Submission form for topics for Standards and Implementation

*(Updated by the IPPC Secretariat 2018-04-27)*

Name of Country or Organization United States of America (USA)

Introduction

In Accordance with CPM-13 decision, a combined call for topics for standards and tools for implementation is opened in 2018. IPPC contracting parties and RPPOs are invited to submit proposals for topics to be included as gaps in the Framework for Standards and Implementation for consideration to be put onto the IPPC work programme. Each submission should clearly define the problem needing resolution in sufficient detail to determine how it fits into the Framework for Standards and Implementation and the cost/benefit of the development of the standard or tool. Submitters are requested to consult the current IPPC Framework for Standards and Implementation (<https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/82439/>) to identify areas where the proposal can contribute.

Standards

This form covers submissions for new ISPMs, new components to an existing ISPM and revision or amendments to an ISPM, supplement, annex or appendix, including diagnostic protocols. Please note that a separate call for phytosanitary treatments (PTs) is made, more information on this call is available at <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/standards-setting/calls-treatments/>.

Please refer to the IPPC Standard Setting Procedure Manual[[1]](#footnote-1) for an explanation of the hierarchy of terms for standards (technical area, topic and subject). The list of topics for IPPC standards adopted by the CPM is available at <https://www.ippc.int/core-activities/standards-setting/list-topics-ippc-standards>.

Implementation

This form covers submissions for new IPPC implementation resources for implementation of the Convention, ISPMs and CPM recommendations or for revisions to IPPC implementation resources. Please refer to the IPPC Framework for Standards and Implementation on implementation resources that have been adopted/developed, are under development or are planned to be developed.

Submission

This completed form should be submitted by the IPPC official contact point, preferably via e-mail, to the IPPC Secretariat ([ippc@fao.org](mailto:ippc@fao.org)) no later than **31 August 2018**. Please use one form per topic.

An electronic version of this form is available at <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/standards-and-implementation/call-for-topics-standards-and-implementation/>.

Save and submit the completed submission form as:   
2018\_TOPIC\_*[Country or organization name – Proposed title of topic]*.docx.

(Text in brackets given for explanatory purposes)

|  |
| --- |
| **Submission form for topics for Standards and Implementation** |
| 1. **Proposed by**: (Name of IPPC Official Contact Point) Mr. John Greifer (USA) |
| 1. **Contact:** (Contact information of an individual able to clarify issues relating to this submission)   Name: Mr John Greifer (USA)  Position and organization: Assistant Deputy Administrator for International Phytosanitary Standards  Mailing address: 1400 Independence Ave SW, Washington, DC 20250, USA    Phone: +1 202 799 7159 Fax: +1 202 690 0472  E-mail: John.K.Greifer@aphis.usda.gov |
| 1. **Proposed Topic (Choose one box only)**   [X\_\_] Standard **(go to 4)** [\_\_] Implementation resource **(go to 5)** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **Standards**    1. **Type of topic: (Choose one box only)** | | |
| A. New ISPM:  [\_\_] Concept  [\_\_] Pest specific  [\_\_] Commodity specific  [\_\_] Reference | B. New component to an existing ISPM:  [\_] Supplement  [X] Annex  [\_\_] Appendix  [\_\_] Technical panel (technical area)  [\_\_] Diagnostic protocol (subject) | C. Revision/Amendment of:  [\_\_] ISPM  [\_\_] Supplement  [\_\_] Annex  [\_\_] Appendix |
| **Draft specification:**  As agreed by CPM-7 (2012) and CPM-11 (2016), submissions in answer to the call for topics (except for draft diagnostic protocols, which are subject to additional criteria, see below) should be accompanied by a draft specification. Proposals for phytosanitary treatments are submitted using a different submission form in a separate call: <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/standards-setting/calls-treatments/>.  An annotated template for the draft specification for Standards is available on the IPP (<https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/81324/>) in English, French and Spanish.  **(go to 6)** | | |

