



Report of the Meeting of the Technical Panel on Pest Free Areas and Systems Approaches for Fruit Flies, Salvador, Bahia, Brazil, 4-8 September 2006

1. Introduction

The technical panel on pest free areas and systems approaches for fruit flies (TPFF) was welcomed to Salvador by Maria Júlia Signoretti Godoy on behalf of the Ministry of Agriculture Livestock and Food Supply. Alies van Sauers-Muller was elected as chair for the meeting.

The steward updated the panel on the decisions of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures. He outlined the process of adoption of the International Standard for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPM) on *Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)* (ISPM No. 26) and explained that more than 1000 comments had been received. The panel agreed that new draft standards should provide adequate technical detail, but should also be sufficiently broad to cover measures for fruit flies in all regions. The panel also acknowledged the need to balance requirements for developed and developing countries and to take into account different capacities in different areas.

The steward also provided an update on the work of the Standards Committee (SC), including the approval of the specification on *Trapping procedures for fruit flies of the family Tephritidae* (No. 35) and the draft specifications still to be considered on fruit fly free places of production and production sites (FFF POP/PS) and suppression and eradication procedures for fruit flies. The panel noted that the draft ISPM on *Establishment of areas of low pest prevalence for fruit flies (Tephritidae)* (FF-ALPP), which had been produced at the last TPFF meeting, was currently out for country consultation, and was on the Agenda for consideration during the meeting.

The panel discussed the work of other technical panels as they related to fruit flies. They noted that a diagnostic protocol was in development on the genus *Anastrepha* and that the SC had agreed at its last meeting to propose additional protocols for the work programme, including a protocol on the *Bactrocera dorsalis* species complex. This protocol had been recommended by the TPFF at their meeting in 2005.

The TPFF also noted that the IPPC Secretariat had issued a call for submissions of phytosanitary treatments for fruit flies and the next meeting of the technical panel for phytosanitary treatments (TPPT) would be held at the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) in Vienna. A major topic at this meeting would be to agree irradiation treatments to be incorporated into Annex 1 of ISPM No. 18.

2. Systems approaches for fruit flies (FF-SA)

Jesus Reyes introduced the discussion paper on this topic. The paper had been developed taking into account systems approaches used for a range of commodities and fruit fly species around the world.

The panel produced a draft ISPM, which will be submitted to the SC for their meeting in May 2007. The following issues were identified during production of the draft.

- PRA is the basis for a decision to develop a FF-SA.
- The host commodity, target fruit fly and area must be determined. This was referred to as the “phytosanitary condition” and a definition for this term was proposed.
- The major factor in development of a FF-SA was considered to be a specified (often a controlled) population level of fruit flies on the relevant host in the area.
- Critical control points in the production system of the commodity in the area would usually be determined and independent measures to reduce pest risks should be identified.
- The principle of non-discrimination should apply, i.e. if a FF-SA has been found to be effective for a host commodity in an area with a specified fruit fly population, the same measures should be considered for an area with the same phytosanitary condition.
- It is not always necessary to include a post-harvest treatment as part of a FF-SA.
- If a treatment is required, treatments resulting in less than probit 9 efficacy may be useful for a FF-SA, depending on the pest status and the appropriate level of protection of the importing country.

- It is often useful to have an operational plan for the FF-SA.
- Examples of different types of effective FF-SAs were included in an Appendix. These were included to demonstrate the types of options that have been used in different circumstances.
- In some countries it may be appropriate to develop a compliance arrangement with relevant stakeholders in order to develop an effective FF-SA. Guidance on compliance arrangements was therefore included as Appendix 2.

3. Draft standards for country consultation

3.1 Draft ISPM on FF-ALPP

The TPFf discussed the draft ISPM on FF-ALPP based on comments from regional consultations. A number of issues were identified.

- The TPFf were concerned about the use of terms “risk management option” (ISPMs No. 11 and No. 14) and “pest management option” (ISPM No. 22) in different standards and agreed to seek clarification on their use from the Glossary TP.
- A proposal to restructure the draft to produce a similar format to ISPM No. 26 was considered useful.
- The TPFf considered that the terms primary, secondary and occasional hosts should be defined. These terms are widely debated by the fruit fly research community.
- The TPFf considered that the draft ISPM on FF-ALPPs should not contain any reference to alteration of the status of FF-PFAs when FF-ALPP buffer zones are suspended. Issues relating to buffer zones for FF-PFAs should be dealt with by ISPM No. 26, including guidance in the draft ISPM could be confusing or lead to trade problems if misinterpreted by trading partners.
- The panel considered that it was appropriate to have a different number of cycles for lifting suspension and for re-instatement of an FF-ALPP. The panel suggested that the footnote was placed in the main text rather than in the Annex.
- In section 1.3 (verification and declaration of low pest prevalence), the requirement for additional surveillance is unclear.
- The panel agreed that references to fruit fly free places of production and production sites (FFF-POP/PS) should not be included in this ISPM.
- There was a suggestion that the table in Appendix 1 should be deleted. The TPFf considered that it was useful to provide examples, but acknowledged that the current format of the table may lead to confusion. The panel therefore recommended that if the table was removed, additional explanatory information should be added and it should be incorporated into the explanatory document.

