

# **NATIONAL STANDARDS FOR PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES**

## **NSPM: 35**

### **System approach for pest risk management of fruit flies (tephritidae) 2013**

(This standard is approved by (the NPPO and) the Quarantine Committee of Nepal, chaired by the secretary of the Ministry of Agriculture Development on 1<sup>st</sup> December 2013 and, is submitted by National Plant Quarantine Program to the National Notification Authority to be notified to the WTO member states)

## Table of Contents

Abbreviations .....	3
1. Introduction.....	4
1.1 Scope .....	4
1.2 References .....	4
1.3 Definitions .....	4
1.4 Outline of requirements .....	5
2. Background .....	5
3. Requirements.....	7
3.1 Decision to implement an FF SA.....	7
3.2 Development of an FF SA.....	8
Pre-planting .....	8
Growing period .....	8
Harvest.....	9
Post-harvest and handling .....	9
Transportation and distribution.....	9
Measures applied to several or all stages .....	9
4. Documentation and record-keeping .....	9
5. Verification.....	10
6. Tolerance Level .....	11
7. Non-conformity and non-compliance .....	11
Annex 1: FAO/IAEA guidelines for implementing systems approaches for pest risk management .....	12
Annex 2: Guidelines for the establishment, maintenance and verification of Fruit fly PFA ....	14

## Abbreviations

APPPC	Asia Pacific Plant Protection Commission
CODEX	Codex Alimentarius
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
FF	Fruit Fly
GMO	Genetically Modified Organism
IAEA	International Atomic Energy Commission
IP	Import Permit
IPPC	International Plant Protection Convention
ISPM	International Standard for Phytosanitary Measures
NPPO	National Plant Protection Organization
NPQP	National Plant Quarantine Programme
PFA	Pest free area
PRA	Pest Risk Analysis
SA	System Approach
SIT	Sterile Insect Technique
WTO	World trade organization

## 1. Introduction

### 1.1 Scope

This standard provides guidelines for the development, implementation and verification of integrated measures in a systems approach as an option for pest risk management of fruit flies (Tephritidae) of economic importance under Plant Protection Acts 2007 and the Plant Protection Regulation 2010. NSPM preparation based on guidelines and recommendations developed within the framework of the IPPC. This standard also adopted the principles, recommendations and format of ISPM to achieve international harmonization of phytosanitary measures with the aim to facilitate trade.

### 1.2 References

**IAEA2011.** FAO/ IAEA Guidelines for implementing system approach for pest risk management of Fruit flies (working Material). FAO/IAEA Division of Nuclear Techniques in FAO, Vienna, Austria, June 7-11, 2010, Reproduce by the IAEA Vienna, Austria

**IPPC.** *International Plant Protection Convention.* Rome, IPPC, FAO.

**ISPM 2.** 2007. *Framework for pest risk analysis.* Rome, IPPC, FAO.

**ISPM 5.** *Glossary of phytosanitary terms.* Rome, IPPC, FAO.

**ISPM 11.** 2004. *Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests including analysis of environmental risks and living modified organisms.* Rome, IPPC, FAO.

**ISPM 13.** 2001. *Guidelines for the notification of non-compliance and emergency action.* Rome, IPPC, FAO.

**ISPM 14.** 2002. *The use of integrated measures in a systems approach for pest risk management.* Rome, IPPC, FAO.

**ISPM 35.** 2012. *System approach for pest risk management of fruit flies (Tephritidae).* Rome, IPPC, FAO.

**ISPM 24.** 2005. *Guidelines for the determination and recognition of equivalence of phytosanitary measures.* Rome, IPPC, FAO.

**ISPM 26.** 2006. *Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae).* Rome, IPPC, FAO.

**Plant Protection Act 2007.** National Plant Quarantine Program, Plant protection Directorate Ministry of Agriculture, Government of Nepal

**RSPM 17.** Guidelines for the establishment, maintenance and verification of Fruit fly pest free area in North America NAPPO

**RSPM 4.** Guidelines for the confirmation of non-host status of fruit and vegetables to Tephritid Fruit fly

**The Plant Protection Regulation 2010.** National Plant Quarantine Program, Plant protection Directorate Ministry of Agriculture, Government of Nepal

### 1.3 Definitions

Definitions of phytosanitary terms used in the national standard can be found in ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*) Plant Protection Acts 2007 and the Plant Protection regulation 2010.

