



ORGANISATION NORD AMERICAINE POUR LA PROTECTION DES PLANTES
 NORTH AMERICAN PLANT PROTECTION ORGANIZATION
 ORGANIZACION NORTEAMERICANA DE PROTECCION A LAS PLANTAS
 CANADA UNITED STATES MEXICO

NAPPO Panel Report

Panel Name:	Invasive Species Panel	
Location:	Conference Call	
Date:	13 th of October 2009	
Panel Chair:	Christine Tibelius	
Participants*:		
Christine Tibelius Canada, CFIA	Ken Farr Canada, Canadian Forest Service	Claire Wilson Canada, CFIA
Daryl Seip Environment Canada	Patricia Koleff Mexico, CONABIO	Ana Isabel Gonzalez Mexico, CONABIO
Georgia Born-Schmidt Mexico, CONABIO	Alejandra Elizalde Mexico, SENASICA SAGARPA	Shirley Wager-Pagé, USA, USDA APHIS
Tony Koop USA, USDA APHIS	Penny Kriesch, USA, USDA APHIS	Michel-Antoine Renaud Canada, Flowers Canada
Louise Dumouchel, PRA Chairperson Canada, CFIA	Ian McDonell NAPPO	
Summary		
Issue 1:	Attendance at the IAS Panel meeting in Chicago on October 19, 2009	
Consensus:	<p>The following IS Panel members confirmed that they would be attending the meeting in Chicago in person: Canada – Ken, Christine, Claire, Michel-Antoine Mexico – Patricia, Isabel United States – Shirley, Tony, (Lin previously confirmed)</p> <p>Penny agreed to look further into getting a conference line of some sort set up for other panel members to call in for parts of the meeting.</p> <p>In terms of the joint meeting with the PRA panel on the morning of the 19th, Louise will be joined by 3 panel members. Others may call in if this option is available.</p> <p>Updating the list of panel members on the NAPPO website was discussed. Penny and Tony agreed to look into the status of Catherine Hazelwood from The Nature Conservancy. Countries were to consider the identification of new representatives from environmental NGOs. Isabel and Patricia confirmed that Heike was still involved for Mexico. In addition, they introduced Georgia from CONABIO, who will be working with them in the future.</p>	
Issue 2:	Assist the TAG to complete RSPM 31 on Pathway Risk Analysis. (Note: The TAG has been dissolved, and the panel is now working on this assignment)	

Consensus	<p>Before the meeting, Panel members were provided with copies of the original draft standard that went out for country consultation in 2008, a combined table of the Mexican and Canadian comments and responses to some of those comments, the US proposed draft (prepared by Penny and Bob Griffin, and reviewed by Dorothea, Tony and Lin), and comparison tables of the original draft and the US draft. This constituted a very large amount of material for the members to review.</p> <p>Panel members were asked to provide their perspectives on the documents prepared to date. At first glance, the group agreed that some very good material had been added to the original draft standard in the US draft. However, most panel members felt that there was still a need to discuss broad issues such as definitions and scope. Many had not had time to thoroughly review the documents and others indicated that they still had some concerns about the direction of the standard.</p> <p>It was agreed that Christine would re-send the documents, and that a more in-depth discussion would be held in Chicago in conjunction with the PRA panel.</p>
Issue 3:	Complete the position paper describing NAPPO's role in Invasive Alien Species including documentation of relevant federal legislative authority for regulation of aquatic plants in North America
Consensus:	It was agreed by those that had reviewed the expanded position paper that it had some merit but needed to be tidied up. It was requested that the document be sent out again with the original documents and the tables. Isabel was to send a version of the tables updated with Mexican information. We will try to get this project wrapped up as soon as possible.
Issue 4:	Complete the discussion paper on RSPM 32 (Pest risk assessment for plants for planting as quarantine pests)
Consensus:	<p>The discussion paper has been completed and will be posted on the NAPPO website (initially in English and then in Spanish once Nedelka has some time to do the translation).</p> <p>The subcommittee of Claire, Tony and Alejandra plus Ian, Christine, Isabel, Georgia and Patricia stayed on the line after the Panel conference call to discuss where to go in terms of future work stemming from RSPM 32. The subcommittee will report on their discussions on Oct.19th.</p> <p>(Note: it was agreed during this subsequent call that the three countries would continue to communicate and collaborate on work related to weed risk assessment over the next year. No new assignment will be proposed at this time. Additional topics to discuss in the future may include management of invasive plants (this could also be part of a broader discussion on managing the risks of all types of invasive plant pests), and joint weed risk assessments or strategies. It was noted that we should discuss this work with the PRA Panel, as they are developing a PRA format for NAPPO).</p>
Issue 5:	Continue outreach efforts to other national and international organizations in North America, particularly those related to the environment.
Consensus:	The subgroup of Isabel, Tony and Daryl, established to identify environmental groups who may be interested in the work of NAPPO, has been in communication with each other since the meeting in March in San Antonio but progress has been slow because of competing demands on their time. They are in the process of developing a discussion paper to put some parameters around the project before starting to identify organizations. They are hoping to have a draft available for discussion on Oct. 19.
Issue 6:	<p>Climate Change</p> <p>The Invasive Species and PRA panels have been asked to explore the potential impacts of climate change on IAS and PRA, and to consider if these should be taken into account as part of NAPPO's standard setting activities. Louise indicated that one of her colleagues at CFIA had been approached by Gordon Gordh of USDA-APHIS querying whether or not the CFIA was doing any work on the impacts of climate change on PRA.</p>