3.2 Glossary terms for country consultation

The panel considered the definition of buffer zone was acceptable for the fruit fly ISPMs.

4. Format for publication of fruit fly standards

The TPFf recommended all the fruit fly standards should be compiled into a single publication (and/or CD) for ease of reference once they are completed.

5. Topics and priorities for standards

The panel considered the priorities for standards on fruit flies and agreed the priorities should be (in order of priority):

- *Trapping procedures for fruit flies*
- *Fruit fly free places of production and production sites (FFF-POP/PS)*
- *Suppression and eradication procedures for fruit flies.*

The TPFf considered that the trapping procedures could take the form of a stand alone standard or could become an Annex of ISPM No. 26. This decision should be taken once the document is drafted. The panel recommended that the FAO/IAEA trapping guidelines should form the basis for the document and it should be updated, particularly with information on trapping procedures in Asia-Pacific region.

The TPFf recommended that the FFF-POP/PS should be an Annex to ISPM No. 26. They noted that a document may have been produced for the Australia national programme by the time of the meeting, which could be used as the basis for discussion.

In discussions on the FF-ALPP draft ISPM, the TPFf recognised that guidance on the criteria for determining the susceptibility of hosts to fruit flies would be useful for fruit fly researchers and regulators. The panel therefore recommended a new topic for a standard:

- *Determination of host susceptibility for fruit flies.*

A regional standard, produced by the APPPC is available and the panel will draft a specification for consideration by the SC at their meeting in November 2006.

6. Composition of the TPFf

The panel decided that the current composition of the panel is well balanced, covering broad expertise from a number of regions. The concept of the core group had worked for previous meetings; however, the panel recommended that all members should be invited to future meetings. The panel recommended that IPPC funding should be used for members meeting the criteria of the core group with the most relevant expertise for the topic under discussion.

The panel recommended that for the meeting on trapping procedures a participant with experience on trapping procedures for *Bactrocera* spp. in the Asia/Pacific region should be invited.

7. Interaction with other technical panels

7.1 Diagnostics panel (TPDP)

The panel requested that draft protocols on fruit flies should be sent to the TPFf before being submitted to SC, so that the fruit fly experts can consider them and propose amendments if required.

The panel also proposed two new protocols:

- *Use of DNA techniques to identify fruit fly species, particularly larvae*
- *Use of molecular techniques to differentiate medfly and Oriental fruit fly haplotypes.*

These protocols would assist with the rapid identification of immature fruit flies when detected in commodities and, for medfly and Oriental fruit fly haplotypes, would help identify sources of infestation and aid surveillance and off-shore mitigation programmes as well as sterile fly preventative release programmes.

7.2 Treatments panel (TPPT)

The panel noted that the TPPT will be considering irradiation and other treatments for fruit flies at their next meeting in December 2006. The TPFf recommended that the TPPT endorse the use of 150 Gray for fruit flies. This is widely acknowledged by fruit fly community to be an effective dose for the treatment of a wide range of commodities for fruit flies of economic importance.

For other treatments against fruit flies, the TPFf discussed the different types of treatments used for fruit fly control and recognised the value of harmonised schedules. The panel considered the criteria to be used for adopting treatments as international standards. The factors the panel considered important in prioritising fruit fly treatments for harmonization were:

- the importance (size, value) of the trade
- frequency of trade problems such as:
 - requests from trading partners to repeat experiments, when data already exists for a particular treatment schedule.
 - requests to demonstrate efficacy of treatments for different cultivars.
 - requirements from different trading partners for different temperature/time/dose schedules for the same pest species.

The TPFf therefore recommended that the TPPT consider cold treatments as the highest priority. The priorities determined by the TPFf are given in Annex 1.

7.3 Glossary TP

The TPFf requested definitions of “primary, secondary and occasional hosts” as used in ISPM No. 26.

8. Work programme

The panel agreed a work programme (Annex 2).

9. Recommendations

The following recommendations are proposed to the SC and several technical panels.

The TPFf requested the SC:

- *approve* a new topic for fruit flies (*Determination of host susceptibility for fruit flies*)
- *note* the recommendation to publish the fruit fly standards in one volume once they are complete
- *agree* that FFF-POP/PS should be an Annex of ISPM No. 26
- *note* the recommendation on the composition of the TPFf.

