venue for the next meeting were changed to 3 – 7 October 2010, in Valencia, Spain. The chair thanked the members for their contribution and closed the meeting.

The TPF requested the Standards Committee to:

- *revise* the text and table 4 in draft ISPM *Fruit fly trapping (*Tephritidae*)* Annex 1 to ISPM no. 26, Section 1 Pest Situations and Survey Types, page 2, paragraph 3 to incorporate changes recommended by the TPF (See agenda item 3 of the executive summary and section 6 of the full meeting report).
- *send* the draft specification *Determination of host susceptibility for fruit flies (*Tephritidae*)* for member consultation in November 2009 so that an ISPM for this standard can be drafted by the panel at the 2010 TPF meeting.
- *appoint* a steward for the TPF to replace the outgoing steward.
- *note* the work program for the TPF for 2009 –2010 (Appendix 4 of the meeting report).

- *request* the IPPC Secretariat to consider the discussion paper developed by Mr. R. Duthie on *International technical assistance for fruit fly risk management* for possible inclusion into the IPPC capacity building strategy. (Appendix 5 of the meeting report)
- *request* the IPPC Secretariat to note the need for fruit fly specific training assistance as part of capacity building and pest risk assessment training to member countries
- *consider* the discussion paper developed by Mr. A. Malavasi on practical applications of fruit fly ISPMs (Appendix 6 of the meeting report)
- *consider* assigning high priority to the draft standard on *Phytosanitary Procedures for Fruit Fly (Tephritidae) Management* because it contains basic requirements and background for other fruit fly ISPMs.
- *consider* updating ISPMs No. 4 and 9, in particular the sections on surveillance.
- *provide* guidance on the format and placement of the environmental statement in draft ISPMs.



FINAL

Report of the Meeting of the Technical Panel on Pest Free Areas and Systems Approaches for Fruit Flies, Vienna, Austria, 31 August -- 4 September 2009

1. Introduction

The technical panel on pest free areas and systems approaches for fruit flies (TPFF) was welcomed by the host of the meeting (the Joint FAO/IAEA Division) and the IPPC Secretariat. The TPFF Steward had notified the panel shortly before the meeting that he was considering stepping down from the role of steward and would be unable to attend the meeting. It was not possible for another SC member to attend the meeting on such short notice. Administrative details and local arrangements were discussed by a representative from the Joint FAO/IAEA Division..

The participants thanked the Joint FAO/IAEA Division for again hosting the meeting, funding participants, and making organizational arrangements to support the meeting.

All TPFF members were in attendance. Mr. A. Jessup of the IAEA was invited to attend for the first two days to brief the panel on relevant work of the technical panel on phytosanitary treatments (TPPT) related to his field of expertise.

2. Adoption of the Agenda

The IPPC Secretariat representative gave a brief overview of recent developments in the IPPC and standard setting activities, and explained the roles and functions of participants in the TPFF and expectations for the meeting. The TPFF elected Mr. K.H. Tan as chair and Mr. J. H. Venter as rapporteur. The agenda was accepted as drafted. In addition, the IAEA representative indicated that in future the TPFF would be responsible for drafting meeting reports using a new format which includes a two page executive summary.

3. Decisions of other bodies affecting the TPFF

The IPPC Secretariat and the steward for the standard on fruit fly trapping provided updates on the outcomes of recent meetings, including the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM), Standards Committee (SC) the SC-7. Mr. A. Jessup provided an update on his participation in a recent TPPT meeting.

The IPPC Secretariat provided updates on recent meetings of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) and the Standards Committee (SC). She explained that formal objections had been received on irradiation treatments for fruit flies and indicated that six of the treatments had been sent back to the TPPT by the SC for resolution of the technical issues involved. The SC decision on avoiding the use of brand names in so far as possible in diagnostic protocols and its significance for the TPFF in the development of highly technical standards like *Fruit fly trapping guidelines Appendix 1 to ISPM 26* was noted. The panel was informed that the specification *Determination of host susceptibility for fruit flies (Tephritidae)* was approved by the SC for member consultation. There was a question from the panel about dates for member consultation for the specification. It was explained that the SC would decide when this specification would be sent for member consultation. The panel expressed concern that if the specification *Determination of host susceptibility for fruit flies (Tephritidae)* was not ready for the panel to work on by October 2010 that the 2010 TPFF meeting might need to be cancelled. It was noted that the draft ISPM *Systems approaches for pest risk management of fruit flies* was approved by the SC for member consultation but was not sent for member consultation in 2009. TPFF members expressed interest in learning how the drafts were prioritized

to be sent for member consultation. The Secretariat also presented an update on the status of the explanatory documents program, indicating that the program had been put on hold in 2006 because of resource constraints and that only documents urgently requested by CPM, or in an advanced stage of drafting were being worked on. An update was given on the TPDP selection of experts to draft molecular diagnostics protocols for fruit flies.