**OR**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. **Implementation**    1. **Type of topic: (Choose one box only)** | |
| 1. New implementation resource:   [\_\_] Guide (e.g. Manual)  [\_\_] Training material (e.g. e-Learning)  [\_\_] Awareness material  [\_\_] Other (Please specify ) | 1. Revision of implementation resource   [\_\_] Guide (e.g. Manual)  [\_\_] Training material (e.g. e-Learning)  [\_\_] Awareness material  [\_\_] Other (Please specify ) |
| * 1. Featured Convention articles, ISPMs and CPM recommendations in the proposed implementation resource   [\_\_] for Convention articles (Please specify )  [\_\_] for ISPM (Please specify )  [\_\_] for CPM Recommendation (Please specify ) | |
| **Draft outline:**  Submissions for topics on implementation should be accompanied by a draft outline of implementation resource defining a scope and purpose, or a draft implementation resource. Commitment for financial/in-kind resources to support the development of the implementation resource may be included in the submission (non-obligatory).  **(go to 6)** | |

|  |
| --- |
| **6. Proposed title of document** *Criteria for the determination of host status for fruit flies based on available information (Annex to ISPM 37).* |
| **7. Proposed priority**  [\_X\_] 1 (high) [\_\_] 2 [\_\_] 3 [\_\_] 4 (low)  Comments: The IPPC Framework for Standards and Implementation (<https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/standards-and-implementation/ippc-framework-for-standards-and-implementation/>) identifies a gap for a conceptual standard on fruit fly host status. This proposed Annex to ISPM 37 will fill this gap. |
| **8. Featured outcome of standard/implementation resource:**  *The new Annex to ISPM 37 will provide the missing conceptual guidance and will develop consistent criteria for evaluating already available information (e.g. scientific literature, NPPO records, pest reports, etc.) for determining the host status for fruit flies, without conducting any experiments.* |
| **9. Contribution to filling the gaps of the Framework for Standards and Implementation:** (2 lines max)  *A gap in guidance on host status has been identified in the CPM-12 (2017) version of the Framework, line 25. The proposed Annex to ISPM 37 will fill the identified gap for conceptual guidance on fruit fly host status.* |
| **10. Summary of justification for the proposal** (2 lines max)  *The proposed Annex will provide criteria on evaluating published information for consistency in decision-making; and will harmonize terminology for host status to fruit flies aligning it with the terms already in ISPM 37.* |

**Criteria for justification and prioritization of proposed topics[[2]](#footnote-2):**

|  |
| --- |
| Submissions should address the applicable criteria for justification of the proposal (as listed below). Where possible, information in support of the justification and that may assist in the prioritization should be indicated.  All core criteria must be addressed; supporting criteria should be addressed if applicable.  Priority will be given to topics with the largest global impact. |
| **Core criteria (must provide information. It is expected that all submissions meet the following core**  **criteria)** |
| Contribution to the purpose of the IPPC as described in article I.1.  *The Annex will secure common and effective action to prevent introduction and spread of fruit flies by ensuring harmonized approach to correctly identifying and regulating their hosts. This will prevent disagreements between NPPOs over which plants (fruits) are hosts for particular fruit flies according to already available information and will assist in safe trade in plants and plant products.* |
| Linkage to IPPC Strategic Objectives (SOs) and Organizational results demonstrated.  *The Annex will help improving phytosanitary capacity of NPPOs in accomplishing main IPPC Strategic Objectives, i.e., protecting agriculture and environment from introduction of fruit flies; enhancing food security by preventing fruit flies’ spread and by facilitating safe trade in commodities that are scientifically confirmed to be not suitable hosts for fruit flies.* |
| Feasibility of implementation at the global level (consider ease of implementation, technical complexity, capacity of NPPO(s) to implement, relevance for more than one region).  *The Annex on host status for fruit flies is based on already available information and should be no more technically complex or more difficult to implement than any existing concept standards or other guidance. This Annex is of particular benefit globally where historic host records have led to host status uncertainty and debate amongst NPPOs.* |
| Clear identification of the problems that need to be resolved through the development of the standard or implementation resource.  *Numerous published information on fruit fly host status is used by NPPOs to implement existing ISPMs related to PRA, PFA, designing import and export programs, eradication, surveys, pest records, and much more. There is considerable inconsistency in interpreting information that often leads to potential disputes between NPPOs. Nearly 30 terms could be found in the literature describing host status, e.g., preferred host, rare host, field host, primary host, secondary host, experimental host, reproductive host. Instead of using a plethora of ambiguous and inconsistent terms, the international phytosanitary community needs to harmonize them, aligning with the terms already in ISPM 37. Consistent and transparent criteria for listing and interpretation fruit fly host status based on available information should be developed being crucial for preventing future trade challenges over whether a particular fruit fly should be regulated by NPPOs on different hosts.* |
| Availability of, or possibility to collect, information in support of the proposed standard or implementation resource (e.g. scientific, historical, technical information, experience).  *Plentiful scientific, historical, technical information and expertise are all readily available globally.* |