See the SC May 2007 report for final decisions.

The TPFf requested the TPDP:

- *agree* to circulate draft protocols on fruit flies to the TPFf before sending to SC
- *consider* the two proposed topics for new diagnostic protocols (*Use of DNA techniques to identify fruit fly species, particularly larvae; Use of molecular techniques to differentiate medfly and Oriental fruit fly haplotypes*).

The TPFf requested the TPPT:

- *approve* 150 Gray as the standard for irradiation treatments for fruit flies
- *note* the recommended priorities for fruit fly treatments in Annex 1 of this report.

The TPFf requested the Glossary TP:

- *provide* clarification of the use of terms “*risk management option*” (ISPMs No. 11 and No. 14) and “*pest management option*” (ISPM No. 22) to avoid conflict in different standards.
- *consider* providing definitions of “*primary, secondary and occasional hosts*” of fruit flies (from ISPM No 26).

Priorities for fruit fly treatments

(agreed by the TPF 060908)

1. Irradiation: generic dose of 150 Gray.

2. Other treatment priorities (in order of priority):

Treatment	Species	Host
Cold	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mediterranean fruit fly (<i>Ceratitis capitata</i>) - Queensland fruit fly (<i>Bactrocera tryoni</i>) - Caribbean fruit fly (<i>Anastrepha suspensa</i>) - <i>Anastrepha fraterculus</i> (protocol needed) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - citrus (Sweet orange (<i>C. sinensis</i>), lemon (<i>C. limon</i>), grapefruit (<i>C. paradise</i>), clemantine (<i>C. reticulata</i>)) - stone fruits - cherry - grapes - pome fruit (apples, pears) - longan - lychee - carambola
Hot water	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Anastrepha</i> spp. - Mediterranean fruit fly (<i>Ceratitis capitata</i>) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - mango
Vapour heat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Bactrocera</i> spp. - <i>Anastrepha</i> spp. - Mediterranean fruit fly (<i>Ceratitis capitata</i>) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - papaya - mango - citrus (sweet orange, grapefruit)

Technical panel on pest free areas and systems approaches for fruit flies

PROPOSED WORK PROGRAMME 2006-7

(as at 2005-09-08)

2006	
Sept	30 – Examples of FF-SA for Appendix 1 to MH
Oct	1 - Comments on draft specifications (FFF-POP/PS, suppression) to ORS 1 - RD to circulate draft specification on host susceptibility to TPF 5 - IPPC Secretariat to circulate draft FF-SA and draft report 15 – TKH to send proposed definitions of primary, secondary and occasional hosts to TPF 31 – TPF to send comments on draft ISPM FF-SA to MH 31 – TPF to send comments on draft specification on host susceptibility to ORS 31 – TPF to send comments on proposed definitions to MGA
Nov	6-10 - SC7 13-17 - SC meeting – ORS to propose new topic for fruit fly ISPM
Dec	
2007	
Jan	15 Draft ISPM FF-SA due to IPPC Secretariat to be considered by SC in April
Feb	
Mar	26-29 – CPM
April	30-4 May - SC meeting – consider draft ISPM FF-SA
May	
June	
July	31 – Submission of discussion documents for trapping procedures for fruit flies (Tephritidae)
Aug	27 – 31 Next meeting of TPF, Rome (tentative)
Sept	
Oct	

Participants list TPF meeting, Salvador, Brazil, 4 - 8 September 2006

TPFF members:

<p>Steward: Odilson Luiz Ribeiro e Silva Department of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Matters Secretariat of Agribusiness International Relations Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Food Supply Esplanada dos Ministérios – Bloco D, Sala 352 CEP: 70043-900 – Brasília - DF Brazil</p> <p>Tel: (+55) 61 3218 2834 or 3218 2731 Fax: (+55) 61 3225 4738 E-mail: odilson@agricultura.gov.br</p>	<p>Robert Duthie Manager South East Asia & subcontinent Plant Biosecurity Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry P.O. Box 858 Canberra, ACT 2601 Australia</p> <p>Tel: (+61) 2 6272 5564 Fax: (+61) 2 6272 3307 E-mail: robert.j.duthie@affa.gov.au; robert.j.duthie@daff.gov.au</p>
<p>Walther Enkerlin Joint FAO/IAEA Programme of Nuclear Techniques in Food and Agriculture Wagramer Strasse 5 P.O. Box 100 A-1400 Vienna Austria</p> <p>Tel: (+43) 1 26077 Fax: (+43) 1 26077 E-mail: w.engerlin@iaea.org</p>	<p>José Fernandes Direcção General da Protecção das Culturas Divisão de Inspeção Fitossanitária Tapada da Ajuda Edifício 1 1349-018 Lisbon Portugal</p> <p>Tel: (+351) 21 361 3285 Fax: (+351) 21 361 3277 E-mail: josefernandes@dgpc.min-agricultura.pt</p>
<p>Jaime Gonzalez Jefe Nacional del Proyecto Mosca de la Fruta Servicio Agrícola y Ganadero Av. Bulnes 140 Santiago Chile</p> <p>Tel: (+56) 2 696 1339 Fax: (+56) 2 696 3370 E-mail: jaime.gonzalez@sag.gob.cl</p>	<p>Tan Keng Hong 20, Jalan Tan Jit Seng Hillside Tanjong Bungah 11200 Penang Malaysia</p> <p>Tel: (+60) 4 890 5737 Fax: (+60) 4 892 1123 E-mail: tan_kh@tm.net.my; khtan@thonline.com.my</p>
<p>Aldo Malavasi Director Brazilian Medfly Facility Quadra D 13, Lote 15 Juazeiro, Bahia 48.900-00 Brazil</p> <p>Tel: (+55) 74 3612 5399 Fax: (+55) 74 3612 5118 E-mail: malavasi@moscamed.org.br</p>	<p>Alies van Sauers-Muller National Coordinator National Program for the Carambola Fruit Fly in Suriname Agricultural Experiment Station Letitia Vriesdelaan 8 Paramaribo Suriname</p> <p>Tel: (+597) 425 632 or (+597) 886 3814 Fax: (+597) 475 919 E-mail: cffsur@sr.net; aliesmuller@yahoo.com</p>

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
 E-mail: janhendrikv@nda.agric.za;

Other participants:

<p>Jane Chard (IPPC Secretariat) Scottish Agricultural Science Agency 82 Craigs Road East Craigs Edinburgh United Kingdom</p> <p>Tel: (+44) 131 244 8863 Fax: (+44) 131 244 8940 E-mail: Jane.Chard@sasa.gsi.gov.uk</p>	<p>Maria Júlia Signoretti Godoy (Host) Chefe da Divisão de Prevenção e Controle de Pragas Departamento de Sanidade Vegetal Ministério da Agricultura, Pecuária e Abastecimento Esplanada dos Ministérios, Bloco D, Anexo B, Sala 332 CEP: 70043-900 Brasília, DF Brazil</p> <p>Tel: (+55) 61 3218 2703 / 2407 Fax: (+55) 61 3218 2693 E-mail: mgodoy@agricultura.gov.br</p>
<p>Magda Gonzalez Arroyo (Steward, ALPP-FF) Genencia Técnica de Exportaciones Servicio Fitosanitario del Estado Ministerio de Agricultura y Ganadería P.O.Box 70-3006 Barreal de Heredia Costa Rica</p> <p>Tel: (+506) 260 6721 Fax: (+506) 260 6721 E-mail: mgonzalez@protecnet.go.cr</p>	<p>Mike Holtzhausen (Steward, SA-FF) Deputy Director Agricultural Products Inspection Services Private Bag X258 Pretoria 0001 South Africa</p> <p>Tel: (+27) 12 319 6100 Fax: (+27) 12 319 6350 E-mail: mikeh@nda.agric.za</p>
<p>Jesús Reyes (invited expert) Fruit Fly Regional Project Manager IAEA 16 Calle 3-38, Zona 10 Ciudad de Guatemala 01010 Guatemala</p> <p>Tel: (+502) 2366 4604 Fax: (+502) 2367 2084 E-mail: jreyes@medflygt.com</p>	

Unable to attend

<p>Ms Mary Bahdousheh Head, Pest Control Section Plant Protection Department Ministry of Agriculture P.O. Box 2099/961044 Amman, Jordan</p> <p>Tel: (+962) 6 568 6151 Ext. 309 Mob: (+962) 796 916 952 Fax: (+962) 6 568 6310 ppcs@moa.gov.jo; bahdousheh_m@yahoo.com</p>	<p>Kenji Tsuruta Senior Officer (Identification) Moji Plant Protection Station, MAFF 1-3-10, Nishikaigan Moji-ku Kitakyushu 801-0841 Japan</p> <p>Tel: (+81) 093-321-2601 Fax: (+81) 093-332-5182 E-mail: tsurutak@pps.go.jp</p>
<p>José Luis Zavala López 11 y 12 Abasolo # 617 Zona Centro, CP 87000 Ciudad Victoria, Tamaulipas México</p> <p>Tel: (+52) 834 310 0014 Fax: (+52) 834 315 1537 E-mail: joseluiszavalalopez@yahoo.com.mx; moscadir@prodigy.net.mx</p>	