Systems approach(es): The integration of different risk management measures, at least two of which act independently, and which cumulatively achieve the appropriate level of protection against regulated pests (ISPM 5)

#### **1.4 Outline of requirements**

For the development of a systems approach for fruit flies (FF SA), the relationship between host, target fruit fly species and the area of production of the host fruits and vegetables (Fruits and Vegetables here after referred to as fruits) should be considered. The options for pest risk management measures should be determined by means of pest risk analysis (PRA).

The NPPO Nepal shall establish a mechanism to develop workable measures. While developing a systems approach NPPO of Nepal requires the integration of different measures, at least two of which act independent measures, which may be applied throughout various stages of the process, specifically during the growing period and harvest; post-harvest and transportation; and entry and distribution within the importing country. An FF SA may be developed in an area of low pest prevalence or temporary or localized pest absence or geographic or biological barriers of the target fruit fly species in combination with other measures (such as selection of less susceptible hosts, crop management practices or post-harvest handling) to reduce pest risk to meet the phytosanitary requirements of the importing country.

For development, implementation and verification of an FF SA, operational procedures are necessary. Conformity with these procedures should be ensured and verified by the NPPO of the exporting country. Procedures should be monitored during the implementation and corrective actions should be taken in case of non-conformity.

The development, implementation and verification of an FF SA should be adequately documented and the documentation reviewed and updated when necessary by the NPPO of the exporting country.

## **2. Background**

Under the Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS) of the World Trade Organization (WTO), essentially all trading countries have agreed to allow free trade to continue as far as possible, whilst maintaining individual country sovereignty in efforts to prevent the entry and spread of pests new to that area, such as fruit flies. Many species of fruit flies of the family Tephritidae are among the most injurious pests of fruits and

vegetables in the world. Presence of species of this family not only has a negative direct effect on the economy of many countries, but also has implication on international trade. Therefore, to identify and manage the target fruit fly species risk, a PRA should be conducted by the NPPO of the importing country and phytosanitary measures may be applied (NSPM: Framework for PRA, NSPM: PRA for quarantine pest including analysis of environmental risk and LMOs). The Systems Approach (SA) facilitates the design of risk management that is proportional to the estimated pest risk. It provides a flexible method for achieving an importing country's appropriate level of protection (ALOP) against the pest risk, as estimated in the PRA.

Systems approaches have been developed as pest risk management measures in situations where a single measure is not available or practicable, or in cases where a systems approach is more cost-effective than the single measure available. The decision to implement a specific FF SA depends on the particular relationship between the host fruit, the target fruit fly species and the specified fruit production area. A systems approach requires a combination of at least two measures that are independent of each other, and may include any number of measures that are dependent on each other (NSPM: The use of integrated measures in a system approach for pest risk management). Treatments used in an FF SA are those not considered sufficiently efficacious to be applied as a single measure. The measures may be applied in different places at different times and may therefore involve a number of organizations and individuals.

Often, countries have used phytosanitary measures such as treatments or pest free areas for fruit flies (FF-PFAs) (NSPM: Establishment of PFA for FF) to support import or movement of host fruit. In other cases, prohibition has been applied. An FF SA may be an alternative to facilitate the export and movement of fruit fly hosts into endangered areas. NPPOs may recognize FF SAs as being equivalent to single measures.

The exporting country may seek formal approval of equivalence of these measures with the importing country. In cases where an effective FF SA has been implemented, components of those systems may be used by other importing and exporting countries to facilitate the movement of fruit from areas with similar conditions.

An FF SA can be applied in an area of fruit production as small as a production site or as large as a country.

### 3. Requirements

#### 3.1 Decision to implement an FF SA

The importing country may establish and communicate its technically justified phytosanitary import requirements. Options that the importing country may select as the basis for phytosanitary import requirements (NSPM: The use of integrated measures in a system approach for pest risk management)).