The steward for the Fruit fly trapping standard reported on the SC-7 discussion of draft ISPM which was revised and recommended to the SC for consideration. There were over 600 comments received, many with sub-comments, although most comments were editorial and not substantive. He explained that there was one change made to the draft standard by the SC-7 related to trapping types and pest situations that differs from what the panel considered to be common practice in fruit fly programs. The panel agreed to propose an amendment to the SC for consideration. (See section 6 of this report).

He explained that the SC-7 had divided the the draft ISPM into two separate documents: an Appendix to ISPM 26 and an Annex to ISPM 26. Appendix 1 contains descriptive information about commonly used fruit fly traps. Annex 1 contains trapping types, systems, scenarios, procedures, densities, and trapping for delimiting surveys in free areas. Substantive comments were made by the SC-7 on the table on trapping scenarios and this table was removed from the draft ISPM and replaced by text describing trapping applications (Section 1, Pest Situations and Survey Types, page 2, paragraph 3) . The SC-7 recommended that trapping principles should be consistent with those described in ISPMs No. 4 and 9 regarding surveys. However, it is recognized that some of the sections in these ISPMs need to be updated. In this regard one member country has recently submitted to IPPC a proposal to review ISPM No. 4 *Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas*.

He also noted that the amount of general and technical information on technical standards should be balanced and also to avoid the use of brand names as far as possible.

Mr. A. Jessup presented an overview of subjects discussed during the 2009 TPPT meeting related to the TPF work, including formal objections on irradiation treatments for fruit flies, the SC decision on brand names, heat treatments for fruit flies, and the value of historical data in determining treatment efficacy.

The IPPC Secretariat and IAEA representatives discussed procedures to assign a new TPF Steward to replace the former steward , whose contributions to work of the panel was noted. It was explained that a new steward will be appointed by the SC.

4. Review of 2008-2009 work programme

The IAEA representative reviewed the 2008 TPF meeting report and work programme. The panel confirmed that the most current version of draft ISPM *Systems approaches for pest risk management of fruit flies* had been reviewed and approved by the SC. He emphasized that host susceptibility is a priority issue for the TPF to address. The panel agreed to invite an expert on host susceptibility to attend to 2010 TPF meeting. It was noted that the TPF had requested the TPG to redefine the term “*pest free places of production*” but that this proposal had not been accepted by the TPG.

The member from Brazil i presented draft guidelines for member countries on when to use various fruit fly standards in making phytosanitary decisions regarding fruit flies. The guidelines were well received by the TPF and it was agreed to incorporate them in the planned publication on fruit fly standards.

The member from Jordan made a presentation on helping countries implement standards and facilitate trade issues highlighting some issues related to a regional training course that was given in Jordan. She indicated that many countries do not know how to determine priorities (i.e., A1, A2, A3 pest lists), or develop risk management plans, and that fruit fly identification is also an issue. The need for training in taxonomy and identification and well equipped laboratories was noted. The IAEA representative agreed to share information regarding training opportunities at Griffith University. The lack of *Bactrocera* specialists who speak Spanish was noted.

A paper on *International technical assistance for fruit fly risk management* was presented. It was indicated that many countries do not know how to implement fruit fly standards and lack necessary phytosanitary

infrastructure. It was proposed to develop a pool of international technical assistance specialists to deal with trade and market access related issues. He identified a need for consolidated plans, feasibility and scoping tools, getting pools of specialists registered with appropriate groups, getting donor countries or aid bodies to assist. The panel discussed the possibility of developing a task force and also discussed a *Bactrocera* task force similar to the CDC task force on invasive species which is supported by Gates foundation funds. The panel agreed to revisit this paper and to consider making recommendations regarding technical assistance.

Components of the proposed publication of fruit fly ISPMs were discussed and it was suggested that it include a general introduction on fruit flies, other relevant ISPMs, agencies and experts using ISPMs, irradiation and treatment protocols, and the guidelines proposed by for implemented standards proposed earlier. . No final decision has been made by IAEA about whether to fund this publication. Because of uncertainty regarding dates for adopting fruit fly standards that are currently under development, it was decided to publish the document on the web initially and to add draft ISPMs currently under development as they are adopted. Once all standards are adopted a print publication would be developed.

5. Drafting -- *Phytosanitary Procedures for Fruit Fly (Tephritidae) Management*

A draft ISPM was completed by the panel. It will be circulated for comment after the meeting and will be forwarded to the Secretariat by the end of September 2009. Issues discussed by the panel during the drafting process are described below.

--Change in Title of the draft ISPM: The panel agreed to change the title of the draft ISPM from *Suppression and Eradication Procedures for Fruit Flies (Tephritidae)* to *Phytosanitary Procedures for Fruit Fly (Tephritidae) Management* because suppression and eradication are not actually procedures, rather they are control or management strategies. In addition it was thought that the title should be broader than just suppression and eradication since the panel will be addressing containment and exclusion in the standard.

