

Appendix B: Issues raised in stakeholder comments

This section summarises key stakeholder comments and the department's response. Most stakeholders commented favourably on the comprehensive nature of the report and expressed appreciation of the opportunity to provide comment.

Comment 1: One stakeholder raised concerns over the methodology used in the pest categorisation process that led to several organisms not requiring a pest risk assessment.

Response: The Australian Government Department of Agriculture and Water Resources has conducted the pest categorisation process in accordance with ISPM 11 (FAO 2013). Section 2.1 of ISPM 11 states 'The categorisation process examines for each pest whether the criteria in the definition for a quarantine pest are satisfied' and 'The opportunity to eliminate an organism or organisms from consideration before in-depth examination is undertaken is a valuable characteristic of the categorisation process'.

Comment 2: One stakeholder noted that *Bactrocera papayae*, *B. invadens* and *B. philippinensis* are now all synonyms of *Bactrocera dorsalis* and suggested that this information be presented in the report.

Response: The Australian Government Department of Agriculture and Water Resources considered literature for all of these synonyms during the assessment for *Bactrocera dorsalis*. However, the department agrees that it is useful to present this information in the report. The report has been amended accordingly.

Comment 3: One stakeholder commented that a recommendation will be made to regulate *Diaspis echinocacti*, which is absent from its jurisdiction, as a prohibited organism under its respective legislation.

Response: The Australian Government Department of Agriculture and Water Resources noted this stakeholder advice and will review its assessment for *Diaspis echinocacti* once the status of this pest has changed. As stated in section 5.4.2 Review of Policy, the department reserves the right to review the import policy as deemed necessary. The department has conducted a preliminary assessment of *Diaspis echinocacti* in preparation of this change. The unrestricted risk estimate of this pest achieves the ALOP for Australia and therefore specific risk management measures will not be required.

Comment 4: One stakeholder commented that *Lopholeucaspis cockerelli* was considered by the United States and New Zealand as associated with dragon fruit from Vietnam and requested that this pest is included in the risk assessment.

Response: The Australian Government Department of Agriculture and Water Resources has conducted thorough research and could not find any records of *Lopholeucaspis cockerelli* being present in Vietnam. The department noted that the United States assessment stated the presence of this pest in Vietnam was uncertain. However, the pest was considered further by the United States based on the information that this pest was recorded from other Asian regions i.e. Hong Kong, India, Indonesia and the Philippines. The New Zealand assessment cited the United States assessment for the association of this pest with dragon fruit from Vietnam.

Comment 5: One stakeholder requested that the text relating to irradiation be modified to make it more explicit that irradiation of dragon fruit will not be allowed until it is approved by FSANZ.

Response: The Australian Government Department of Agriculture and Water Resources has amended the text in Section 5.1.1 (page 37) to explicitly state that irradiation cannot be used as a measure for dragon fruit until it is approved by FSANZ.