The development of an FF SA is a combination of pest risk management measures integrated into an FF SA is one of the other responsibility of the NPPO of the exporting country. An FF SA may be developed and implemented in cases where:

- (1) The importing country, in its phytosanitary import requirements, specifies a systems approach to be used in the exporting country.
- (2) The importing country does not explicitly require a systems approach, but the NPPO of the exporting country deems a systems approach to be a suitable and effective approach for achieving the importing country's phytosanitary import requirements. The exporting country may need to negotiate formal approval of the equivalence of measures with the importing country (ISPM: Guidelines for the determination and recognition of equivalence of phytosanitary measures).

An FF SA should have the appropriate combination of measures to achieve the appropriate level of protection. They should be scientifically sound and be selected to meet the phytosanitary import requirements. Aspects of operational feasibility include cost-effectiveness of the measures to be applied while seeking to impose the least restrictive measures necessary to manage target fruit fly species risks for detail see **Annex 1**.

The fruit production area proposed for implementing an FF SA should be defined and the participating producers should be approved by the NPPO of the exporting country.

It is advisable that NPPOs involve other stakeholders in the development of an FF SA (NSPM: Framework for PRA).

Basic information required for the development of an FF SA includes the following:

- The host should be identified to the species level. In cases, where risk varies with the variety (e.g. because of varying tolerance to infestation), hosts should be identified to variety level.
- The stage of maturity of the fruit being examined is relevant (e.g. physiologically mature

bananas are recognized as not being suitable hosts for fruit flies)

- Data on the target fruit fly species associated with the host should be available (such as scientific name, pest incidence and its fluctuation, and host preference).
- The fruit production area defined for implementing an FF SA should be described and adequately documented with particular attention to host distribution in commercial areas as well as non-commercial areas, if appropriate.

In practice, FF SAs may be applied to one or more hosts or target fruit fly species in the same fruit production area.

### **3.2 Development of an FF SA**

Measures may be applied at various stages from production of fruit within the exporting country to distribution within the importing country. The NPPO of the importing country may also implement one or more measures on arrival of the consignment. Measures applied at the different stages to prevent fruit fly infestation may include:

#### **Pre-planting**

- selecting planting sites with low pest incidence of target fruit fly species (e.g. areas of low pest prevalence, areas unsuitable because of geographic location, altitude, climate)
- selection of less susceptible fruit species or varieties
- sanitation
- managing hosts other than the crop
- intercropping with non-fruit fly host plants
- growing host fruit during specific periods when the pest incidence of target fruit fly species is low or temporally absent.

#### **Growing period**

- flowering control and timing fruit production
- chemical control such as insecticide bait treatments, bait stations, male annihilation technique, and biological control such as natural enemies
- physical protection mechanisms (e.g. bagging fruit, fruit fly protected structures)
- sterile insect technique
- campaigning mass trapping
- management of non-commercial hosts within the production area (e.g. elimination or replacement of other host plants by non-host plants where appropriate)
- monitoring and survey of the target fruit fly species e.g. using traps or fruit sampling



- sanitation (i.e. collection, removal and appropriate disposal of fallen fruit from the orchard or removal of mature fruit from the tree)
- fruit stripping.

### **Harvest**

- harvest at a specific stage of fruit development or time of the year
- safeguarding activities to prevent infestation at harvest
- surveillance including fruit cutting
- sanitation (e.g. safe removal and disposal of fallen fruit).

### **Post-harvest and handling**

- safeguarding activities to prevent infestation, for example chilling fruit, refrigerated transport, processing in screen-protected packing rooms, warehouses and transit conveyances, using cold storage, wrapping of fruit
- monitoring for target fruit fly species absence by trapping in and around packing houses
- sanitation (e.g. removal of fruit with signs of infestation (culling) in packing houses)
- sampling, inspection (e.g. by fruit cutting) or testing
- treatments that are not considered sufficiently efficacious as a single measure
- packing requirements (e.g. using insect-proof packages)
- ensuring traceability of lots.