Consensus:	Because Gordon Gordh is attending NAPPO, Christine will invite him to the morning session on October 19 when the two IAS panels will be discussing climate change so that he can provide information on the work that is being done at USDA-APHIS. It is important to ensure that there will be no overlap in what Gordon is working on and what the two panels may undertake.	
Next Steps		
Responsible Person	Action	Date
Penny Kriesch	Action Item 1 - to organize conference call or some other type of communications for people not able to attend the upcoming meeting in person. Penny will contact Phil to determine when he is interested in participating. Daryl, Alejandra, Georgia and Penny are all interested in participating on-line for some or all of the meeting.	October 19, 2009
Ian McDonell	Action Item 2 - Ian will contact the organizing committee to ensure that we are aware of our room location at the hotel (contact made and we are awaiting further communication which we will distribute once we have it).	October 16, 2009
All/Christine Tibelius	<p>Action Item 3 – RSPM No. 31 - Participants will review the documents included in this email in order to be prepared for Monday's discussions. The plan is to discuss the broader issues and questions in order to move forward. Next steps will be identified. Christine will re-send the documents.</p> <p>The CFIA is proposing to include the following questions in the discussion on Monday. Panel members will bring other questions to the discussion as they wish.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What do you consider the objective of this standard? What are we trying to achieve? What gaps are we addressing? What is the scope - there is a large difference between the original draft and the US proposal. 2. Is this standard at a high enough level or are we mixing a concept standard with a technical standard? Are we trying to do too many things in one standard? Should the in depth study of pathways be one standard, and the ranking and prioritization of pathways be another? 3. What is the difference between "pathway risk analysis" (i.e., mapping out a pathway to apply management at critical points) and "pathway ranking" (i.e., comparing multiple pathways and ranking them for prioritization/resource allocation). Does ranking come after both the assessment and management phases? 4. There is still significant overlap between "pathway risk analysis" and pest risk analysis as already covered in existing ISPMs. This should be addressed, the relationship clarified, documents lined up and cross-referenced where appropriate, and any unnecessary repetition removed. 5. There is a need to clarify the sequence of steps in the process of pathway risk analysis, and adjust the document headings to reflect this. All other information (e.g., "collecting data" sections) should be redistributed under process headings. It might be most useful to seek out a few examples of PWRA and walk through the draft with them to see if the proposed process makes sense. 	October 19, 2009
All/Christine Tibelius	Action Item 4 - Review documents on Scope of IAS under NAPPO to be prepared to identify next steps to bring this assignment to a conclusion. Christine will re-send the documents	October 19, 2009

Claire Wilson, Tony Koop, Alejandra Elizalde plus Isabel González, Patricia Koleff, Georgia Born-Schmidt, Ian McDonell, Michel Antoine Renaud and Christine Tibelius	Action Item 5 - Follow up to RSPM 32 – The subcommittee will stay online after the Panel call concludes to discuss this issue. They will report to the panel on Monday.	October 13 and 19, 2009
Isabel González, Daryl Seip, Tony Koop	Action Item 6 - Daryl, Isabel and Tony are working on a brief draft discussion paper on engagement of environmental stakeholders. This will be ready for our meeting on Monday.	October 19, 2009
Tony Koop, Penny Kriesch	Action Item 7 - The US will look into the situation with Catherine Hazelwood and if necessary identify a new NGO rep from the US.	No date set.
Isabel González	Action Item 8 - Mexico will provide contact information for Georgia.	October 16, 2009
Christine Tibelius	Action Item 9 - Christine will invite Gordon Gordh to attend the meeting in Chicago for the agenda item on climate change.	October 13, 2009
Next Meeting		
Location:	NAPPO annual meeting, Chicago, Illinois, USA.	
Date:	19 October 2009	
Proposed Agenda Items		
The agenda for the Panel meeting was developed from the discussions at the conference call on October 13, 2009 and is included below:		
MEETING OF THE NAPPO IS PANEL AND JOINT MEETING OF THE NAPPO IS AND PRA PANELS CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, MONDAY OCTOBER 19, 2009 AGENDA		
8:30	Joint Meeting - Opening remarks (Christine/Louise)	
	Introductions	
8:45	Discussion on RSPM No. 31 (all)	
	- Review of comments from Canada/Mexico and US proposed draft	
	- Establish next steps	
10:00	Break	
10:30	Discussion on climate change (all)	
	- Impact on spread / establishment of IAS	
	- Implications for current PRA process	
	- Initiation of a white paper on climate change	
	- Establishment of a WG to continue work	
12:00	Lunch	
13:30	Meeting of the IS Panel	
	Review of assignments:	
	Assignment 2 - Scope of IAS under NAPPO (Christine)	
	▪ Finalization of paper	
	▪ Review of country positions	
	▪ Next steps for finalizing NAPPO position	
	Assignment 3. Follow up to RSPM 32	
	▪ Discussion on whether or not any follow up on RSPM 32 should be done (i.e. is there is a need to do another document on risk management for example)	
15:30	Break	
16:00	Assignment 4: Engagement of Environmental stakeholders in NAPPO IAS activities (Daryl, Isabel, Tony)	
	• Finalization of brief discussion paper	
	• Discussion on list of environmental organizations in Canada, US and Mexico	
17:00	Adjourn	