

NAPPO Panel Report

Panel Name:	Fruit Panel	
Location:	Merida, Yucatan, Mexico	
Date:	April 1-4, 2008	
Panel Chair:	Susan McCombs	
Participants:		
Joe Cavey, USA, USDA APHIS	Susan McCombs, USA, USDA APHIS	Lisa Neven, USA, USDA ARS
Marie-Pierre Mignault, Canada, CFIA	Charles Brisco, Canada, CFIA	Carlos H. Chavez, Mexico, Unifrut
Jose Luis Zavala, Mexico, SAGARPA	Walther Enkerlin, NAPPO	Guillermo Santiago Martinez, Mexico, SAGARPA
Ramon Ceballos, Mexico, Yucatan State Committee	Oscar de Leon, Mexico CESAVENL	Juan Lorenzo Palau, Mexico, CESAVENL
Abenamar Jordan Zuniga Alvarez, Mexico, CESAVENL	Jorge Suarez Estrada, Mexico, Unifrut	
Summary		
Issue 1:	Initiate development of a NAPPO standard on determination and designation of host status of a commodity for tephritid fruit flies	
Consensus:	<p>The Fruit Panel reviewed a draft document in detail. This document will be revised to include the suggested changes. The next draft will be circulated to the Panel members by April 15.</p> <p>The Panel aims to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete a draft for Country Consultation by June 2008 • Present a final draft to the Working Group in September 	
Issue 2:	Prepare a draft of a specific case study to apply ISPM No. 10, 'Requirements for the establishment of pest free places of production and pest free production sites',	
Consensus:	<p>The Fruit Panel members and representatives of the Mexico industry conducted a site visit to the ProAgro San Francisco citrus production site. This production site has participated in the SAGARPA program for certification of fruit fly free places and sites of production for three years.</p> <p>Guillermo Santiago presented an overview of the Mexico standards under which fruit fly free places and sites of production are regulated. Jose Luis Zavala presented a comparison of</p>	

	<p>ISPM No. 10 and the application of fruit fly free sites of production in Mexico.</p> <p>The panel recognizes that the application of the concept of fruit fly pest free orchards on a temporary basis, which regulates within country movement of commodities in Mexico (NOM-023-FITO-1995), aligns with RSPM 17 (Guidelines for the Establishment, Maintenance and Verification of Fruit Fly Free Areas in North America) and ISPM 10 (Requirements for the Establishment of Pest Free Places of Production and Pest Free Production Sites).</p> <p>The concept has been successfully applied in various countries for international trade according to ISPM 10. The feasibility is dependant upon the level of risk associated with each specific case.</p> <p>RSPM 17 presents the concept in a generic manner, thus, it should be revised to include the general and specific requirements contained in ISPM 10 to facilitate commodity movement among the NAPPO member countries.</p>
<p>Issue 3:</p>	<p>Develop guidelines to determine the host range and adaptability of <i>Rhagoletis</i> spp. in the NAPPO region.</p>
<p>Consensus:</p>	<p>A conference call was held on February 22, 2008 with the PRA Panel Chair. Mike Willett provided an overview of this issue, as previously raised by the industry. Host range and species identification of <i>Rhagoletis pomonella</i> is central to the trade issue concerning movement of sweet cherries from the USA to Mexico. This may be more of a regional issue if Canada produces more sweet cherries for export.</p> <p><i>Rhagoletis</i> has 7 species of economic importance in North America. Some of these species have limited distribution in the USA but do impact trade in the apple industry of the Pacific NW and SE Canada. <i>R. pomonella</i> could be an important pest in western Canada and apple production states in Mexico.</p> <p>There is ongoing work on identification (molecular) and host range of <i>Rhagoletis</i> spp. This is a difficult issue because of recent speciation and expansion of the host range to apples and cherries. There are some biological parameters that may impact the development of <i>R. pomonella</i> on sweet cherry. There is no identification of pomonella on sweet cherry. <i>R. indifferens</i> (Western Cherry Fruit Fly) is controlled by GF-120 in production.</p> <p>In Mexico, <i>R. pomonella</i> is a quarantine pest that is not present in the apple production areas. A species of <i>Rhagoletis</i> is present in the central highlands of Mexico. Identification of the latter species is in question.</p>

