NAPPO
North American Plant Protection Organization
Organización Norteamericana de Protección a las Plantas

NAPPO Conference Call Report

Expert Group/Grupo de Expertos:	Biological Control	
Location/Lugar:	Via phone and webinar	
Date/Fecha:	15 August, 2016	
Chairperson/Presidente	Peter Mason, Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada	
Participants/Participantes:		
Bruno Gallant, CFIA	Peter Mason, AAFC	Gustavo Torres, SENASICA
Rosalind James, USDA-ARS	John Huber, AAFC	Bob Tichenor, APHIS-PPQ
	John Goolsby, USDA-ARS	Nedelka Marin-Martinez, NAPPO
	Stephanie Bloem, NAPPO	Alonso Suazo, NAPPO
Summary/Resumen		
Project /Proyecto:	Discuss Agenda circulated by EG Chair	
General comments/ Comentarios generales:	• Introduced Alonso • Suggestion that Secretariat be in charge of call reports and send to EG chair for review – everyone agreed	
Item 1/ Asunto 1:	Introductions	
Consensus/Decisiones:	No questions or comments	
Item 2/ Asunto 2:	Joint activities with EPPO – Peter invited to Budapest to give presentation on regulatory issues for biocontrol in the NAPPO region; shared report & presentation w/EG; was asked to co-author paper for EPPO newsletter comparing how we do things in NA and in EPPO; currently in draft form; consulted with Tichenor and Arredondo on regulations for U.S. & Mexico. He will be at ICE; might meet-up informally with EPPO	
Consensus/Decisiones:	No questions - all clear	
Item 3 / Asunto 3:	Online training course. June/July presenters did voiceover; uploaded to website for Ashley to have access to presentations; Ken, Ashley and Peter worked on materials; Ashley converted all to common template format; Ashley provided comments on materials – these are issues that we need to address; some she can fix – some need re-recording audio; some just for information. • Some presentations have overviews/summaries and others not • Throughout – lack of consistency on how workshop is termed; same for modules – modules, presentations, etc. – she could fix this easily	

	• Photos, maps, etc. need proper attribution for use – sometimes this is tricky and companies in the internet are ready to charge money for things that don't belong to them • Some modules have overly long titles and sentences - makes font inconsistent • Voiceover can't be heard in some modules; in some the audio cuts-out at beginning or end • Some people refer to slides by number • Sometimes audio not synched. More work to do; propose Peter, Ashley and Ken work together – make recommendations for changes on slide content and voice-over issues. Presenters willing to re-look at presentations and make modifications on voice-over while Ashley can make the edits on slides. Timeline – sometime in September – hope to have the Module before the NAPPO meeting end of October. Might be able to make it but will need timely turn around on presentations.
Consensus/Decisiones:	• Look at your own presentation – can some slides be removed? Can other modifications be made? Make notes of changes – send to Peter • Try to work on version that Ashley prepared and agree to changes • Rosalind – In both languages or only English? First in English and then add Spanish
Item 4/ Asunto 4	New project proposals/deferred proposals. Three were not moved forward. What to do with this? • Pollen for feeding non-*Apis* pollinators – lots of people favored this one – Biobest was the company that submitted this project; any comments? • Issue outside of plant protection in Canada and Mexico, not in the U.S. • Rosalind - might this situation make it more relevant to NAPPO countries? Standardization rather than clarity of regulations? Issue has been around for a while – might it be taken back to industry on how to deal with it?
Consensus/Decisiones	• Where to go? Industry should approach Animal Health (AH) authorities in Canada and Mexico to get this going – does group agree? Yes, all member countries agree – who does this? Secretariat or group? Maybe group writes letter to industry – agreed? Yes – Peter & Rosalind – w/advice from Bruno – Rosalind & Bruno will review • question: is NAPPO the correct forum? Yes, because bees important for plant survival • if industry engages AH, it might come back to NAPPO
Item 5/ Asunto 5	Pathogen project - Letter to Renee - should project to be put forth again – OK with group? Question - are there methods to detect specific pathogens? University working on this – France's lab. ARS – worthwhile to pursue project? yes – all BC agents checked for microsporidians? Should we develop RSPM or S&T guidance document? Who does testing? Something that has to meet APHIS

	guidelines for first time importations of BC agents. In Canada not sure there is a lab they could send it to. Better to have someone else doing the test, not the importer. AGDIA? Need standardized protocol
Consensus/Decisiones	• Letter to Rene on S&T document for consideration by EC – everybody OK? Yes– might be a good instrument for harmonization • Can it be broader that non-Apis pollinators? Better to start small – list of pathogens could be broad – markers available for specific pathogens; develop guidance on how to do this kind of testing – maybe mention that it has utility beyond non-Apis pollinators – means non-Apis bee-type pollinators • Peter will draft letter to Renee
Item 6/ Asunto 6	Quck-scan, IR-4/PMRA or rapid PRA – came from discussions at workshop – also from Renee – comes from regulation in NED where BC agents were already in the system (Van Lenteren and company developed it) – industry in favor – circumvents RSPMs 12; look at whether the BC agent could overwinter – basic jist of the rapid PRA
Consensus/Decisiones	• Should re-submission encouraged or should it be incorporated into RSPM 12 • Concern with weather in U.S. and Mexico – several of the tropical agents would be able to survive in parts of MX and the U.S. • Peter read the justification – move forward for resubmission? • Goolsby – advise against – pretty risky – advise that only Canada has winters! All agree • Tichenor wondered about implementation in the U.S.; • Mason - Canada considers establishment in nearby countries • Mason will write letter; Goolsby will review
Item 7/ Asunto 7	New projects? RSPM revision? 39? – 2014; RSPM 22 – 2011 coming up for review – containment facilities – we might propose Tichenor – beneficial entomopathogenic nematodes off our radar – should we address? Canada uses RSPM 12 – is 12 sufficient guidance? Maybe proposal could add entomopathogenic nematodes commercially available Nothing on NAPPO for nematodes? Would Canada and Mexico be interested? At present all countries are broadly interpreting RSPM 12 for nematodes Broad consensus – proposal to expand 26 – Tichenor will take the lead
Consensus/Decisiones	• Expand RSPM 26 • RSPM 22
Other issues / otros asuntos	• Update on Annual Meeting invited EGs to present - Peter might come for the day to make the presentation • Call for proposals might be announced at the Annual Meeting • Question about project template
Consensus/Decisiones:	NAPPO will review template and send it out before call for proposals
Next Steps/Próximos pasos	

Responsible Person /Responsable	Action/Acciones	Date/Fecha
Peter, Ken and Ashley	review presentations and provide feedback	
All EG members	Review their materials and make edits as discussed during the call	
All EG members	Ensure that they have copyright permission for images – send to Peter	
Peter/Rosalind	Letter to Biobest on proposal on pollen movement	
Rene	Letter for resubmission of project to develop S&T document on molecular methods for pathogens	
Rene	Letter on quick-scan project	
?	RSPM 22 coming up for 5-year review	
?	New project – add nematodes to RSPM 26	
Peter	Biocontrol EG presentation at the Annual Meeting	
Next Meeting/Próxima Reunión		
Location/Lugar:	Conference call	
Date/Fecha:	October 12th at 2:00 pm EST; 1:00 pm Mexico time	
Proposed Agenda Items/Asuntos Propuestos – ACTION ITEMS		
See above		