--Steward of draft ISPM

It was noted that there will be a new steward for this standard in future, but that he was unable to attend the TPF meeting because of prior commitments. The current steward presented a discussion paper on the specification, reviewed the specification, and identified issues for agreement by the panel. The outgoing steward will brief the incoming steward on the current status of the standard and the outcomes of the TPF meeting.

--Inclusion of Environmental Statement:

The current steward indicated that an environmental statement is now being included in the specifications for all ISPMs being drafted and the panel noted that the procedures discussed in this ISPM would be environment friendly.

--Annex or Stand-alone Standard

The TPF discussed how the topic should be developed and whether it should be a stand-alone standard or an annex to another fruit fly standard, noting that it would need to contain more general information if a standalone and more technical information if an annex. Questions were raised by the panel about the appropriate level of technical detail in annexes to ISPMs. The panel discussed which ISPM the information on suppression and eradication should be annexed to, and it was thought that it could fit with any of the fruit fly standards but would probably fit best with the systems approach standard currently under development. Questions were raised about the procedure for drafting an annex to a standard which has not yet been adopted and the panel voiced concerns about slowing down the adoption process for draft ISPM *Systems Approaches for pest risk management of fruit flies*. The panel decided to develop a stand-alone standard for fruit fly management and noted that some technical detail would need to be omitted from the body of the standard itself and would be incorporated into annexes or appendices.

It was agreed to modify the format of the discussion paper to make it consistent with the outline of an ISPM and to use the modified discussion paper as the basis for drafting the standard.

--Add exclusion or prevention as an additional management strategy

The panel noted that the term *exclusion* is used in several ISPMs and is an important control strategy that is different from eradication, containment or suppression. It was noted that the type of control strategy would

affect the control measures that need to be applied. The panel agreed to add *exclusion* as an additional control strategy (ie, to deal with free areas/exclusion zones).

--Definitions for *area-wide* and *exclusion*

The panel agreed upon definitions for the terms “*area-wide*” and “*exclusion*” and agreed to propose these definitions to the SC for possible further consideration by the TPG for inclusion in the glossary of phytosanitary terms.

Area-wide control-- The group reviewed a definition for *area-wide* control and discussed if and how it should be modified. There was discussion about the need for a definition which focuses on the entire target population in an area. The group agreed to use the following definition for *area-wide* in drafting this standard: “*Integrated pest management against an entire target population within a delimited geographical area*”.

Exclusion --The panel noted that there is no FAO definition for *exclusion* although it is a commonly used control strategy and several members have asked for a definition to be developed. The TPF had also requested the TPG to develop a definition for *exclusion* but this request was not acted upon. The group considered several definitions for *exclusion* and decided to use the following definition in drafting this standard: “*Application of phytosanitary measures in and around an endangered area to prevent the introduction of a pest.*”

--Other Issues Discussed

--Male Annihilation Technique (MAT) The group agreed to add a section on Male annihilation technique (MAT) independent from bait stations and language for this section was drafted and agreed upon.

--Bait Stations

The section on bait stations was revised to be consistent with information in a draft FAO/IAEA document.

--Appropriate level of technical information

The panel considered the appropriate level of technical information for a standalone standard and attempted to balance the amount of information presented in various subtopics in the draft ISPM.

--Appendices:

The following Appendices were recognised by the panel as necessary for inclusion in the standard due to the importance and relevance of the information to member countries. IAEA representatives will draft Appendix 1 (Technical information for fruit fly control) and send it to the TPF panel members for comment.

Appendix 1

Technical information for fruit fly control

Appendix 2

Information about packing, shipping, holding and release of sterile flies in area-wide fruit fly control programmes, and product quality control and shipping procedures for sterile mass reared Tephritidae fruit flies are available in the following publications:

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. 2007. Guideline for packing, shipping, holding, and release of sterile flies in area-wide fruit fly control programmes. Walther Enkerlin (Editor). Joint FAO/IAEA Programme of Nuclear Techniques in Food and Agriculture. FAO Plant Production and Protection Paper, Rome. Pp. 134.

FAO/IAEA/USDA. 2003. Manual for product quality control and shipping procedures for sterile mass reared Tephritidae fruit flies, version 5.0. International Atomic Energy Agency. Vienna, Austria. 85 pp.

Appendix 3

Additional relevant literature

6. Other Issues Discussed

--Topics for future ISPMs The need for topics for future ISPMs was discussed. It was confirmed that there are currently only 2 topics in the pipeline, including the topic that was recently submitted by the panel during the recent call for topics (*Establishment and maintenance of regulated areas upon outbreak detection in PFAs*) which will be proposed to the CPM-5. It was decided that the TPFF steward will present a list of topics to the panel for discussion in August 2010 well in advance of the 2011 biennial call for topics.

--Development of timeline for fruit fly standards under development by the TPFF

For clarification, a timeline was developed showing all fruit fly standards currently under development by the panel and projected milestones and projected dates of adoption by CPM (Appendix 8 of this report).

