2020 SECOND CONSULTATION

1 July – 30 September 2020

Compiled comments for Draft PT: Cold treatment of *Ceratitis capitata* on *Prunus avium, Prunus domestica* and *Prunus persica* (2017-022A)

Summary of comments

Name	Summary
Cuba	No hay comentarios al documento propuesto.
European Union	The comments have been introduced by the European Commission on behalf of the European Union and its Member States.
Myanmar	Agree wit the document
OIRSA	Revisión Completa
Viet Nam	According to the evidence "De Lima, C.P.F. 2011. Cold treatment and methyl bromide fumigation of Australian cherries, peaches, nectarines and plums (8 cultivars) infested with eggs and larvae of the Mediterranean fruit fly (Ceratitis capitata Wiedemann) Diptera: Tephritidae. South Perth, Australia, Department of Agriculture and Food Western Australia. 420 pp" in reference of this draft, the treatment will be combine cold treatment and methyl bromide fumigation of cherries, peaches, nectarines and plum infested with Ceratitis capitata (eggs and larvae stages). Viet Nam would like to request to clearify to clarify why this draft only applies cold treatment without applying combine cold treatment and methyl bromide fumigation as published in the scientific research of authors mentioned in the reference of this draft.

T (Type) - B = Bullet, C = Comment, P = Proposed Change, R = Rating

FAO sequential number	Para	Text	T	Comment
1	G	(General Comment)	C	*Category : SUBSTANTIVE* **(48) Guyana (30 Sep 2020 10:02 PM)** Guyana has no reservation regarding the draft document at this point.
2	G	(General Comment)	C	*Category : TECHNICAL* **(47) Peru (30 Sep 2020 4:45 PM)** Peru agrees with COSAVE´s comments.
3	G	(General Comment)	C	*Category : TECHNICAL* **(46) Australia (30 Sep 2020 12:57 PM)** Australia has reviewed this phytosanitary treatment and is supportive of this treatment and the respective text.
4	G	(General Comment)	C	*Category : SUBSTANTIVE* **(45) Brazil (29 Sep 2020 10:28 PM)** Brazil supports COSAVE's general comment.
5	G	(General Comment)	C	*Category : SUBSTANTIVE* **(44) Costa Rica (29 Sep 2020 8:30 PM)** No comment

6	G	(General Comment)	C	*Category : TECHNICAL* **(40) Paraguay (29 Sep 2020 3:26 PM)** Paraguay agrees with Cosave's comments
7	G	(General Comment)	C	*Category : TECHNICAL* **(39) Slovenia (29 Sep 2020 1:56 PM)** Slovenia would like to formally endorse the EPPO comments submitted via the IPPC Online Comment System.
8	G	(General Comment)	C	*Category : SUBSTANTIVE* **(38) Argentina (29 Sep 2020 1:48 PM)** We fully support comments provided by COSAVE to this draft
9	G	(General Comment)	C	*Category : TECHNICAL* **(36) COSAVE (29 Sep 2020 4:01 AM)** We noted the TPPT response to our comment submitted during the first consultation regarding mentioning cultivars in Section "other relevant information". However, we suggest do not include cultivars to avoid confusion when implementing treatment schedule. According to ISPM 28, a requirement for varietal testing should be based on evidence that the varietal differences affect treatment efficacy, and data should be provided to support the requirement. However, the information provided on cultivars in this draft does not show evidence about differences among cultivar treatments but it only mentions general information on which cultivars the treatments were performed. On the other hand, detailed information of cultivars used in developing treatment schedules can be found in the references listed in "References" section. Tomamos nota de la respuesta del PTTF a nuestro comentario presentado durante la primera consulta con respecto a la mención de cultivares en la Sección "otra información relevante". Sin embargo, sugerimos no incluir cultivares para evitar confusiones al implementar el protocolo de tratamiento . De acuerdo con la NIMF 28, el requisito de pruebas varietales debe basarse en evidencia de que las diferencias varietales afectan la eficacia del tratamiento, y se deben proporcionar datos para respaldar el requisito. Sin embargo, la información sobre los cultivares que se detallan en este borrador, no ofrece evidencia de diferencias entre los tratamientos entre cultivares sino que sólo se trata de información general sobre los cuales se realizaron los ensayos. Por otro lado, la información detallada de los cultivares utilizados en el desarrollo de los protocolos de tratamiento se puede consultar en las referencias listadas en la sección "Referencias".
10	G	(General Comment)	C	*Category : SUBSTANTIVE* **(35) OIRSA (28 Sep 2020 7:13 PM)** No momentous comments for this document.
11	G	(General Comment)	C	*Category : SUBSTANTIVE* **(34) Barbados (28 Sep 2020 6:22 PM)** Barbados has no changes to make to this draft ISPM.

