Appendix B: Issues raised in stakeholder comments

This section summarises key stakeholder comments and the department's response.

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 (described in section 2.2.1 of the report) 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: Some stakeholders raised concerns over the risk management measures, particularly area freedom and methyl bromide fumigation, proposed for *Drosophila suzukii*.

Response: As stated in section 5.1.1 of the report (Management for *Drosophila suzukii*, Recommended measure 3: Area freedom), area freedom may be a plausible option for Korea because the proposed imports will be restricted to greenhouse-grown strawberries. However, Korea will need to provide a submission demonstrating area freedom, in line with ISPM 4 (FAO 1995) or ISPM 10 (FAO 1999), for consideration and approval by the department before this measure can be used. Text in Chapter 5 has been modified to clarify this point.

With regards to methyl bromide fumigation treatment, the department has reviewed research data (Walse, Krugner & Tebbets 2012) and considered that the treatment schedule of 40 grams per cubic metre for three hours is effective, as it exceeds the dosage rate found to reach 100% mortality of all life stages for *D. suzukii* in strawberries.

The department would like to clarify that the more stringent methyl bromide treatment schedule (48 grams per cubic metre) for strawberries from California is an existing treatment (prior to spotted wing drosophila becoming established in the USA) to manage other pests on the pathway.

As stated in section 5.4.2 of the report, the department reserves the right to review the import policy as deemed necessary.

Comment 3: Some stakeholders raised concerns over the proposed risk management measures (area freedom or systems approach) for *Xanthomonas fragariae*.

Response: Korea will need to provide a submission demonstrating area freedom, in line with ISPM 4 (FAO 1995) or ISPM 10 (FAO 1999), for consideration and approval by the department before area freedom can be used as a measure. Text in Chapter 5 has been modified to clarify this point.

Similarly, Korea will need to submit a proposal for consideration and approval by the department before a systems approach can be used as a measure. The proposal needs to outline components of the system and how these components will address the risks posed by this pest and fulfil the requirements set out in ISPM 14 (FAO 2002). Text in Chapter 5 has been modified to clarify this point.

Comment 4: One stakeholder commented that *Septoria fragariae* and *Phyllosticta fragariicola* are absent from Australia.

Response: The Australian Government Department of Agriculture and Water Resources contacted the states and territories to re-examine the available evidence relating to the status of *Septoria fragariae* and *Phyllosticta fragariicola* in Australia.

No conclusive evidence could be found to support the presence of either *Septoria fragariae* or *Phyllosticta fragariicola* in Australia (IPPC 2016a, b). Therefore, the department has amended text in the pest categorisation table (Appendix A) to reflect the absent status of these pests from Australia and proceeded with the categorisation process of these pests.

Comment 5: One stakeholder asked why quality standards were included in the risk analysis.

Response: The Australian Government Department of Agriculture and Water Resources included information on quality standards in Chapter 3 as part of the commercial production practices for strawberries in Korea to inform stakeholders. Only relevant information on commercial production practices is taken into consideration in estimating the likelihood of pest introduction.

Comment 6: One stakeholder commented that it appeared that the potential of strawberry seed as a pathway had not been investigated in the report.

Response: Pathogens that can potentially be transmitted via seed have been individually assessed in this risk analysis for their ability to be introduced via strawberry seeds, for example: *Verticillium albo-atrum* and *Tomato ringspot virus*.

Comment 7: One stakeholder commented that *Tomato ringspot virus* should have been fully assessed in a pest risk assessment and that additional measures are warranted to mitigate this pest.

Response: The Australian Government Department of Agriculture and Water Resources acknowledges that this virus is seed transmissible. However, as stated in the report, there are no records of this virus occurring in strawberries in Korea and QIA tests for this virus using PCR and ELISA on imported seed and runner daughter plants. Based on this information, the department considers that there is insufficient information to consider this virus further in a pest risk assessment and that no additional measures are warranted.