--Proposed changes to Annex 1 to ISPM no. 26 on *Fruit fly trapping*

(Section 1. Pest Situations and Survey Types, page 2, paragraph 3 of Annex 1 to ISPM No. 26)

The panel acknowledged the general improvements made to the draft standard on *Fruit fly trapping* as a result of comments provided by Member States.

However, the panel is not in agreement with a modification made in Annex 1 to ISPM No. 26, Section 1 Pest Situations and Survey Types, page 2, paragraph 3 that deals with trapping types and pest situations particularly on the description of trapping survey applications. Delimiting trapping to define the target area has been included as the first trapping survey in a generally infested area before the initiation of a fruit fly suppression/eradication program. Although this is a requirement contained in ISPM No. 9 (Guidelines for Pest Eradication Programmes) and ISPM No. 4 (Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas), it is related to the scenario where the pest is not widely present in an area (a localized population or a recent introduction); however, the scenario for the draft Guideline for Fruit Fly Trapping was where an area is generally infested and pest distribution limits are already known, according with ISPM No. 8 (Determination of pest status in an area) and ISPM No. 6 (Guideline for surveillance). This latter scenario was recognized by the TPFF as the most common pest situation found in member countries.. Therefore, there is no need of delimiting the pest population but to determine its characteristics throughout a monitoring survey before starting a suppression/eradication programme.

The panel proposed that the existing text in Section 1 Pest Situations and Survey Types, page 2, paragraph 3 of Annex 1 to ISPM No. 26 be replaced by the following text proposed by the TPFF:

Text proposed by the TPFF to replace existing text:

Monitoring surveys are necessary in the first three situations (A, B and C) to verify the characteristics of the pest population before the initiation or during the application of suppression and eradication measures to verify the population levels and to evaluate the efficacy of the control measures. Delimiting surveys are applied to determine the boundaries of an established FF-ALPP and as part of a corrective action plan when the pest exceeds the established low prevalence levels (situation B) (ISPM No. 30: Establishment of areas of low pest prevalence for fruit flies (Tephritidae)) or in a FF-PFA as part of a corrective action plan when a detection occurs (situation E) (ISPM No. 26: Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae). Detection surveys are necessary to demonstrate pest absence (situation D) and to detect a possible entry of the pest into the FF-PFA (pest transient actionable) (ISPM no. 8).

Table No.4 on trap density should be amended accordingly.

Existing text as approved by the SC-7 at May 2009 meeting:

(Annex 1 to ISPM No. 26, Section 1, Pest Situations and Survey Types, page 2, paragraph 3)

Delimiting surveys are needed at the start of a new programme (situation A). In the case of a pest under suppression (situation B) leading to a FF-ALPP and in the case of a pest under eradication (situation C) leading to a FF-PFA (situation E), delimiting surveys are applied as part of a corrective action plan when the pest exceeds the established low prevalence level or when a detection occurs in a FF-PFA (situation E)

(ISPM No. 26: Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (*Tephritidae*) and ISPM No. 30: Establishment of areas of low pest prevalence for fruit flies (*Tephritidae*)). Monitoring surveys are necessary in the first three situations (A, B and C) to verify the characteristics of the pest population before the initiation of control measures, during the application of suppression and eradication measures to verify that population levels have not changed unexpectedly and to evaluate the efficacy of the control measures. In the case of establishment of pest absence, and pest absence being maintained (situation D), detection surveys are necessary to verify the status of the pest and to detect a possible entry of the pest into the FF-PFA.

7. Requests and recommendations

The following requests and recommendations are proposed to the Standards Committee and other technical panels.

The TPFF requested the Standards Committee to:

- *revise* the text and table 4 in draft ISPM *Fruit fly trapping (Tephritidae)* Annex 1 to ISPM no. 26, Section 1 Pest Situations and Survey Types, page 2, paragraph 3 to incorporate changes recommended by the TPFF (See section 6 of this report).
- *send* the draft specification *Determination of host susceptibility for fruit flies (Tephritidae)* for member consultation in November 2009 so that an ISPM for this standard can be drafted by the panel at the 2010 TPFF meeting.
- *appoint* a steward for the TPFF to replace Mr. O. Ribeiro e Silva.
- *note* the work program for the TPFF for 2009 –2010 (Appendix 4 of this report).
- *request* the IPPC Secretariat to consider the discussion paper developed by Mr. R. Duthie on *International technical assistance for fruit fly risk management* for possible inclusion into the IPPC capacity building strategy. (Appendix 5 of this report)
- *request* the IPPC Secretariat to note the need for fruit fly specific training assistance as part of capacity building and pest risk assessment training to member countries
- *consider* the discussion paper developed by Mr. A. Malavasi on practical applications of fruit fly ISPMs (Appendix 6)
- *consider* assigning high priority to the draft standard on *Phytosanitary Procedures for Fruit Fly (Tephritidae) Management* because it contains basic requirements and background for other fruit fly ISPMs.
- *consider* updating ISPMs No. 4 and 9, in particular the sections on surveillance.
- *provide* guidance on the format and placement of the environmental statement in draft ISPMs.