### **Transportation and distribution**

- safeguarding activities to prevent target fruit fly species infestation
- treatments that are not considered sufficiently efficacious as a single measure (prior to, during or after transport)
- distribution limited geographically or seasonally to areas where or periods when target fruit fly species cannot establish or where suitable hosts are not present.

### **Measures applied to several or all stages**

- Community awareness programmes to generate support from the public
- Movement control of host fruit and other pathways into the area (e.g. requirements for production sites or islands).

## **4. Documentation and record-keeping**

The development, implementation and verification of an FF SA should be properly

documented by the NPPO of the exporting country. The roles and responsibilities of the NPPOs of the exporting and importing countries should be specified and documented. The documentation and records should be reviewed and updated regularly, maintained for at least 24 months and made available to the NPPO of the importing country upon request.

Documentation may include:

- phytosanitary import requirements and, if available, a report of the pest risk analysis
- identifying and describing the measures for reducing risk
- description of the requirements for an FF SA's operational procedures
- description of the area intended for an FF SA
- description of host fruit to be exported and target fruit fly species
- details of the organizations involved and their roles and responsibilities and any linkages, including for example:
  - registration of organizations involved or stakeholders
  - agreement to cooperate in surveillance and control procedures
  - conformity with FF SA requirements (origin of fruit, movement from place of production, selection and packing of fruit, transportation and safeguarding of the fruit)
  - agreement to take appropriate corrective actions
  - keeping records and making them available
- pest surveillance and control programme
- survey results
- training programme for FF SA participants
- traceability procedures
- technical basis for specific procedures
- survey, detection and diagnostic methodology
- description of corrective actions and records of follow-up
- reviews of the implementation of an FF SA
- contingency plans.

## **5. Verification**

The measures in an FF SA should be implemented in accordance with the standard procedures and should be monitored by the NPPO of the exporting country to ensure the system achieves its objectives.

The NPPO of the exporting country has the responsibility to monitor the implementation and the effectiveness of all stages of an FF SA. In cases where the operational procedures of an FF SA were properly implemented, but one or more of the components did not provide sufficient pest risk management to give the required effectiveness of all stages, a revision of an FF SA should be conducted to ensure that phytosanitary import requirements are met.

This revision may not necessarily involve the suspension of trade. Other components of an FF SA may not need to be verified again. The frequency of verification should be influenced by the design of the FF SA.

The NPPO of the importing country may audit an FF SA in agreement with the NPPO of the exporting country.

## **6. Tolerance Level**

In many cases, the basis for developing an FF SA may be that the target fruit fly species incidence is kept at or below a tolerance level (in connection with fruit flies, the term “specified pest population level” has sometimes been used instead of “tolerance level”) specified by the NPPO of the importing country in the defined area, for example an area of low pest prevalence (ALPP). This may be as a result of a naturally low target fruit fly species incidence or as a result of the implementation of control measures.

Evidence to support that the target fruit fly species incidence is kept at or below the specified tolerance level may be required and, if so, should be obtained as a result of trapping and fruit sampling. Surveillance of target fruit fly species incidence may be conducted not only during the growing period of the host fruit but also during non-growing periods.

## **7. Non-conformity and non-compliance**

Non-conformity involves incorrect implementation or failure of an FF SA. In such cases, the NPPO of the exporting country may suspend the trade from the non-conforming component of the FF SA until corrective actions have been taken to address the non-conformity. Non-conformity may occur in one or more stages of an FF SA. It is important to identify at which stage the non-conformity has occurred.

The NPPO of the exporting country should notify the NPPO of the importing country of any non-conformity that may have affected a shipment or phytosanitary certification.

The NPPO of the importing country should notify the NPPO of the exporting country of any non-compliances (see ISPM 13:2001).

# **Annex 1: FAO/IAEA guidelines for implementing systems approaches for pest risk management**

## **Working material**

### **FAO/IAEA Guidelines for Implementing Systems**

#### **Approaches for Pest Risk Management of Fruit Flies**

*Report and recommendations of the consultants group meeting organized by the Joint*

*FAO/IAEA Division of Nuclear Techniques in Food and Agriculture, Vienna, Austria,*

*June 7-11 2010*

Reproduced by the IAEA

Vienna, Austria 2011

---

## **Note**

The material in this document has been supplied by the authors and has not been edited by the IAEA. The views expressed remain the responsibility of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the government(s) or the designating Member State(s). In particular, neither the IAEA nor any other organization or body sponsoring this meeting can be held responsible for any material reproduced in this document.