|  |
| --- |
| **Supporting criteria (information may be provided, as appropriate):** |
| **Supporting criteria (Practical)**   1. Is there a regional standard and/or implementation resource on the same topic already available and used by NPPOs, RPPOs or international organizations.   *Development of a regional NAPPO standard commenced several years ago but currently is on hold due to insufficient funding.*   1. Availability of expertise needed to develop the proposed standard and/or implementation resource.   *Information on how to develop a harmonized approach to the problem and available found in other regions, e.g., APPPC, EPPO.* |
| **Supporting criteria (Economic)**   1. Estimated value of the plants protected.   *This Annex could have a tremendous global effect on all fruits and vegetables in trade that are potential hosts of fruit flies.*   1. Estimated value of trade including new trade opportunities affected by the proposed standard and/or implementation resource (e.g. volume of trade, value of trade, the percentage of Gross Domestic Product of this trade) if appropriate.   *There is a likely increase in new trade opportunities after the Annex development, particularly where commodities may have been denied importation into a country due to old or erroneous information in the literature*. |
| **Supporting criteria (Environmental)**   1. Utility to reduce the potential negative environmental consequences of certain phytosanitary measures, for example reduction in global emissions for the protection of the ozone layer.   *The Annex will lead to reductions of unjustified phytosanitary measures, including MB fumigation for fruit and vegetable commodities that are non-hosts or conditional hosts of the fruit flies.*   1. Utility in the management of non-indigenous species which are pests of plants (such as some invasive alien species).   *It will allow for more accurate PRAs and better host regulations during eradication programs.*   1. Contribution to the protection of the environment, through the protection of wild flora, and their habitats and ecosystems, and of agricultural biodiversity.   *The Annex will contribute to protection of agroecosystems, natural resources and biodiversity by accurate assessment of the host status to fruit flies leading to prevention of pest introductions and limiting application of pesticides.* |
| **Supporting criteria (Strategic)**   1. Extent of support for the proposed standard and/or implementation resource (e.g. one or more NPPOs or RPPOs have requested it, or one or more RPPOs have adopted a standard on the same topic).   *Development of a NAPPO standard on the same topic is currently on hold due to funding shortage. NAPPO and APPPC have also adopted standards related to host status determinations, similar to ISPM 37, which are based on research protocols, not on available evidence. The SC identified the need for a conceptual guidance on the host status of plants to fruit flies based on the existing information.*   1. Frequency with which the issue to be addressed, as identified in the submission emerges as a source of trade disruption (e.g. disputes or need for repeated bilateral discussions, number of times per year trade is disrupted).   *Determination of host status for fruit flies is a frequent source of disagreement and trade disruption between contracting parties. Harmonized criteria for determining host status based on available evidence would expedite consensus and thereby expedite trade. Laboratory studies are often not feasible due to time and resource constraints, while wealth of published information is readily available for analysis.*   1. Relevance and utility to developing countries.   *This guidance is relevant and useful to both developed and developing countries*. *It* s*hould be of particular benefit to developing countries who may lack funding or trained personnel to undertake laboratory studies to determine host status.*   1. Coverage (application to a wide range of countries/pests/commodities).   *It could be applied to a wide range of countries, pests, and commodities.*   1. Complements other standards and/or implementation resources (e.g. potential for the standard to be used as part of a systems approach for one pest, complement treatments for other pests).   *The guidance will provide a broad foundation to address host status determinations and* c*omplements other ISPMs relating to PRA (ISPMs 2 and 11), surveillance and pest status (ISPMs 6 and 8), pest reporting (ISPM 17), systems approaches (ISPM 14), and to a full suite of fruit fly ISPMs.*   1. Conceptual standard and/or implementation resource to address fundamental concepts (e.g. treatment efficacy, inspection methodology).   *This guidance can evolve into a foundation for addressing fundamental concepts related to host status determination based on the available information. It could be further be developed to apply the same concept and utility to the broadest range of potential plant pests, i.e., other arthropods and pathogens.*   1. Urgent need for the standard and/or implementation resource.   *A gap identified in the Framework for standards and Implementation explains the pressing need for the Supplement.* |
| **Diagnostic protocols are subject to additional criteria. For proposals for DPs, please elaborate on the following criteria to help the future consideration of the subject proposed:**   * Need for international harmonization of the diagnostic techniques for the pest (e.g. due to difficulties in diagnosis or disputes on methodology) * Relevance of the diagnosis to the protection of plants including measures to limit the impact of the pest. * Importance of the plants protected on the global level (e.g. relevant to many countries or of major importance to a few countries). * Volume/importance of trade of the commodity that is subjected to the diagnostic procedures (e.g. relevant to many countries or of major importance to a few countries). * Other criteria for topics as determined by CPM that are relevant to determining priorities * Balance between pests of importance in different climatic zones (temperate, tropics etc.) and commodity classes. * Number of labs undertaking the diagnosis. * Feasibility of production of a protocol, including availability of knowledge and expertise. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Literature review**[[3]](#footnote-3) (This section will provide a **summary of the topic** based on scientific and technical publications, including a referenced **list of literature reviewed**. This will help provide the scientific basis for the content of the standard/implementation resource to be used by the selected experts during the development of the standard/implementation resource)**.**  *Aluja, M., and R. L. Mangan. 2008. Fruit fly (Diptera: Tephritidae) host status determination: critical conceptual, methodological, and regulatory considerations. Ann. Rev. Entomol. 53: 473–502.*  *Cowley, Baker and Harte. 1992. Definition and determination of host status for multivoltine fruit fly (Diptera: Tephritidae) species. Journal of Economic Entomology. 85(2): 312-317.*  USDA APHIS PPQ.  *Guidelines for plant pest risk assessment of imported fruit and vegetable commodities. Supplement 3. Host status.* |