12	G	(General Comment)	C	*Category : SUBSTANTIVE* **(33) PPPO (27 Sep 2020 11:25 PM)** it would be good to develop a more generic rate GY to cover other fruit fly species e.g. to cover Bactrocera spp. complex.
13	G	(General Comment)	C	*Category : SUBSTANTIVE* **(32) Mexico (26 Sep 2020 5:34 AM)** I support the document as it is and I have no comments
14	G	(General Comment)	C	*Category : SUBSTANTIVE* **(14) China (23 Sep 2020 8:21 AM)** The treatment efficacy of cold treatment should be based the mortality of the most tolerant stage of target pest. 1. Cold treatment should apply to achieve pest mortality in treatment objective in ISPM 42, all the PTs adopted after April of 2018 should be consensus as its requirements. 2. The pest mortality is the key standard for temperature treatment according the outline of requirements and requirements in ISPM 42. The measure of treatment efficacy for eggs and larvae in the drafts of 2017-022A、2017-022B、2017-023A、2017-023B is not comply with the requirements. Even though those words like "kill" and "failure to pupariate" are used in the revision drafts, the endpoint for efficacy is preventing pupation in fact. 3. The TPPT response of "failure to pupariate " is accepted in ISPM 28 PT24, PT25, PT26, PT30 and PT31, but the PTs had published before the adoption of ISPM 42. It can not be the cases for the new PTs of temperature treatment. The endpoint of "failure to pupariate" have been accepted in the published PTs (PT24, PT25, PT26, PT30 and PT31), as the TPPT explained, but all these TPs endorsed before the adoption of ISPM 42, then, this cannot be regard as the reason for the inconsistency with the new criteria for temperature treatment. 4. Preventing successful development or inability to reproduce is only applied to irradiation treatment. The endpoint standard is also one of obstacles for using irradiation treatment. So as to facility the application of this standards, failure to pupariate should not be used in cold treatments. 5. The annex of ISPM 28 is important as the guideline of the technology for phytosanitary treatment. once failure to pupariate is accepted as endpoint for cold treatment, is meaning failure to pupariate can be used in the other researches of cold treatment? The ISPM 28 and its annexes have an important guiding role in the development of phytosanitary treatment technology. If the prevention of pupation can be regarded as the criteria for judging the effect of cold treatment, there will be a lot of research to follow this criterion in the future, which will be difficult to apply in practice. If exceptions are still allowed, is the prevention of fruit fly emergence acceptable as a criterion for determining the effect of cold treatment?
15	G	(General Comment)	C	*Category : TECHNICAL* **(13) Uruguay (22 Sep 2020 5:13 PM)**

				We noted the TPPT response to our comment submitted during the first consultation regarding mentioning cultivars in Section "other relevant information". However, we suggest do not include cultivars to avoid confusion when implementing treatment schedule. According to ISPM 28, a requirement for varietal testing should be based on evidence that the varietal differences affect treatment efficacy, and data should be provided to support the requirement. However, the information provided on cultivars in this draft does not show evidence about differences among cultivar treatments but it only mentions general information on which cultivars the treatments were performed. On the other hand, detailed information of cultivars used in developing treatment schedules can be found in the references listed in "References" section. Tomamos nota de la respuesta del PTTF a nuestro comentario presentado durante la primera consulta con respecto a la mención de cultivares en la Sección "otra información relevante". Sin embargo, sugerimos no incluir cultivares para evitar confusiones al implementar el protocolo de tratamiento . De acuerdo con la NIMF 28, el requisito de pruebas varietales debe basarse en evidencia de que las diferencias varietales afectan la eficacia del tratamiento, y se deben proporcionar datos para respaldar el requisito. Sin embargo, la información sobre los cultivares que se detallan en este borrador, no ofrece evidencia de diferencias entre los tratamientos entre cultivares sino que sólo se trata de información general sobre los cuales se realizaron los ensayos. Por otro lado, la información detallada de los cultivares utilizados en el desarrollo de los protocolos de tratamiento se puede consultar en las referencias listadas en la sección "Referencias".
16	G	(General Comment)	C	*Category : SUBSTANTIVE* **(8) Qatar (9 Sep 2020 9:39 AM)** we don't have any comment
17	G	(General Comment)	C	*Category : SUBSTANTIVE* **(7) Malawi (5 Sep 2020 1:55 PM)** we agree with annex
18	G	(General Comment)	C	*Category : SUBSTANTIVE* **(6) Thailand (2 Sep 2020 10:31 AM)** Thailand has no objection on the proposed draft Cold treatment for Ceratitis capitata on Prunus avium, Prunus salicina and Prunus persica.
19	G	(General Comment)	C	*Category : EDITORIAL* **(5) Singapore (1 Sep 2020 5:48 AM)** Singapore is supportive of this.
20	G	(General Comment)	C	*Category : TECHNICAL* **(1) Venezuela (18 Aug 2020 12:44 AM)** La parte técnica del Organismo Fitosanitario de Venezuela, al analizar el proyecto de NIMF: normas para medidas fitosanitarias para productos,