	<p><i>R. mendax</i> is found in blueberry in eastern USA and Canada. This could be a concern for Mexico as the cultivation of berries expands. Blueberry production in eastern Canada is impacted by <i>R. mendax</i>, a regulated pest for Canada.</p> <p>How do we apply the host status standard to univoltine and/or temperate species? The host status testing as proposed, would require more than 12 months to complete for a univoltine species. The draft standard provides guidelines for testing and the details would be delineated in a bilateral workplan.</p> <p>The draft host status determination standard will be provided to the PRA Panel for review.</p> <p>It may be helpful to have a discussion paper summarizing the distribution of <i>Rhagoletis</i> species in the NAPPO region, their potential for establishment, and host range. The PRA Panel could do this, but the scientific data may not be currently available.</p>
Issue 4:	Evaluate and recommend NAPPO diagnostic protocols
Consensus:	<p>Some protocols are listed in the attached table.</p> <p>The Fruit Panel agreed in 2007 to develop protocols for <i>Tetranychus</i> spp., tephritid fruit flies, Tortricidae, and PPV. PPV will be addressed by the Tree Fruit Panel, so is no longer considered by the Fruit Panel.</p> <p>The protocols will be developed sequentially, beginning with the <i>Tetranychus</i> spp. A TAG will be established in 2008 to develop a harmonized diagnostic protocol for the <i>Tetranychus</i> species. The TAG will consider the Canadian protocol (attached) as the initial step in their discussions.</p>
Issue 5:	Evaluate and recommend NAPPO treatment protocols
Consensus:	<p>Some protocols are listed in the attached table.</p> <p>Cold treatment for fruit flies (Diptera: Tephritidae) was selected as a common protocol for NAPPO member countries. In the case of Mexico, this protocol is used only for exports to Argentina. This protocol will be submitted to the NAPPO Executive Committee for approval and IPPC submission. This will be addressed at the next panel meeting.</p>

Next Steps

Responsible Person	Action	Date
--------------------	--------	------

Sue McCombs	Revise draft standard on host determination.	April 15, 2008
Lisa Neven and Walther Enkerlin	Provide references for draft standard to Sue.	April 11, 2008 COMPLETED
Lisa Neven	Submit flowchart to Sue.	April 11, 2008 COMPLETED
Sue McCombs	Submit draft panel meeting report to Panel Members for comment.	April 11, 2008 COMPLETED
Sue McCombs	Submit final panel meeting report to Panel Members, Walther Enkerlin, and Nedelka Marin Martinez.	April 15, 2008
Marie-Pierre Mignault	Provide diagnostic protocol for <i>Tetranychus</i> mites.	April 15, 2008 COMPLETED
Sue McCombs, Joe Cavey & Walther Enkerlin	Establish TAG for <i>Tetranychus</i> mites	May 30, 2008
Sue McCombs	Circulate diagnostic and treatment protocol lists to Panel members for confirmation and comment.	April 15, 2008
Sue McCombs	Submit NAPPO diagnostic and treatment tables to NAPPO. Submit cold treatment protocol to NAPPO.	August 1, 2008
Sue McCombs	Panel conference call	June 3, 2008

Next Meeting

Location:	Niagara Falls, Ontario, Canada Arrive into Buffalo, NY or Toronto, Ontario, Canada airport
Date:	July 7 (travel day) 8-11, 12 (travel day), 2008 Friday field trip
Proposed Agenda Items	
1. Complete draft standard on determination and designation of host status of a commodity for tephritid fruit flies.	
2. Discuss NAPPO Working Group comments on the recommendations made regarding, 'Requirements for the establishment of pest free places of production and pest free production sites'.	
3. Develop guidelines to determine the host range and adaptability of <i>Rhagoletis</i> spp. in the NAPPO region.	
4. Review TAG progress on <i>Tetranychus</i> spp. diagnostic protocol for submission to the NAPPO Working Group.	
5. Develop cold treatment protocol for submission to the NAPPO Working Group.	
6. Field trip to observe CFIA PPV Eradication Program.	