The TPFF requested the SC to ask the Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments (TPPT) to:

follow up on the issue of using historical data, as per provision of ISPM 28, as a valid source to assess treatment efficacy and modify the IPPC template for assessing the efficacy of treatments accordingly.

The TPFF requested the SC to ask the Technical Panel on the Glossary (TPG) to:

- *consider* the following terms and definitions for inclusion in the glossary of phytosanitary terms:
area-wide control and exclusion.
consider the proposed definition for *area-wide*: “ *Integrated pest management against an entire target population within a delimited geographical area*”.
- *consider* the proposed definition for *exclusion*: “*Application of phytosanitary measures in and around an endangered area to prevent the introduction of a pest.*”

7. Meeting Close

The members of the TPFF and the IPPC Secretariat thanked the Joint FAO/IAEA Division for organizing and funding meeting participants. The meeting report was reviewed and approved by the panel. The date and venue for the next meeting is 3 – 7 October 2010, in Valencia, Spain. The chair thanked the members for their contribution and closed the meeting.

APPENDIX 1

2009 Meeting of the Technical Panel on Pest Free Areas and Systems Approaches for Fruit Flies

31 August to 4 September 2009
IAEA Headquarters, Room A2311
Vienna, Austria

DRAFT AGENDA

AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT
1. Introduction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcome and introduction (J. Hendrichs, L. Erikson and R. Pereira) • Administrative details and local arrangements (R. Pereira) 	-
2. Adoption of the agenda <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Background to TPFf, roles and expectations from the meeting (L. Erikson and R. Pereira) • Selection of chair and rapporteur (R. Pereira) • Review and adoption of the agenda and review of meeting documents (R. Pereira) 	2009-TPFF-03 2009-TPFF-01 2009-TPFF-02
3. Decisions of other bodies and activities affecting the TPFf <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Updates and decisions from meetings of other bodies relevant to the TPFf (Commission on Phytosanitary Measures, Standards Committee, other technical panels, etc.) (L. Erikson and W. Enkerlin) • Subjects discussed during the 2009 TPPT meeting related to the TPFf work (A. Jessup) • TPFf membership and procedures to assign the new TPFf Steward (L. Erikson and R. Pereira) 	2009-TPFF-04 2009-TPFF-05 2009-TPFF-06 2009-TPFF-14 2009-TPFF-04 2009-TPFF-07
4. Review of 2008-2009 work programme <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of 2008 meeting report and work programme (R. Pereira) • Topics for next TPFf meetings (L. Erikson and R. Pereira) • Explanatory documents for fruit fly standards and/or implementation of fruit fly standards (A. Malavasi and R. Duthie) • Capacity building and technical assistance on fruit fly risk management (M. Bahdousheh and R. Duthie) • Detailed outline and proposal for fruit fly related ISPMs publication (J. L. Zavala and A. Van Sauer) 	2009-TPFF-08 2009-TPFF-09 2009-TPFF-10 2009-TPFF-11
5. Suppression and eradication procedures for fruit flies (Tephritidae) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suppression and eradication procedures for fruit flies (introduction, review of Specification 39) (W. Enkerlin) • Review of discussion paper on suppression and eradication procedures for fruit flies (W. Enkerlin) • Drafting of an international standard on suppression and eradication procedures for fruit flies (W. Enkerlin) • Discussion and finalization of draft international standard (W. Enkerlin) 	2009-TPFF-12 2009-TPFF-13 2009-TPFF-13
6. Final report <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of priority for next meeting (R. Pereira) • Date and venue of the next meeting (R. Pereira) • Work programme for 2009-2010 (R. Pereira) • Conclusions and meeting report (R. Pereira and Rapporteur) 	-

APPENDIX 2
Documents List

DOCUMENT NUMBER	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE	DATE POSTED/DISTRIBUTED
2008-TPFF-01	2	Provisional agenda	12-08-2009
2008-TPFF-02	2	Documents list	12-08-2009
2008-TPFF-03	2	Participants list	12-08-2009
2008-TPFF-04	3	Report excerpts and updates from the CPM, standards committee and other technical panels	12-08-2009
2008-TPFF-05	3	IPPC standard setting work programme	12-08-2009
2008-TPFF-06	3	Selection of experts to draft diagnostic protocol	25-08-2009
2008-TPFF-07	3	Common procedures for technical panels	12-08-2009
2008-TPFF-08	4	Report of 2007 meeting	12-08-2009
2008-TPFF-09	4	Draft specification for member consultation: Experimental protocol to determine host status of fruits to fruit fly (Tephritidae) infestation.	12-08-2009
2008-TPFF-10	4	Capacity building and technical assistance on fruit fly risk management	12-08-2009
2008-TPFF-11	4	Action plan: Peach fruit fly <i>Bactrocera zonata</i> (Saunders)	12-08-2009
2008-TPFF-12	5	Specification No. 39: Suppression and eradication procedures for fruit flies (Tephritidae)	12-08-2009
2008-TPFF-13	5	Discussion Paper: Specification No. 39: Suppression and Eradication Procedures for Fruit Flies (Tephritidae)	25-08-2009
2008-TPFF-14	3	Update on explanatory documents for ISPMs	25-08-2009