				concluyo estar de acuerdo con lo planteado por el Grupo de debate sobre normas
21	1	DRAFT ANNEX TO ISPM 28: Cold treatment for *Ceratitis capitata* on *Prunus avium*, *Prunus salicina* and *Prunus persica* (2017-022A)	C	*Category : EDITORIAL* **(37) Nepal (29 Sep 2020 7:09 AM)** We have no comment on the draft annex
22	13	2018-05 ~~SC~~ Standards Committee (SC) added topic *Cold treatment of stone fruit against* Ceratitis capitata (2017-022A) to the TPPT work programme with priority 1.	P	*Category : EDITORIAL* **(41) European Union (29 Sep 2020 4:32 PM)** Acronym to be developed for its first use.
23	13	2018-05 ~~SC~~ Standards Committee (SC) added topic *Cold treatment of stone fruit against* Ceratitis capitata (2017-022A) to the TPPT work programme with priority 1.	P	*Category : EDITORIAL* **(10) EPPO (15 Sep 2020 1:21 PM)** Acronym to be developed for its first use.
24	36	**Treatment schedule**	C	*Category : TECHNICAL* **(3) South Africa (27 Aug 2020 11:42 AM)** Proposal that these schedules be considered in drafting new cold treatments for Ceratitis capitata
25	36	**Treatment schedule**	C	*Category : TECHNICAL* **(2) South Africa (27 Aug 2020 11:42 AM)** The USDA T107-a schedules are: 1.11°C for 14 days, 1.67°C for 16 days and 2.22°C for 18 days.
26	37	**Schedule 1: 1 °C or below for 16 continuous days**	C	*Category : TECHNICAL* **(29) Viet Nam (25 Sep 2020 12:15 PM)** According to the evidence "De Lima, C.P.F. 2011. Cold treatment and methyl bromide fumigation of Australian cherries, peaches, nectarines and plums (8 cultivars) infested with eggs and larvae of the Mediterranean fruit fly (Ceratitis capitata Wiedemann) Diptera: Tephritidae. South Perth, Australia, Department of Agriculture and Food Western Australia. 420 pp" in reference of this draft, the treatment will be combine cold treatment and methyl bromide fumigation of cherries, peaches, nectarines and plum infested with Ceratitis capitata (eggs and larvae stages). Viet Nam would like to request to clearify to clarify why this draft only applies cold treatment without applying combine cold treatment and methyl bromide fumigation as published in the scientific research of authors mentioned in the reference of this draft.
27	41	**Schedule 2: 3 °C or below for 20 continuous days**	C	*Category : TECHNICAL* **(30) Viet Nam (25 Sep 2020 12:16 PM)** According to the evidence "De Lima, C.P.F. 2011. Cold treatment and methyl bromide fumigation of Australian cherries, peaches, nectarines and plums (8 cultivars) infested with eggs and larvae of the Mediterranean fruit fly (Ceratitis capitata Wiedemann) Diptera: Tephritidae. South Perth, Australia, Department of Agriculture and Food Western Australia. 420 pp" in reference of this draft, the treatment will be combine cold treatment and methyl bromide fumigation of cherries, peaches, nectarines and plum infested with Ceratitis capitata (eggs and larvae stages). Viet Nam would like to request to clearify to clarify why this draft only applies cold treatment without applying combine cold treatment and methyl bromide fumigation as published in the scientific research of authors mentioned in the reference of this draft.