**Send submissions to:** **Address:** IPPC Secretariat (AGDI)

**E-mail:** [ippc@fao.org](mailto:ippc@fao.org) Food and Agriculture Organization of the UN

(Subject line: “Call for topics 2018”) Viale delle Terme di Caracalla

00153 Rome, Italy

**DRAFT SPECIFICATION FOR ISPM: Criteria for the determination of host status for fruit flies based on available information ([Topic no.])**

Status box

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| This is not an official part of the specification and it will be modified by the IPPC Secretariat after approval | |
| **Date of this document** | [2018-08-23] |
| **Document category** | Draft specification for an ISPM |
| **Current document stage** |  |
| **Major stages** |  |
| **Steward history** |  |
| **Notes** |  |

Title

1. *Criteria for the determination of host status for fruit flies based on available information (Annex to ISPM 37)*.

Reason for the annex to the standard

1. Numerous published information on fruit fly host status is used by national plant protection organizations (NPPOs) to implement existing international standards for phytosanitary measures (ISPMs) related to pest risk analysis (PRA), pest free areas (PFA), designing import and export programs, eradication, surveys, pest records, etc. There is considerable inconsistency in interpreting published information that often leads to potential disputes between NPPOs. Nearly 30 terms could be found in the literature describing host status, e.g., preferred host, rare host, field host, primary host, secondary host, experimental host, reproductive host. Instead of using a plethora of ambiguous and inconsistent terms, the international phytosanitary community should harmonize them, aligning with the terms in ISPM 37. Consistent and transparent criteria for listing fruit fly hosts and for interpretation of host status based on available information should be developed. This will be crucial for preventing future trade challenges over whether a particular fruit fly should be regulated by NPPOs on different hosts.

Scope

1. This Annex outlines criteria and provides guidelines for their consistent application when interpreting host status of fruits and vegetables to fruit flies based on already existing evidence. This Annex applies to all commodities in global trade that can be potential hosts for fruit flies.