APPENDIX 3
Participants of the 2009 Meeting of the Technical panel on pest free areas
and areas of low pest prevalence for fruit flies (TPFF)

31 August - 4 September 2009

Vienna, Austria

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

I	Participant role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address	Membership confirmed	Term expires
X	Member	Ms Mary Bahdousheh Director of Plant Protection Department Ministry of Agriculture P.O. Box 2099/961044 Amman, Jordan Tel: (+962) 6 568 6151 Ext. 458 Fax: (+962) 6 568 6310Ms	ppcs@moa.gov.jo ; bahdousheh_m@yahoo.com	2008 (CPM-3)	2013
X	Member	Mr. Robert Duthie Plant health consultant Camberra, ACT 2606, Australia Tel: (+61) 2 6272 5564; 6286 7151; 4 2290 5787	rob.duthie@kalang.com.au	2008 (CPM-3)	2013
X	Member	Mr. Walther Enkerlin Technical Director North American Plant Protection Organization (NAPPO) 1431 Merivale Road, 3rd floor, Room 309 Ottawa, ON K1A 0Y9 Canada Tel: (+1) 613 221 5147 Fax: (+1) 613 228 2540	Walther.Enkerlin@NAPPO.org	2008 (CPM-3)	2013
X	Member	Mr. Jaime Gonzalez Jefe Nacional del Proyecto Mosca de la Fruta Servicio Agrícola y Ganadero Av. Bulnes 140, Santiago, Chile Tel: (+56) 2 345 1207 Fax: (+56) 2 345 1203	jaime.gonzalez@sag.gob.cl	2008 (CPM-3)	2013
X	Member	Mr. Aldo Malavasi Director Brazilian Medfly Facility Quadra D 13, Lote 15 Juazeiro, Bahia 48.900-00 Brazil Tel: (+55) 74 3612 5399 Fax: (+55) 74 3612 5118	malavasi@moscamed.org.br	2008 (CPM-3)	2013
X	Member	Mr. Rui Cardoso Pereira Joint FAO/IAEA Division IPCS/NAFA Wagramerstrasse 5 P.O. Box 100 A-1400 Vienna, Austria Tel: (+43) 1 2600 26077	r.cardoso-pereira@iaea.org	2008 (CPM-3)	2013

I	Participant role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address	Membership confirmed	Term expires
X	Member	Mr. Keng Hong Tan 20, Jalan Tan Jit Seng Hillside Tanjong, Bungah 11200 Penang, Malaysia Tel: (+60) 4 890 5737	tan_kh@tm.net.my ; khtan@x-digitals.com	2008 (CPM-3)	2013
X	Member	Mr. Kenji Tsuruta Head, Pest Identification and Diagnostics Division Kobe Plant Protection Station Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries 1-1, Hatoba-cho, Chuo-Ku, Kobe, 650-0042, Japan Tel: (+81) 78 331 1026 Fax: (+81) 78 391 1757	tsurutak@pps.go.jp	2008 (CPM-3)	2013
X	Member	Ms. Alies Van Sauers-Muller National Coordinator National Program for the Carambola Fruit Fly Agricultural Experiment Station Letitia Vriesdelaan 8 Paramaribo, Suriname Tel: (+597) 425 632 or (+597) 886 3814 Fax: (+597) 475 919	cffsur@sr.net ; aliesmuller@yahoo.com	2008 (CPM-3)	2013
X	Member	Mr. Jan Hendrik Venter Assistant Director, Early Warning Systems Directorate Plant Health Department of Agriculture Private Bag 14 Pretoria, 0031, South Africa Tel: (+27) 12 319 6384 Fax: (+27) 12 319 6025	janhendrikv@nda.agric.za	2008 (CPM-3)	2013
X	Member	Mr. José Luis Zavala López Mediterranean Fruit Fly Programme Sub Director Avenida Central Poniente #14, Altos 1, Edificio Soconusco Col. Centro, Tapachula, Chiapas CP 30700, Mexico Tel: (+52) 962 625 1374 Fax: (+52) 962 625 0802	joseluiszavalalopez@yahoo.com.mx	2008 (CPM-3)	2013
X	Host organization representative	Mr. Jorge Hendrichs Joint FAO/IAEA Division IPCS/NAFA Wagramerstrasse 5 P.O. Box 100 A-1400 Vienna, Austria Tel: (+43) 1 2600 21628	j.hendrichs@iaea.org		
X	Host organization representative	Mr. Jesus Reyes Flores Joint FAO/IAEA Division IPCS/NAFA	j.reyes-flores@iaea.org		

