



# NAPPO

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

## NAPPO Conference Call Report

Expert Group:	Revision of RSPM 26 ( <i>Certification of commercial arthropod biological control agents moving into NAPPO member countries</i> )	
Location:	Video conference (Zoom meeting)	
Date:	October 13, 2022	
Chairperson	Bruno Gallant (CFIA)	
Participants:		
Vicente Rosas Medina (SENASICA)	Hugo Arredondo (MX industry)	Brian Spencer (Canada industry)
Stephanie Bloem (NAPPO)	Melissa Tacolla (U. S. Industry)	Serena Bhardwaj (US / CA Industry)
Peter Mason (Agri. Canada)	Bob Pfannenstiel (APHIS PPQ)	Ron Weeks (APHIS PPQ)
Nedelka Marín-Martínez (NAPPO)		

### Summary

Project:	Revision of RSPM 26 ( <i>Certification of commercial arthropod biological control agents moving into NAPPO member countries</i> )	
General comments:	Welcome remarks by the EG Chairperson.	
Item 1:	Background study paper (BSP) for the review of RSPM 26	
Consensus:	<p>The chairperson reminded the EG that the purpose of the background study paper is to indicate what aspects of RSPM 26 need to be reviewed and what can be done to improve the implementation of the standard. He thanked EG members for providing feedback and the Secretariat for compiling, translating, and sharing the information.</p> <p>Notes and highlights from the discussion on the BSP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The ED provided an overview of the role of NAPPO. She indicated that the main role of NAPPO is to harmonize phytosanitary activities with the NAPPO member countries. She also indicated that standards are not an obligation but rather guidance provided on how to deal with specific phytosanitary issues. NAPPO RSPMs, unlike ISPMs, which are legally bound to the WTO, rely on expert groups to develop guidance and governments and industry to implement them.</li> <li>• In reference to the ED explanation of what the role of NAPPO is, the EG purpose is to develop harmonized guidelines that can be implemented in the three NAPPO countries for the movement of biological control agents.</li> <li>• The real issue is the movement of BCA to the United States and the standard should address this.</li> <li>• Knowledge of import-export requirements in each NAPPO</li> </ul>	

	<p>country will be useful and considered when updating RSPM 26. For the US there are no export requirements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mexico suggested to update the list of BCA species in RSPM 26.</li> <li>• RSPM 26 revision should include flexibility to adapt to future regulation changes.</li> <li>• The purpose of having a list of BCAs in RSPM 26 was to facilitate the imports of these species. The US indicated that regardless of the list in RSPM 26, the NPPO requires a permit for all BCAs that are imported into the country. US also indicated that there is a list of BCAs that do not require permits if moved within the US. The USDA-APHIS-PPQ list might not be the same as the one in RSPM 26.</li> <li>• Canada indicated that the list of BCAs in RSPM 26 is already integrated in their list of BCA species that can be imported but they also need an import permit but not a certification. Canada indicated that this is an aspect where RSPM 26 defers from its rules.</li> <li>• The US also indicated they do not require certification for the importation of BCA except for new importers. In this case, the certificate is good for 3 years with one inspection and the possibility of additional inspections as determined by APHIS PPQ.</li> <li>• The US indicated that it is important that the revised standard include a mechanism whereby the need for inspecting shipments that come on a regular basis from the same sources is reduced. Inspection alone delays the delivery of imported BCAs by at least one day.</li> <li>• Most harmonization aspects for the import of BCAs are already addressed in RSPM 26 but implementation is an important factor to consider.</li> <li>• The ED indicated that guidelines are normally produced before the regulations are in place. Implementation of the standards (at the IPPC level) is normally done through the development of a guide or through workshops.</li> <li>• Goal of RSPM 26 is to speed the importation process into the US. This will also provide an opportunity for the EG to understand the importation processes in each NAPPO country.</li> <li>• Options other than certification should also be considered as means for achieving the objective that was sought with RSPM 26.</li> </ul>
--	--

**Next Steps**

<b>Responsible Person</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Date</b>
Expert Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Explore options to include in the revised RSPM 26.</li> <li>• Consider inviting representatives from agencies involved in the importation/certification process</li> </ul>	

	to provide more information for consideration by the EG.	
Bob Pfannenstiel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider inviting inspectors from the USDA that work on commercial and non-commercial issues to join a video conference call with the EG. Bob will reach out to the inspectors initially and discuss the possibility of joining a video conference with the EG.</li> </ul>	
Bruno Gallant / NAPPO Secretariat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Develop a “skeleton document”. NAPPO will translate and share with the EG for comments. The comments will be translated and shared again with the EG before the next discussion session with the EG.</li> </ul>	
<b>Next Meeting</b>		
Location:	Video conference (Zoom meeting)	
Date:	TBD. Secretariat will send a poll for a videoconference in January 2023.	
<b>Proposed Agenda Items</b>		
1. Introduction		
2. Discuss/Complete the skeleton of the discussion paper		
3. Document development: assignment of responsibilities and timelines		
4. Next meeting		