Purpose

1. The Annex will provide conceptual guidance and consistent criteria for evaluating already available information (e.g. scientific literature, NPPO records, pest reports) to determine the host status for fruit flies, without conducting new experiments. These harmonized criteria will improve consistency in decision-making and will align multiples terms broadly used for host status assessments with those adopted in ISPM 37.

Tasks

1. The expert drafting group (EDG) should undertake the following tasks:
2. Examine existing documentation related to determination of host status for fruit flies (see references).
3. Identify different types of fruit fly-host interactions and related terminology recognized in scientific and regulatory literature (e.g. host, non-host, conditional host, natural host, non-natural host, reproductive host, alternate host).
4. Identify the most relevant types of fruit fly-host interactions and the specific conditions that determine host status (e.g. conditions related to conditional hosts, non-hosts, natural hosts) and align those with the categories in ISPM 37; propose new categories if appropriate.
5. Describe key criteria that can be used to evaluate fruit fly-host interactions based on published evidence (e.g. what specific information and criteria is needed to determine whether a plant is truly a host for a fruit fly).
6. Recommend specific criteria and terminology for describing hosts in phytosanitary literature, i.e., RPPO standards, NPPO documents (e.g. PRAs, surveillance protocols, etc.), and regulations, reflecting on task No.3.
7. Consider whether the Annex could affect in a specific way (positively or negatively) the protection of biodiversity and the environment. If this is the case, the impact should be identified, addressed and clarified in the draft.
8. Consider implementation of the Annex by contracting parties and identify potential operational and technical implementation issues. Provide information and possible recommendations on these issues to the Standards Committee (SC).

Provision of resources

1. Funding for the meeting may be provided from sources other than the regular programme of the IPPC (FAO). As recommended by ICPM-2 (1999), whenever possible, those participating in standard setting activities voluntarily fund their travel and subsistence to attend meetings. Participants may request financial assistance, with the understanding that resources are limited and the priority for financial assistance is given to developing country participants. Please refer to the *Criteria used for prioritizing participants to receive travel assistance to attend meetings organized by the IPPC Secretariat* posted on the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP) (see <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/>).

Collaborator

1. To be determined.

Steward

1. Please refer to the *List of topics for IPPC standards* posted on the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP) (see https://www.ippc.int/core-activities/standards-setting/list-topics-ippc-standards).

Expertise

1. Pest risk analysis, developing lists of hosts of fruit flies for various reasons (e.g. PRA, surveillance, inspection, standards development).

Participants

1. Six to eight experts with expertise in pest risk analysis and general entomology, especially in taxonomic groups of Diptera: Tephritidae, with experience in developing lists of hosts of fruit flies for various tasks (e.g. PRA, surveillance, inspection, national/regional/international standards on host status development and implementation, etc.).

References

1. The IPPC, relevant ISPMs and other national, regional and international standards and agreements as may be applicable to the tasks, and discussion papers submitted in relation to this work.
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RSPM 30. 2008. Guidelines for the determination and designation of host status of a fruit or vegetable for fruit flies (Diptera: Tephritidae). Ottawa, NAPPO.

Aluja, M., and R. L. Mangan. 2008. Fruit fly (Diptera: Tephritidae) host status determination: critical conceptual, methodological, and regulatory considerations. Ann. Rev. Entomol. 53: 473–502.

Cowley, Baker and Harte. 1992. Definition and determination of host status for multivoltine fruit fly (Diptera: Tephritidae) species. Journal of Economic Entomology. 85(2): 312-317.

USDA APHIS PPQ. 2012. Guidelines for plant pest risk assessment of imported fruit and vegetable commodities. Supplement 3. Host status.

Discussion papers

1. Participants and interested parties are encouraged to submit discussion papers to the IPPC Secretariat ([ippc@fao.org](mailto:ippc@fao.org)) for consideration by the EDG.

1. IPPC Standard Setting Procedure Manual URL: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/85024/> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. As agreed by CPM-13 (2018) [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. As agreed by CPM-7 (2012) and CPM-11 (2016). [↑](#footnote-ref-3)