<http://www-naweb.iaea.org/nafa/ipc/public/ipc-systems-approach-2011.pdf>

## **1. Parts of a system approach**

By defining types of phytosanitary measures associated with SA with useful terms, we can better understand, develop, and modify SA. This will also allow us to better understand the requirements regarding independent and dependent measures within the SA.

### **1.1 Independent measures**

We can define the large comprehensive phytosanitary measures as major components. These can be *poor host status, areas of low pest prevalence, pest exclusion structure, and less than probit-9 post-harvest commodity treatment among others*. These measures, by themselves, lower the risk of the pest and are thus independent measures for risk management. To be classed as a SA there must be two or more independent measures/major components working together in the pest risk management plan.

### **1.2 Dependent measures**

Several measures, that by themselves would not significantly lower the risk, may be used in a combination to create an independent measure/major component. For instance, the *pest exclusion structure* (which is an independent measure) is made up of several dependent

measures/elements, like *self-closing doors, screening, double doors*, etc. Individually, these can be classed as dependent measures or elements. Other dependent measures may be: *producer registration, training, trapping, field controls, etc.* and many other similar elements that help support the independent measure/major component for risk management.

Other dependent measures/elements associated with SA are being employed as safeguards (safeguard measures). They can be actions required either in the exporting country such as *containment of the shipment* to protect from reinfestation and to maintain the integrity of the shipment or in the importing country to protect the importing country from an introduction of the pest when further mitigation is taking place. Safeguard measures may also be required in a shipment transiting third countries.

At least one of the dependent measures/elements is an action that verifies the effectiveness and or compliance of the independent measure/major component for risk management. These related elements include *trapping by the NPPO* (dependent) in an *area of low pest prevalence* (independent), *regular inspections by the NPPO* (dependent) of a *pest exclusion structures* (independent), and *monitoring of performance by the NPPO* (dependent) of a *less than probit-9 post-harvest treatment* (independent).

Certain specific dependent measures/elements used by the grower to support the independent measure/major component for risk management may not be required by the importing NPPO, but are actions commonly used to ensure compliance with a required component. An example of this is when a low level of pest population is required in a SA; the specific *field controls* used by the grower may be optional. This would be an outcome based requirement, as opposed to a prescriptive based requirement.

The dependent and independent measures that are integrated into a specific SA are agreed by the importing and exporting countries, or regions. These measures should be not only efficacious, but also technically and economically feasible.

### Parts of a systems approach - an example

*Independent measure or major component*

**Area of low pest prevalence**

*Dependent measures or elements*

- o Quarantine controls
- o Trapping (verification element)
- o SIT
- o Sanitation
- o More, More, More

*Safeguard Measures*

**Transport in pest proof sealed containers and more**

## **Annex 2: Guidelines for the establishment, maintenance and verification of Fruit fly PFA**

The following is a list of elements that should be considered in order to determine if a PFA meets the conditions of this standard:

1. Geographic description of the proposed PFA
  - a. maps
  - b. places of production
  - c. natural barriers
  - d. buffer zone
  - e. size
  - f. location of regulatory control check points, as appropriate
2. Survey protocols for establishment and maintenance of PFA
  - a. trap type
  - b. bait or lure type
  - c. target pest
  - d. density of traps
  - e. servicing intervals
  - f. reporting of survey results
3. Quality control protocols for surveillance
  - a. verification of lure efficacy
  - b. placement and recovery of marked target flies
  - c. regular reviews of survey documentation
  - d. audits of trap placement and servicing
  - e. confirmation of identifier competency
4. Movement controls
  - a. sampling records
  - b. identification of intercepted specimens
  - c. verification of documents
  - d. confirmation that required treatments occurred
  - e. documentation of any other phytosanitary procedures
5. Corrective action plan
  - a. trigger for plan implementation
  - b. delimiting survey
  - c. mitigation measures