28	45	For both schedules, the fruit must reach the treatment temperature before treatment exposure time commences. The fruit core temperature should be monitored and recorded, and the temperature should not exceed the stated level throughout the duration of the treatment, otherwise it should be repeated if failed.	P	*Category : TECHNICAL* **(4) Egypt (28 Aug 2020 8:29 PM)**
29	51	for Prunus~~P.~~ *avium*: 143 810	P	*Category : EDITORIAL* **(23) China (23 Sep 2020 8:26 AM)** consistent with para. [59][60][61][62]
30	51	for *P. avium*: 143 810.	P	*Category : EDITORIAL* **(16) China (23 Sep 2020 8:23 AM)** consistent with para. [53][57][61]
31	52	for Prunus~~P.~~ *salicina*: 185 646	P	*Category : EDITORIAL* **(24) China (23 Sep 2020 8:27 AM)** consistent with para. [59][60][61][62]
32	52	for *P. salicina*: 185 646.	P	*Category : EDITORIAL* **(17) China (23 Sep 2020 8:24 AM)** consistent with para. [53][57][61]
33	53	for Prunus~~P.~~ *persica*: 174 710.	P	*Category : EDITORIAL* **(25) China (23 Sep 2020 8:27 AM)** consistent with para. [59][60][61][62]
34	55	for Prunus~~P.~~ *avium*: 163 906	P	*Category : EDITORIAL* **(26) China (23 Sep 2020 8:28 AM)** consistent with para. [59][60][61][62]
35	55	for *P. avium*: 163 906.	P	*Category : EDITORIAL* **(18) China (23 Sep 2020 8:25 AM)** consistent with para. [53][57][61]
36	56	~~for~~ forPrunus~~P.~~ *salicina*: 133 798	P	*Category : EDITORIAL* **(27) China (23 Sep 2020 8:28 AM)** consistent with para. [59][60][61][62]
37	56	for *P. salicina*: 133 798.	P	*Category : EDITORIAL* **(19) China (23 Sep 2020 8:25 AM)** consistent with para. [53][57][61]
38	57	for Prunus~~P.~~ *persica*: 218 121.	P	*Category : EDITORIAL* **(28) China (23 Sep 2020 8:28 AM)** consistent with para. [59][60][61][62]
39	59	*Prunus avium* (cherry) (cultivars 'Sweetheart' and 'Lapin').	P	*Category : EDITORIAL* **(20) China (23 Sep 2020 8:25 AM)** consistent with para. [53][57][61]
40	60	*Prunus salicina* (Japanese plum) (cultivars 'Angelino' and 'Tegan Blue') .	P	*Category : EDITORIAL* **(21) China (23 Sep 2020 8:25 AM)** consistent with para. [53][57][61]
41	61	*Prunus persica* (peach) (cultivars 'Snow King' and 'Zee Lady')~~.~~	P	*Category : EDITORIAL* **(42) European Union (29 Sep 2020 4:33 PM)** Typo: dot to be deleted.

42	61	*Prunus persica* (peach) (cultivars 'Snow King' and 'Zee Lady').	P	*Category : EDITORIAL* **(11) EPPO (15 Sep 2020 1:21 PM)** Typo: dot to be deleted.
43	62	*Prunus persica* var. *nectarina* (nectarine) (cultivars 'Arctic Snow' and 'August Red').	P	*Category : EDITORIAL* **(43) European Union (29 Sep 2020 4:34 PM)** Typo: dot to be added.
44	62	*Prunus persica* var. *nectarina* (nectarine) (cultivars 'Arctic Snow' and 'August Red').	P	*Category : EDITORIAL* **(22) China (23 Sep 2020 8:25 AM)** consistent with para. [53][57][61]
45	62	*Prunus persica* var. *nectarina* (nectarine) (cultivars 'Arctic Snow' and 'August Red').	P	*Category : EDITORIAL* **(12) EPPO (15 Sep 2020 1:21 PM)** Typo: dot to be added.
46	63	In this treatment, *Prunus persica* includes all cultivars and varieties, including nectarines (Vendramin *et al*., 2014).	C	*Category : SUBSTANTIVE* **(9) Botswana (15 Sep 2020 11:55 AM)** agreed
47	64	**References**	C	*Category : TECHNICAL* **(31) Viet Nam (25 Sep 2020 12:17 PM)** Add more references
48	68	~~**Vendramin E., Pea G., Dondini L., Pacheco I., Dettori MT., Gazza L., Scalabrin S., Strozzi F., Tartarini S., Bassi D., Verde I., Rossini L.** 2014. A Unique Mutation in a MYB Gene Cosegregates with the Nectarine Phenotype in Peach. PLoS One March 2014 9(3); e90574., doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0090574.~~Verde I., Rossini L." should be changed into "Verde I. & Rossini L." . "PLoS One March 2014 9(3); e90574" should be changed into "PLoS One, 9(3): e90574.", and Delete "doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0090574	P	*Category : EDITORIAL* **(15) China (23 Sep 2020 8:23 AM)** Reference literature is written mistakenly