1	Participant role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address	Membership confirmed	Term expires
		Wagramerstrasse 5 P.O. Box 100 A-1400 Vienna, Austria Tel: (+43) 1 2600 26062			
X	IPPC Secretariat	Ms Lottie Erikson Standards programme IPPC Secretariat Food and Agriculture Organization of the UN Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00153 Rome, Italy Tel: (+39) 06 5705 5696 Fax: (+39) 06 5705 4819	lottie.erikson@fao.org		

APPENDIX 4
PROPOSED WORK PROGRAMME 2009-2010
Technical panel on pest free areas and systems approaches for fruit flies (TPFF)

2009	
September	31 August – 4 September: 2009 meeting 15: L. Erikson to e-mail report to TPFF for comments 15: R. Pereira to e-mail draft to TPFF for comments 22: Comments on report due to Secretariat 22: Comments on report due to R. Pereira 30: Report finalized and posted on IPP 30: Draft finalized and sent to IPPC Secretariat 30: International technical assistance for fruit fly risk management (R. Duthie) 30: Practical applications of fruit fly ISPMs (A. Malavasi)
October	7-16: TP Glossary meeting
November	9-13: SC working group (review and possible approval of the draft standard on <i>Fruit Fly Trapping</i> annex 1 of ISPM No. 26)
December	Potential country consultation of the specification on <i>Determination of Host Susceptibility for Fruit Flies (Tephritidae)</i>
2010	
January	31: Detailed outline and proposal for fruit fly related ISPMs publication (J. L. Zavala and A. Van Sauer) to the TPFF
February	28: Draft the appendix 1 (Technical information for fruit fly control) of the <i>Draft Standard on Phytosanitary Procedures for Fruit Fly (Tephritidae) Management</i> (J. Reyes and R. Pereira) Sent to TPFF
March	22-26: CPM-5 meeting (potential adoption of draft standard on <i>Fruit Fly Trapping</i> and approval of proposed topic <i>Establishment and maintenance of regulated areas upon outbreak detection in PFAs</i>) 31: Comments on draft appendix 1 (Technical information for fruit fly control) of the <i>Draft Standard on Phytosanitary Procedures for Fruit Fly (Tephritidae) Management</i> , to J. Reyes and R. Pereira) 31: Comments on outline and proposal for fruit fly related ISPMs publication, to J. L. Zavala and A. Van Sauer
April	15: Draft appendix 1 finalized (Technical information for fruit fly control) of the <i>Draft Standard on Phytosanitary Procedures for Fruit Fly (Tephritidae) Management</i> , J. Reyes and R. Pereira). Submission to SC for revision. 26-30: SC meeting (consideration of draft ISPM on <i>Phytosanitary Procedures for Fruit Fly (Tephritidae) Management</i>)
May	3-7: SC working group meeting 31: Outline and proposal for fruit fly related ISPMs publication (J. L. Zavala and A. Van Sauer) final draft for discussion at the 2010 TPFF meeting
June	Possible country consultation of draft ISPM on <i>Systems Approaches for Pest Risk Management of Fruit Flies</i>
July	5-9: TP on Forest Quarantine meeting 26-30: TP Diagnostic Protocols meeting 26-30: TP Phytosanitary Treatments meeting

August	31: Draft discussion paper on <i>Determination of Host Susceptibility for Fruit Flies (Tephritidae)</i> (for the TPF meeting) (W. Enkerlin) 31: A list of topics will be presented for panel discussion (Steward of the TPF)
September	
October	3-7: TPF meeting (topic: <i>Determination of Host Susceptibility for Fruit Flies (Tephritidae)</i>) 3-7: TPG
November	1-12: Tentative SC meeting
December	Potential country consultation of the specification on regulated areas

APPENDIX 5

International technical assistance for fruit fly risk management by R. Duthie

Introduction

Fruit flies are a large and important group of insect pests that attack a wide range of fruit and vegetables. Many fruit fly species throughout the world have a major economic impact on fruit production, market access and economic prosperity.

To help manage the impact of fruit flies the IPPC Technical Panel on Fruit Flies has been developing International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPMs) particularly focussed upon the management of these pests.

Areas where ISPMs or annexes to ISPMs have been developed or will be developed include fruit fly pest free areas (FF-PFA), fruit fly areas of low pest prevalence (FF-ALPP), fruit fly free places of production (FFF-POP), fruit fly free production sites (FFF-PS), fruit fly systems approaches (FF-SA), fruit fly suppression and eradication techniques and confirmation of fruit fly host status.

It is anticipated that the development and international endorsement of these fruit fly specific ISPMs will eventually provide guidelines for sustainable and effective access to domestic and international commodity markets that require efficient management of fruit fly species.

However, countries seeking to implement the generic principles outlined within the fruit fly ISPMs to suit specific production and market access requirements must have sufficient technical capacity and support to do so. This paper provides recommendations and strategies to assist the development of these fruit fly management systems.

An international team of fruit fly specialists

Some countries have the expertise required to interpret and implement the fruit fly management principles outlined within the ISPMs. However, many countries do not and fruit flies continue to adversely impact upon their economies. It is recommended that this international expertise is made available to countries that do not possess these skills through an international fruit fly extension unit.

Country specific requirements will vary from overall system assessment and design, policy and regulatory issues, surveillance and diagnostics, operational issues, research and development, economic considerations and specific market access strategies.

A coordinating body for the fruit fly specialists

An international body will be required as a coordinator for this strategy. Fruit fly management specialists with an interest in involvement in this programme would register an expression of interest and provide a CV outlining the relevant areas of expertise. Availability and authorisation of availability to participate in the programme from employers would also be required.

IPPC endorsement of the programme

The concept, scope and terms of reference of an international fruit fly technical assistance programme the coordinating body and the available expertise would ideally be endorsed by the IPPC Secretariat and the TPDF.

Country registration of fruit fly issues to be addressed

Once established, notification of the availability and scope of this international fruit fly service would be made by the coordinating body, the IPPC secretariat and the TPDF. Countries seeking assistance would be required to provide an outline of issues to be addressed or request that an initial assessment of the fruit fly issues is made by appropriate programme representatives.

Once an assessment of the issues has been conducted a project plan outlining costs, timelines and potential benefits should be developed to allow for consideration of the viability of the proposal. If the proposal is considered to be viable and meets the countries' and international requirements for sustainability and profitability the programme may need to be prioritised in accordance with available resources and competing proposals.

Resources

Coordinating body – it is beyond the scope of this paper to determine an appropriate coordinating body. TPDF and IAEA to consider.

Operating funds – demand for this service would be anticipated to be strong. The funds required to coordinate and provide suitable expertise for project design, implementation and possibly maintenance would be considerable. However, the returns on investments are likely to be large if trade can be maintained,

improved or started for various fruit fly host commodities. It is beyond the scope of this paper to determine budgets.

Potential funders of the project – A strong business case for the development and implementation of the project should be designed to present to potential funding bodies.

In kind contributions may be sort from those countries that have well developed fruit fly expertise in the required areas. Aid funding from the FAO, various international donor bodies and developed countries should be sort.

Perceived benefits of the programme

International assistance in capacity building and implementation of fruit fly related ISPMs will help with the timely development of internationally consistent fruit fly risk management strategies, enhanced development of national capacity to design and implement strategies and increased economic prosperity due to increased opportunities in market access for fruit fly host commodities.

APPENDIX 6

Guidance for Applying ISPM Fruit Fly Standards by A. Malvasi



1. The (1) [Commodity] is in the list of fruit species prohibited by the potential importing country?

YES go to 2

NO → exporting is possible

2. Is there any fruit fly surveillance in (3) [Area] to learn what species are present?

YES go to 3

NO → start a survey (see Trapping Guidelines_ and 12 months later go to 3

3. A survey for at least 12 months has shown no capture of the target (2) fruit fly species in the (3) area?

YES go to ISPM # 4 for background and ISPM # 26 for operation

NO go to 4

4. The (3) [Area] has been regularly monitored to determine the target fruit fly population density?

a. YES and the population of the target fruit fly (2) is VERY LOW

Then go to ISPM # 22 for background and ISPM # 30 for operation. Also consider to move to an eradication programme. Then go to specification # 39 and later to ISPM # 26.

YES and the population of the target fruit fly (2) is FAIRLY LOW – go to 5

YES and the population of the target fruit fly (2) is HIGH -- then go to Specification # 39

5. The population of target fruit fly (2) is fairly low and (1) Commodity is less susceptible to (2) attack in some ripe stage.

a. Then go to ISPM FF-SA

APPENDIX 7

Projected timelines for fruit fly ISPMs currently under development*

Title	Drafting (TPFF)	Approval by SC for Member Consultation	Member Consultation**	Re-drafting (Steward)	Review Approval SC7 and SC	Approval CPM
Guidelines for Fruit Fly Trapping					May 2009 SC7 Nov 2009 SC	Mar 2010 (CPM-5)
Systems Approaches for fruit flies			Jun-Sept 2010	October 2010	May 2011 SC7 Nov 2011 SC	Apr 2012 (CPM-7)
Suppression/eradication procedures	Sep 2009	May 2010 SC	Jun-Sept 2011	October 2011	May 2012 SC7 Nov 2012 SC	Apr 2013 (CPM-8)
Host susceptibility	Oct 2010	May 2011 SC	Jun-Sept 2012	October 2012	May 2013 SC7 Nov 2013 SC	Apr 2014 (CPM-9)
Regulated areas*	Sep 2011	May 2012 SC	Jun-Sept 2013	October 2013	May 2014 SC7 Nov 2014 SC	Apr 2015 (CPM-10)

* Dates for approval by CPM correspond the latest revision of the standard setting work programme (September 2009). These dates are based on the assumption that the equivalent of 5 standards will go for member consultation each year, so there may be a lag of one year between approval by the SC for member consultation and member consultation.

Other assignments:

Publication on fruit fly ISPMs - Sept 2011